

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

\*

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY  
NEW YORK

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
LONDON

MARCION  
AND THE  
NEW TESTAMENT

An Essay in the Early History  
of the Canon

+

*By John Knox, The University of Chicago*



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO · ILLINOIS



COPYRIGHT 1942 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED NOVEMBER 1942

\*

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

*To*

TONIE & LOIS BOLLES

*with gratitude for many things  
and especially for one thing*

## PREFACE

**M**ARCION, according to Caspar René Gregory, was "in every way the most active and influential man, bearing the name of Christian, between Paul and Origen." Whether so broad and unqualified a statement is justified or not, there can be no doubt of Marcion's crucial importance in the history of the New Testament canon. Even as conservative a critic as Zahn can write, "No Christian teacher of the second century holds so significant a place in the history of the ecclesiastical canon as the heretic Marcion." The purpose of this book is to define as fully, as sharply, and with as much assurance as possible what that place was.

I am only too aware of the limitations of this study. No period in the history of the church is so obscure as that which lies between the last decade of the first century and the middle decade of the second. And yet few periods have been so important. This half-century is thus both too significant to be ignored and too meagerly represented by extant documents to be adequately known. Under these circumstances conjecture is unavoidable, and I make no apology for the tentativeness of many of the suggestions of this book. Chapters iv and v, concerned with the relation of Marcion's Gospel to the Gospel of Luke, are particularly tentative in character and presume only to reopen a question which, in my judgment, has been prematurely closed. The hypothesis proposed in answer to this question has a bearing on several related questions of importance, such as

the date of Luke-Acts and the relation of Luke to Acts. Full discussion of these questions would carry us far from the special function of this book and into areas where (except possibly for the points made in this book) I have no contribution to make. I have, therefore, dealt with these questions only as the hypothesis bears on them, having first satisfied myself that no established fact in these related fields renders the hypothesis itself untenable.

Throughout this book my indebtedness to other students of Marcion, especially to Adolf von Harnack, will be apparent. I wish also to thank Professors Ernest Cadman Colwell and Wilhelm Pauck for their counsel at several points, and Mr. Willis Edwin Elliott, Mr. Harold Higley Platz, and Mrs. Evelyn Backstrom for editorial assistance. As always, I am grateful to the editorial and managerial staffs of the University of Chicago Press for their generous and competent collaboration.

JOHN KNOX

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
July 1, 1942

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. MARCION AND HIS THOUGHT . . . . .	I
II. MARCION AND THE IDEA OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	19
III. MARCION'S "APOSTLE" AND THE PAULINE CORPUS	39
IV. MARCION'S "GOSPEL" AND THE GOSPEL OF LUKE .	77
V. MARCION'S "GOSPEL-APOSTLE" AND LUKE-ACTS	114
VI. MARCION AND THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL	140
VII. MARCION AND THE NEW TESTAMENT .	158
<b>APPENDIX</b>	
I. THE MARCIONITE PROLOGUES TO THE LETTERS OF PAUL	169
II. A NOTE ON THE COLLECTION OF THE PAULINE LETTERS	172
III. LUKAN TERMS AND MARCION'S GOSPEL . . . . .	177
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN WORKS CITED .	183
INDEX . . . . .	191

## CHAPTER I

### MARCION AND HIS THOUGHT

**A**MONG the creative personalities of early Christianity few are so interesting and important as Marcion, who was expelled from the Roman community somewhere near A.D. 140 and whose activities gave rise to the most vigorous heretical movement within the ancient church. We know relatively little about him. The heresy was destroyed and its records were lost, and for our knowledge of the heretic we must depend upon his enemies—men like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius, orthodox churchmen of his own or later periods—who bitterly fought the strong movement which looked to Marcion as its founder. Such witnesses can hardly be regarded as altogether trustworthy, and, besides, they constantly took for granted in their readers knowledge of Marcion and of Marcionism which we do not possess.<sup>1</sup>

To sum up very briefly the meager knowledge we have: it appears that Marcion was originally from

<sup>1</sup> The documentary source materials for the study of Marcion and Marcionism are the following: Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* and *De Praesc. Haer.*; Adamantius (Pseudo-Origen), *Dial. de recta in deum fide*; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, I, Haer. xlii; and a few scattered references in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Ephraim of Syria, Eusebius (upon whom we must depend for our knowledge of many sources), and other writers. Of these, Tertullian is by far the most extensive and important. For a full and detailed account of the sources see T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen, 1888), I, 603 ff., and II, 409 ff., and A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig, 1921), pp. 1\* ff. (2d ed., 1924, pp. 3\* f.).

Pontus and that he came to Rome late in the 130's. We are told that his father was the Christian bishop of Sinope. This is probably true—there is no particular reason for questioning it—but one may well doubt that Marcion was expelled from his home church because of his heretical views, as some of the sources affirm. The charge that he was expelled for seducing a girl may be dismissed as mere slander.<sup>2</sup> If there had been any ground for this accusation, Tertullian would have known about it, and, if he had known about it, he was not the kind of man to be silent about it, especially as Marcion emphasized a high, even ascetic, morality.<sup>3</sup> As to Marcion's activities as a Christian teacher before his coming to Rome we have little, if any, documentary evidence, but to this matter we shall return later in this chapter.

We are not left in doubt as to the principal distinctive tenets of Marcion's faith. Besides taking a Docetic view of the Gospel history, he denied the identity of the Father of Jesus with the God of the Jews. This God, the Creator of the world, Marcion regarded as an inferior deity. He therefore repudiated the Jewish Scriptures, which were also the Scriptures of the early church, and substituted for them what may properly be called the first New Testament. This Marcionite "New Testament" was in two parts, "Gospel" and "Apostle," corresponding perhaps to the Law and the Prophets of the Hebrew canon, and thus set the pattern of the later

<sup>2</sup> Epiphanius, *Panarion*, I, Haer. xlii. 1. It has been reasonably conjectured that the original maker of this charge meant simply that Marcion had led the church at Sinope astray.

<sup>3</sup> Marcion forbade any sexual relations, even within marriage.

ecclesiastical New Testament. The "Gospel" was in considerable part identical with our Gospel of Luke, and the "Apostle" was ten letters of Paul. No copy of the Marcionite Bible has survived, and for our knowledge of its contents we must depend upon references and quotations in the Fathers. From these quotations one gathers that the letters of Paul in Marcion's canon were very similar to the corresponding letters of Paul in our own canon but that the Gospel which Marcion used, while evidently more like our Luke than like any other Gospel known to us, differed from it in important respects. To mention only the most notable of these differences, Marcion's Gospel,<sup>4</sup> although it contained nothing which is not to be found in our Gospel of Luke, was less than three-fourths as long. That this canon of Marcion was an important factor in the formation of the catholic New Testament has long been recognized; I am persuaded that it was an even more important factor than has been commonly supposed. To explore the connection between the two canons is the purpose of this book.

Before we can attack this special problem, however, we must have Marcion's general theological position somewhat more clearly in mind (although we shall make no effort to discuss it fully or in detail);<sup>5</sup> and, as

<sup>4</sup> A word of explanation of some more or less arbitrary decisions about typography is necessary. Throughout this book the words "Gospel" and "Apostle" will be placed within quotation marks when they refer to the two divisions of the canon. When the word "Gospel" refers simply to a book as such, quotation marks will not appear. The same word will be capitalized when it refers to a book and will be spelled "lower case" when it refers to the Christian message or evangel.

<sup>5</sup> In addition to the sources, any good book on the history of doctrine may be profitably consulted. Important special studies of Marcion and his



we shall see later, it is particularly important for our purpose that we know as much as the meager evidence permits us to know about how and when Marcion's distinctive views took shape in his mind.

## I

A recent book of Walter Bauer<sup>6</sup> has done much to correct and clarify our understanding of the theological situation within the churches of the late first and early second centuries. Within that period there was, strictly speaking, no such thing as heresy and orthodoxy. There was the greatest diversity of belief among churches and among Christians, and the beliefs of no particular group had achieved real pre-eminence. All the great Christian teachers of the period—the authors of the Fourth Gospel, of Hebrews and of Revelation, Ignatius, Polycarp, Clement, Papias, Marcion, Tatian, and many others—were orthodox or heretical, according to the point of view of the critic. One may claim that in a sense this is always true—"orthodoxy" is always "our own doxy," as someone has said—but it is important to note that after A.D. 175 there existed an objective ground for distinguishing between the orthodox and the heterodox which was lacking before A.D. 150. By 175 the church at Rome had established itself as the leading church of Christendom (although its primacy was not yet universally acknowledged) and had consciously set about

---

thought will be alluded to in the course of these pages. The most important of these, to which reference will be made in every part of this book and on which I must constantly depend, is Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig, 1921; 2d ed., 1924). This book will hereafter be referred to simply as *Marcion*.

<sup>6</sup> *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934).

bringing the polity, cult practices, and beliefs of other churches into conformity with its own. The position of church groups in every part of the Mediterranean world which found themselves in harmony with Rome was enormously reinforced, and eventually the organization of the churches under the leadership of Rome was fully accomplished. By the end of the second century this process had only begun, but it had begun vigorously and effectively.

Thus, when Tertullian wrote his reply to Marcion soon after A.D. 200, there is considerably more appropriateness in regarding Marcionism as a heresy than there is for regarding Marcion himself, fifty-five or sixty years earlier, as a heretic. Subsequent events, to be sure, proved him to be such—and indeed I believe it was inevitable that they should—but at the time he came to Rome, probably in 138 or 139,<sup>7</sup> the question who was orthodox and who was heretical had not been so surely settled. Although the future lay with the writer of the Johannine epistles as against the Docetists, with Polycarp and Justin as against Marcion or Valentinus, it was, in 140, by no means clear that it did. It is of the greatest importance to recognize that Marcion was not in the situation of challenging what had become a systematically formulated and generally established theological position; on the contrary, he faced a divided field and was only one of many competing teachers. He never thought of himself other than as a member of the true and universal church of Christ, and his con-

<sup>7</sup> For the evidence for this date see Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 23 ff. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 25 ff.). See also n. 19, pp. 11 f., below. There is a good discussion of chronology for Marcion in R. S. Wilson, *Marcion: A Study of a Second Century Heretic* (London, 1933), pp. 50 ff.

temporaries would have had appreciably more difficulty proving he was wrong than later churchmen had in outlawing his doctrine as held among the Marcionite churches even a generation afterward.

Not only did Marcion prepare a Scripture for the use of his disciples; he is known also to have composed an independent work, the *Antitheses*, which among the Marcionites was of almost equal authority.<sup>8</sup> This work was apparently an effort to make a constructive statement of his theological position by elaborating the contrast, the "antitheses," between law and gospel, between the Jewish Scripture and the revelation in Christ. If this work had survived, we should know a great deal about Marcionism which is now obscure. Unfortunately, however, this document, like the text of the "Gospel and Apostle," has been lost, and we know of its existence only from references to it in Tertullian and less explicit citations in other writings of Marcion's ecclesiastical opponents.<sup>9</sup> In spite of the meagerness of

<sup>8</sup> Harnack ascribes to it canonical value among the Marcionites (see his *Origin of the New Testament* [New York, 1925], a translation of *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung* [Leipzig, 1914], p. 30). The basis for the judgment that it had this kind of value in the Marcionite churches is apparently Tertullian's use of the phrase "in summo instrumento" in connection with it (*Adv. Marc.* i. 19). The context of this passage, however, does not convince me that the word "instrumentum" has the meaning of "testamentum" in this particular place. But see Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 70 (2d ed., p. 76), esp. n. 1, where the author admits that the use of "summo" may mean that the *Antitheses* actually enjoyed something less than canonical authority. Tertullian makes his point too strongly to be quite persuasive: "Hätten die Antithesen genau dieselbe Autorität bei M. besessen wie das Ev. und das Apostolikon, so hätte Tert. einfach 'in instrumento' geschrieben." It is inconceivable that Marcion himself regarded his own work as equal in authority with the "Gospel and Apostle." See also Zahn, *op. cit.*, I, 596 f.

<sup>9</sup> A kind of reconstruction of this work is attempted by Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 81 ff. (2d ed., pp. 256\* ff.).

the evidence, however, Marcion's general theological position is indicated clearly enough.

It can be briefly summarized in the following series of statements: (1) The Creator of the world, although a real God, must be distinguished from the higher God, unknown except as he was revealed in Christ; (2) the Creator of the world is a just God, but severe and harsh; the God whom Christ revealed is a Father, a God of love; (3) judgment is the prerogative of the Creator; redemption is the free gift of the God of love; (4) the Jewish Scriptures represent a true revelation of the Creator, but they do not speak of or for the God whom alone Christians ought to worship and from whom alone salvation from the present wicked world is to be received; (5) the revelation in Christ was intended not merely to supplement or "fulfil" Judaism but entirely to displace it—the one had no connection with the other; (6) the Son of the Father did not actually take sinful flesh but only appeared to do so; (7) there is no resurrection of the flesh; and (8) Paul was the only true apostle, to whom Christ committed his gospel—other "apostles" were false and had misled the church.

Although, as far as we know, no reference was made to the matter in any Marcionite source, it is certain from many allusions in the Fathers<sup>10</sup> that after Marcion came to Rome he became associated more or less closely with Cerdo, an eminent Christian Gnostic from Syria, and there can be little doubt that his views, as they finally took shape, were in some measure influenced by this teacher. The character of this influence has been fre-

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* i. xxvii. 1; Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* i. 2, 22; iii. 21; iv. 17; Hippolytus *Ref. Haer.* x. 15; Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 10, 11.

quently discussed and very differently estimated. Two of the most conspicuous general characteristics of Gnosticism were dualism and Docetism, and correspondence at these two points between Marcionism and Gnosticism has often led to the simple identification of Marcion as a Gnostic and to the ascription of his whole position to Cerdo's influence. But this is far too simple a statement of the case. Not only was Marcion much more than just another Gnostic; he was also in the midst of his teaching career when he met Cerdo. The rest of this chapter will be concerned with presenting the grounds for this assertion.

## II

The earliest allusion to Marcion by name is in Justin Martyr, who, writing in Rome in or near A.D. 150, tells us that Marcion had made disciples among men of many nations and that he was still teaching even then (καὶ νῦν ἔτι).<sup>11</sup> This statement of Justin was made only after Marcion had reached Rome, but it throws some possible light on the latter's earlier career. For one thing, it indicates that Marcion's influence was more widespread than one would suppose possible if his career as a Christian teacher and leader had begun only a few years earlier. Besides, Justin's phrase, "even until now," suggests a longer period of "heretical" activity than is allowed for by the usual theory that Marcion became an influential teacher only after he had reached the West. But this is, at best, only a hint of pre-Roman Marcionism; and not much more than that can be said

<sup>11</sup> *Apol.* i. 26. Fifty years later Tertullian can say that Marcion's heresy has filled the whole world (*Adv. Marc.* v. 19). On widespread influence of Marcion in the early period see Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 26 f., 37 f., 74 f., 132 f.

about the statements in the Latin Prologues of John and in Philastrius, which, Harnack believes, virtually prove that Marcion was teaching in the province of Asia after leaving Pontus.<sup>12</sup>

More dependable evidence is to be found in the so-called Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians. Scholars have always been divided about the date of this epistle of fourteen short chapters. Polycarp, who is identified in the correspondence of Ignatius as the bishop of Smyrna, devotes a small but important part of his letter to attacking the views of an unnamed teacher at Philippi. This teacher is a Docetist, who does not "confess the testimony of the cross"; he has been guilty of twisting the "logia of the Lord" to suit his own purposes; he has denied the resurrection and the judgment. Anyone acquainted with the later polemic against Marcion will be familiar with these several counts against the Philippian teacher, and many students of Polycarp's epistle have identified him with Marcion. The case for this identification is exceedingly strong, especially as Polycarp calls his heretic "the first-born of Satan," a phrase which Irenaeus tells us was used by Polycarp in addressing Marcion on one occasion.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, the thirteenth chapter of Poly-

<sup>12</sup> See *Marcion*, pp. 9\* ff. (2d ed., pp. 11\* ff.); also Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1897), II, 308 ff. Among other discussions of these data may be mentioned three articles by B. W. Bacon, "The Latin Prologues of John," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXII (1913), 194 ff.; "Marcion, Papias and the 'Elders,'" *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXIII (1922), 134 ff.; and "The Anti-Marcionite Prologue to John," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIX (1930), 43 ff. Bacon makes adequate reference to earlier literature in this discussion. A recent contribution is that of Robert Grant, "The Oldest Gospel Prologues," *Anglican Theological Review*, XXIII (1941), 231 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Adv. Haer.* iii. 3. 4 (also noted in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* xiv. 7).

carp's letter plainly indicates that it served originally as a covering epistle for the letters of Ignatius, which the Christians at Philippi had asked Polycarp to send them, and that it was dispatched only a little while after Ignatius had passed through Philippi on his way to martyrdom in Rome. This could hardly have been later than A.D. 117. The prevailing view has been, therefore, that the false teacher mentioned in the letter could not have been Marcion, attractive as that hypothesis would otherwise be.

In a recent work of great importance P. N. Harrison<sup>14</sup> persuasively presents the view that the problem of the date of Polycarp's epistle is to be solved by the recognition that two letters of the bishop of Smyrna were fused to compose the document we have. The first twelve chapters belong to a letter written between A.D. 130 and 135 and concerned, among other things, with the activities of Marcion; the thirteenth chapter alone, or possibly the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters, constituted the earlier letter which accompanied the Ignatian correspondence. As happened in the case of Paul's letters to the Corinthians and perhaps also to the Philippians,<sup>15</sup> the distinction between letters to the same church was ignored as unimportant by later editors and what were originally two communications became the one epistle we know.

Whether or not one finds Harrison's theory of the two letters convincing, there is no denying the strength of the case he presents for the identification of the false teacher at Philippi with Marcion. It must be acknowl-

<sup>14</sup> *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge, 1936).

<sup>15</sup> See pp. 62 f. below.

edged that, as Harnack shows,<sup>16</sup> Marcion cannot fairly be charged with denying the significance of the cross or the reality of the judgment;<sup>17</sup> still, as Harrison points out, there can be no doubt that his enemies would have understood him to do so—as indeed they actually did later. And that is all the case requires.

More serious is the objection that Polycarp does not refer in his letter to what were the most conspicuous features of Marcionism as it is described in the later Fathers, namely, its repudiation of the Old Testament and its doctrine of two Gods. Harrison's quite adequate answer here is that these two features of Marcion's thought had not yet emerged when Polycarp wrote: it was only after coming to Rome that Marcion forsook the monotheism in which he was reared and became an avowed and thoroughgoing dualist.<sup>18</sup>

But if the false teacher at Philippi was Marcion, we have evidence of his activity and importance as a "heretic" years before he was expelled from the Roman church.<sup>19</sup> How many years? Harrison dates Polycarp's "second letter" (chaps. i-xii) about A.D. 132 or 133. But why may not Marcion's activity have begun much

<sup>16</sup> *Chronologie*, I, 388, and *Marcion*, pp. 165, 176 ff. (2d ed., pp. 125, 137 ff.); see also Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

<sup>17</sup> He only denied that Christ or his Father did the judging (see Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* i. 26-28). On Marcion's Docetism see Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 164 f. (2d ed., pp. 124 f.).

<sup>18</sup> It is important to remember, however, that Marcion's two Gods were not the familiar Gnostic Gods of goodness and evil, but rather the just (but harsh) God and the loving God. Likewise, Marcion did not repudiate the Old Testament in the sense of regarding it as altogether evil; it was a valid revelation of the Creator deity. As for the absence of any reference in Polycarp to the "mutilating" of the Gospel see pp. 112 f., below.

<sup>19</sup> Harnack dates this expulsion in A.D. 144, relying upon Tertullian's statement that the Marcionites reckoned 115 years between Christ and



earlier? On what ground do we conclude that it may not have begun by A.D. 120 or 110? Certainly nothing we know as to the time of Marcion's death precludes that possibility. And is it not natural to suppose that he worked in western Asia Minor before entering Macedonia? It has been held that Marcion's "heretical" activity cannot have begun very long before he came to Rome since otherwise the Roman church would have been aware of his heresy and would not have admitted him to its membership even for a while. But this argument involves a conception of the situation as regards beliefs in the church of the early second century which we have already found to be false. There were no fixed standards by which heresy was clearly identified. Especially if Marcion had not yet made explicit his attitude toward the Scriptures and toward the Creator God, he might have been teaching for years without being recognized as a false teacher. Even Polycarp's denunciation of him was only one Christian's judgment of another. However heretical Marcion may have been by the standards of A.D. 175-200, he would have come to Rome with letters of warm commendation from churches and church leaders farther east, and there would have been no question about admitting him to the fellowship of the church.

### III

I have already alluded to Harrison's argument that Marcion's doctrine of the two Gods and his rejection of

---

Marcion (*Adv. Marc.* i. 19). E. Barnikol argues, not too persuasively, that Marcion died in 144 and that the date of his break with the church at Rome was correspondingly earlier (*Die Entstehung der Kirche in zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions* [Kiel, 1933]).

the Old Testament were developments of his position which took place after he reached Rome. This seems to me to be exceedingly likely, although I shall not trouble to reproduce Harrison's case.<sup>20</sup> The new developments are explained by the same scholar as owing to the influence of Cerdo. This may also be true; but I should like to suggest the possibility that Cerdo merely provided the intellectual terms for the embodying and expressing of convictions which were implicit in Marcion's position before he came to Rome or met the Syrian Gnostic. This cannot be proved, but it can be supported as an altogether possible, if not likely, explanation of the facts we have.

One does not begin to understand Marcion until one recognizes that he belongs, first of all, not among the intellectuals but among the prophets. His interests were not primarily intellectual but practical and religious.<sup>21</sup> This was not the only respect in which he was like Paul, his avowed master. Although Marcion undoubtedly misunderstood Paul at certain vital points, there can be no question that he came nearer to understanding him than did, say, the author of I Timothy, and that he stood much closer to Paul than to Cerdo.

<sup>20</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 183 ff.

<sup>21</sup> The superiority of Harnack's interpretation of Marcion rests in considerable part upon his clear apprehension of this fact. This superiority appears most clearly when one turns from Harnack to some attempt to explain Marcion simply as a Gnostic. Read, e.g., the short essay on Marcion in F. C. Baur's *Church History of the First Three Centuries* (London and Edinburgh, 1878), pp. 223 ff. (the English translation of the German work first published in 1853). Harnack defends his view against a number of critics in *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 2 ff. The wide difference between Marcionism and typical Gnosticism will strike one who turns from Tertullian's *Adv. Marc.* to Irenaeus' description of the extravagances of Valentinianism, Marcosianism, etc., in the first book of his *Adv. Haer.*

Underneath the Marcionite antithesis between the God of justice and the God of love lay the Pauline antithesis between the law and the gospel, the flesh and the Spirit. The one was the result—erroneous, if you will—of reflection on the other: an attempt, however misguided, to make it consistent, to draw out what were felt to be its inescapable implications. Marcion was not primarily a Gnostic but a Paulinist. At first, he made no attempt to rationalize his Paulinism in any thoroughgoing way; when he did make that attempt—doubtless under the influence of Gnostic speculation and perhaps also in reaction against ecclesiastical suspicion and antagonism at Rome—his doctrine of the two Gods and his characteristic attitude toward the Jewish Scriptures was the result.<sup>22</sup>

But not only was Marcion devoted to Paul and to what he conceived to be the Pauline gospel; he was also in all probability reared in a community which regarded itself as following in the tradition of that apostle. That Pauline churches existed during Paul's lifetime—always in sharp distinction from and sometimes in real opposition to other communities—is clear enough from Paul's letters. The preservation of these letters and their collection late in the first century<sup>23</sup> are best to be explained as the work of such communities or of some one of them. I find in the hypothesis of the continuance into the second century of distinctively Pauline communities (on a priori grounds surely a plausible hypothesis) the best

<sup>22</sup> That Marcion's Paulinism was a reaction against the literalism and orthodoxy of his home church seems to me far less likely than the view I am now seeking to present. But see Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 20 ff., 28 ff. (2d ed., pp. 22 ff., 30 ff.), and Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

<sup>23</sup> See pp. 57 ff. below.

explanation both of Marcion himself and of the amazingly quick and widespread response to him.

There is undoubtedly historical continuity between Paul's conflicts with the Judaizers, which continued probably up to the very end of his life,<sup>24</sup> and Marcion's struggle with the Roman church (although I hope that no one will understand me to mean either that Paul would have agreed with Marcion or that the Roman church believed Christians must be circumcised!). In a word, there were almost certainly churches in Greece and Asia Minor which were prepared to give Marcion a more friendly hearing than he received at Rome—and these would have been churches established by the Apostle Paul or under his influence.<sup>25</sup>

This does not mean that in any such churches the doctrine of the two Gods was preached or the Jewish Scriptures were expressly repudiated. That may have been the case, but more probably it was not. It does seem quite likely, however, that there were many churches, even as late as A.D. 150, where the Jewish Scriptures were little, if any, used, and where belief in the God of the Jews was held only formally, if at all. A. C. McGiffert in his *God of the Early Christians*<sup>26</sup> has assembled impressive evidence for the view that in many

<sup>24</sup> See two articles of my own on the Pauline chronology: "Fourteen Years Later"—a Note on the Pauline Chronology," *Journal of Religion*, XVI (1936), 341 ff.; and "The Pauline Chronology," *Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, LVIII (1939), 15 ff. See also Donald W. Riddle, *Paul: Man of Conflict* (Nashville, 1940).

<sup>25</sup> It is interesting to remember in this connection that if we may judge from certain passages in Romans, Paul himself was by no means sure of his reception by the Roman church.

<sup>26</sup> New York, 1924.

early Christian communities Jesus was God. The Creator God of the Jews was not necessarily explicitly rejected; he was simply ignored. Worship and prayer were addressed to Christ alone. In such churches it is doubtful that the Jewish Scriptures would have had a very important place. Paul in Col. 3:16 speaks of Christians' teaching one another with "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs" but says nothing of reading from Scripture. The same omission is even more striking in Paul's discussion of the services of the Corinthian church. And Pliny's letter about the practices of the church in Bithynia and Pontus—interestingly enough, Marcion's home church—not only speaks of Christ (not God) as the object of the Christians' worship but also fails to make any mention of Scripture reading in their services.<sup>27</sup> Could such an omission conceivably have occurred if Pliny had been describing the cult practices of the Jewish synagogue?

Paul, needless to say, set great store by Scripture (although he seems to have been likely to resort to its use only when he was trying to argue a point; there are no quotations in Thessalonians, Colossians, and Philipians, which are his less controversial letters), but that does not mean that his churches would have held Scripture in the same high regard. As a matter of fact, is it not more natural to expect that they would not? Copies of Scripture could not have been easily obtained; and why should non-Jewish Christians have had much interest in possessing them anyhow? The Pauline churches, at least, might have been expected to rely upon the

<sup>27</sup> See Pliny *Letters* x. 96.

Spirit: "The letter killeth"; it was the Spirit that gave life.<sup>28</sup>

Now imagine a zealous and forceful Christian of the early second century whose Christianity has been of a decidedly non-Jewish type, who has been nourished on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians and other writings of that apostle, who has found salvation in the Lord Jesus Christ and in his God and Father, who has made little use, if any, of Jewish Scripture, thinking of it as the "law" which Christ has brought to nought—imagine such a Christian suddenly finding himself in a community where the historical continuity with Judaism is prized as one of the most precious values, where ultimate authority is vested in the Jewish Scriptures, where the sharp Pauline antithesis between law and gospel, between letter and Spirit, is softened, if not effaced. Do we not have in such a situation all we need to explain what seems to have happened several years after Marcion came to Rome, namely, his expulsion from the church there and (given Cerdo) the development of the two aberrations of the Pauline gospel which are represented by Marcion's doctrine of the two Gods and by his association of Judaism and its Scripture with the lesser of them?

<sup>28</sup> Harnack in his *Bible Reading in the Early Church* (New York and London, 1912) questions the extent of private Bible-reading in the church before Irenaeus but takes for granted the practice of public reading. I do not see the grounds for this assumption, at any rate as applied to all the churches. In some of the Pauline churches, largely Gentile in background, it seems more likely a priori that the introduction of Bible-reading into the services of worship would come relatively late. And it was from a Pauline church that Marcion probably came. But see also Harnack, "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden," in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1928), pp. 124 ff.

The fact that Polycarp accuses Marcion of Docetism presents no difficulty. To be sure, Docetism is far removed from Paulinism (although there are passages in Paul's letters by which Marcion might quite plausibly have supported it);<sup>29</sup> but in the early second century Docetism was widespread in the church, and Marcion may well have adopted it long before he came into contact with Cerdo.<sup>30</sup> It is equally unnecessary to attribute Marcion's "denial" of the judgment to the influence of Cerdo in Rome. In that connection it is interesting to observe that Marcion's attitude is not far out of line with the statement of the Fourth Gospel: "God did not send his son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."<sup>31</sup>

The purpose of this chapter has been not to give a full account of Marcion's theological position but to indicate the probability that long before he came to Rome he was actively teaching, in the churches of Asia Minor and Greece, doctrines which were later declared heretical. As we shall see, this fact has important bearing upon our study of Marcion's influence upon the formation of the New Testament canon.

<sup>29</sup> One thinks of such a passage as Phil. 2:6 ff., which indeed has sometimes been regarded as a Marcionite interpolation, although in my judgment without sufficient reason. But see Barnikol, *Philipper 2, der Marcionitische Ursprung des Mythos-Satzes Phil. 2:6-7* (Kiel, 1932).

<sup>30</sup> Witness the Johannine epistles, to which Tertullian refers as having been aimed at "precocious and abortive Marcionites" (*Adv. Marc.* iii. 8).

<sup>31</sup> This is only one instance of many striking similarities of emphasis as between Marcion and the Fourth Gospel (see Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 236 ff. [2d ed., pp. 204 ff.]). As I have already said, Marcion did not deny that judgment would take place; he only denied that the God of Jesus would administer it. If C. H. Dodd is right in his interpretation of what Paul meant by the "wrath" (*Epistle to the Romans* [New York and London, 1932], pp. 20 ff.), we have in Paul, here as elsewhere, an anticipation of Marcion's position.

## CHAPTER II

### MARCION AND THE IDEA OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

IT is not infrequently said that Marcion's canon was the first "closed" canon of distinctively Christian writings. This is undoubtedly true. No one before Marcion said of a restricted number of documents: "These and these alone among Christian books are to be accepted in the church." On this every student of the canon will agree. But if one says so much as this, has one not said in effect that Marcion's canon was the first Christian Scripture? Can there be a canon at all unless it is a closed canon, and can a canon be closed without being a canon in the true sense? Here opinion would be far more divided. Many who will agree that Marcion was the first to close a canon of Scripture will not agree that he was the first to have one. Thus, the question of what is meant by the term "Scripture" must be answered before the connection of Marcion with the canon can be adequately dealt with.

#### I

The denial that Marcion had the first Christian Scripture takes two forms. In one of these forms the term "Scripture" is the object of attack, and in the other, the term "first." One denies that Marcion's canon had for him and his churches the value of Scripture; the other denies that it was the first collection of Christian writings to have such value.



As examples of scholars who take the first position one may cite Reuss and Leipoldt. Reuss attacks "the views of those moderns who regard it [Marcion's collection] as the first attempt at a canon," insisting that Marcion "allowed to the books themselves no divine authority at all, and consequently might permit himself to treat the text according to his pleasure."<sup>1</sup> Leipoldt expresses himself in quite similar fashion:

Wie das Lukasevangelium galten ihm [Marcion] auch die Paulusbriefe, nicht als Heilige Schrift, sondern nur als eine besonders wertvolle Geschichtsquelle; denn auch in den Paulusbriefen beseitigte Marcion Schwierigkeiten, die ihm aufstiegen, nicht durch allegorische Deutung, sondern durch Textänderung. . . . Auch Marcions Schüler betrachteten die Paulusbriefe nicht als kanonisch: sie setzten, durch die Polemiker der Grosskirche genötigt, die kritische Redaktionstätigkeit des Meisters fort.<sup>2</sup>

In both of these cases the decision that Marcion did not attribute the quality of Scripture to the books in his collection rests upon the fact that Marcion is known to have edited his text. But Marcion was not the first and was certainly not the last editor of the text of Christian documents, canonical or not; and, like all other editors, he did not think of himself as "treating the text according to his pleasure." The situation was rather, as he saw it, that others had played fast and loose with the text with the result that Paul and likewise the Gospel were made to say things they could not actually have said. Marcion, like every other textual critic, construed his work as that of a restorer of the authentic text. And, in so far

<sup>1</sup> E. Reuss, *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament* (Boston, 1884), II, 296. This is an English translation of the fifth edition (1874) of Reuss's *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments*.

<sup>2</sup> J. Leipoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1907), I, 192.

as his disciples altered the text of the "Gospel and Apostle," they did so, we may be sure, with the same object. Their having done so in no way proves that they did not regard the Marcionite canon as having the kind of value Scriptures have. Indeed, it might be argued that Marcion's very solicitude about the correctness of the text of his canon indicates the high regard he felt for the documents which composed it.<sup>3</sup>

Tertullian's *Against Marcion* gives not the slightest indication that Marcion's way of thinking of and using his "Gospel and Apostle" was in any respect different from the way in which Tertullian himself thought of and used the Christian documents which, there can be no doubt, he received as Scripture.<sup>4</sup> Finally, it may be pointed out that Marcion's setting his collection over against the Jewish Scriptures (i.e., the Old Testament) and on that basis drawing his "antitheses" indicates that he thought of his canon as having the same relation to the God of Christ as the Jewish-Christian Bible had to the Creator God. It would thus have been for him, in very truth, a new (even if the only true) "testament," whether Marcion used that phrase or not.

"But," others say, "although Marcion had a distinctively Christian Scripture, it is a mistake to say that he was the first to have one." Those whose depreciation

<sup>3</sup> That others besides "heretics" deliberately altered New Testament texts in the interest of greater "accuracy" clearly appears in a recent study by Eric L. Titus, "The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942). It must be acknowledged, however, that Justin, at least, had no New Testament in the strict sense.

<sup>4</sup> Tertullian speaks of Marcion's Gospel as being received by the Marcionites as Scripture (e.g., *Adv. Marc.* iv. 34).

of Marcion's significance takes this form defend their position by citing the abundant evidence that many of the books of the New Testament were known and quoted in various Christian communities before even the earliest possible date for Marcion's canon. Indeed, many writers on the canon seem to proceed on the assumption that a history of the canon is simply a matter of cataloguing what books were known, and when, and where.<sup>5</sup> But it scarcely needs to be pointed out that one can know and use religious books—and constantly does—which are not regarded as having the value of Scripture.

Nor does the fact that a book was read in connection with public worship necessarily mean canonicity. Most writers on the canon are much surer than they have any right to be about the extent to which particular books were thus read. That certain Gospels were read in various parts of the church before A.D. 150 is clear; that the letters of Paul were read in some churches is likely (they would almost certainly have been read in the "pre-Marcionite" churches, if the point made in the preceding chapter is sound and there were any such churches); that other Christian documents were read, either regularly or occasionally, in various churches is

<sup>5</sup> Is it fair to Westcott, Gregory, and Souter to say that their books, in many ways so excellent, do not lay enough emphasis upon the distinction between use and canonization? Harnack's *Origin of the New Testament* is in spite of its brevity so good a book on the canon just because it is aware of this distinction and concerned with "how" and "why" as well as with "where" and "when." See Westcott, *On the Canon of the New Testament* (London, 1855); Gregory, *The Canon and Text of the New Testament* (New York, 1909); Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (New York, 1913). An excellent brief discussion of the meaning of canonicity is to be found in E. C. Colwell, *The Study of the Bible* (Chicago, 1937), pp. 1-37.

more than possible. But establishing the fact that particular books were read in church is not the same thing as establishing canonicity. A well-known and rather acrimonious controversy between the two giants among students of the New Testament canon, Zahn and Harnack, turned on this point.<sup>6</sup> Harnack charged that both in Zahn's great work on the canon and in its shorter sequel<sup>7</sup> "the right to be read publicly and the right to be included in the Canon are jumbled together . . . as if they were identical."<sup>8</sup> Whatever may be the truth of this charge as applied to Zahn, there can be no doubt that Harnack is right in insisting that the distinction between public lection and canonicity is real and important.

Everything indicates that, in so far as any particular Christian document was read in church before A.D. 150, it was for one or more of the following reasons: (1) it contained accounts of the words of Jesus or of events in his career, particularly the passion and the resurrection; (2) it was written by some revered apostle or other early leader; (3) it was simply intrinsically edifying. There is no ground for the opinion that any document was in this period read because it belonged to an authorized sacred

<sup>6</sup> The most important literature of this controversy is as follows: Harnack, *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200* (Freiburg, 1889); Zahn, *Einige Bemerkungen zu Adolf Harnack's Prüfung der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1889); and Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament* (New York, 1925), pp. 218 ff.

<sup>7</sup> T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen, 1888) and *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1901). Obviously Harnack's original criticism, made in 1889, was based only on the earlier work.

<sup>8</sup> *Origin of the New Testament*, p. 219. This book, already cited several times, will be referred to hereafter simply as *Origin*.

collection. But until a document is thought of as possessing a peculiar value merely in virtue of its membership in such a collection, it can hardly be said to have the special value of Scripture, no matter how revered it may be for its own sake. In other words, before the time when documents were read in church at least in part simply because they belonged to the New Testament, we are safe in saying that there was no New Testament; and this means a date for the origin of the New Testament almost if not quite as late as A.D. 170. For Justin Martyr the Scriptures are what we know as the Old Testament,<sup>9</sup> and the sources for Marcion clearly indicate that he defended his canon as against those Scriptures alone, never as against a "New Testament."<sup>10</sup> It is apparent that the non-Marcionite churches, at the time when Marcion set up his "Gospel and Apostle" and wrote his *Antitheses*, had no Scripture except what we call the Old Testament. If, then, Marcion's canon was Scripture at all, it was the first distinctively Christian Scripture.

This brings us back to the question with which this discussion began: What is meant by "Scripture"? I should answer that, at least so far as the Hebrew-Christian community is concerned, the term designates a col-

<sup>9</sup> There is no indication that Justin had a New Testament. He relies on the Law and the Prophets, which are Scripture, and upon "memoirs" and other writings of the apostles, which are as plainly *not* Scripture. Sometimes, as, for example, when he is differentiating between "old covenant" and "new covenant" (*Dial.* 51, 67), he would surely have revealed his knowledge of the New Testament if he had been aware of its existence (see F. Overbeck, *Über das Verhältniss Justins des Märtyrers zur Apostelgeschichte*, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XV [1872], 306 ff., and Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 154).

<sup>10</sup> A reading of Tertullian's work makes this abundantly clear. See also Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 78 (2d ed., pp. 84 f.), and *Origin*, p. 223.

lection of books which have unique authority and value because they are accepted as standing in a unique relation to what is believed to have been a unique revelation of God. It is not, as far as formal definition goes, intrinsic quality which determines canonicity but nearness to the revealing events or personalities. Such proximity to the revelation, however, itself confers the highest quality upon a book, whether that quality can be immediately or easily discerned or not, so that the intrinsic and the extrinsic are not in theory separated. The canon is thus as unduplicable as the revelation and tends soon to be thought of as being the revelation itself. In this way the sanctity and importance of its member-books are still further enhanced. Thus a system of mutual support as between canon and individual books is set up which, unless there is some interruption of the process, separates the Scripture, in the regard of the religious community, more and more widely from other books.

If this be an approximately true definition, a canon is by necessity a "closed" canon. This does not mean that all members of the religious community in which the canon is taking form will necessarily agree at any particular time on what shall or shall not be included, but the principle of "closedness" will be universally accepted. For the closing of an authoritative collection of books has the effect not only of shutting out all other books but also of bestowing the peculiar quality of canonicity on the books which are included. In other words, the *closing* of the canon is the formation of the *canon*. And when Marcion said in effect about his "Gospel and Apostle," "These books have a peculiar

and unduplicable value and authority because they alone among surviving documents stand in a true relation to the revelation of God in Christ," Christian writings had for the first time become Christian Scripture."<sup>11</sup>

## II

So far we have been considering the related questions whether Marcion can be said to have had a canon of Christian Scripture and, if so, whether his canon antedates the New Testament. These questions have been answered in the affirmative. It remains to ask whether there is a connection between the two canons. Was the one in any sense the cause or occasion of the other?

That Christian documents would eventually have been canonized, even in the absence of Gnosticism, Marcionism, Montanism, or any other "heresy," can be taken as almost certainly true. From the beginning there were two pre-eminent sources of authority among the churches, "the Scriptures [i.e., the Old Testament] and the Lord [i.e., the words of Jesus]." It is to these two authorities that Paul appeals, where he appeals to external authorities at all, and in doing so he is evidently following the practice of the primitive churches generally. It is quite possible that the letters of Paul were from quite early times regarded in some churches as having almost, if not altogether, the value of Scripture;

<sup>11</sup> It is clear that Marcion's attitude toward the inherited Scriptures was shared, in part at least, by many Gnostics and that also among them certain distinctively Christian writings were appealed to instead. But there is no ground for assurance that among them canons had been so definitely established, either in idea or in content, as among the Marcionites, and there is every reason for confidence that such canons, if they did exist, did not compare with Marcion's in importance and influence. On this subject see Westcott, *op. cit.*, pp. 249 ff., especially pp. 281 f.

but this tendency to rely on that apostle alone, in so far as it existed, was as events proved a heretical tendency and for that reason can be disregarded in this part of our discussion, where we have expressly excluded from consideration the heretical communities. It may be said, then, that at least in large sections of the church the Scriptures and the words of Jesus were authorities for faith and conduct from the very beginning, and, it may be added, of the two, the words of Jesus were the more important.

These words of Jesus were not at first written, and, even when they were committed to writing, it was the words themselves which had authority rather than the documents in which they were contained. But as time passed and memory faded and as the oral tradition became more diffused and unreliable, documents became more and more important, and it was inevitable that eventually they would be thought of as having something of the same value as the words of Jesus themselves.

The probability that some such document or documents would in any event have become canonical Scripture is strengthened by another consideration. Even more important for the early church than the words of Jesus was the *fact* of Jesus, especially the fact of the crucifixion and resurrection. It was with this fact and its significance that the apostolic preaching was principally concerned. Quite early, as the Gospel of Mark clearly indicates, the story of the passion was put in written form—doubtless in several written forms. And such documentary accounts would have tended to assume something of the importance of the gospel message itself. When records of Jesus' words and such ac-



counts of Jesus' life, especially of the passion, were united to form what came to be known as "Gospels," a process had begun which was bound to result in the acceptance of the Gospel along with the Law and the Prophets as canonical Scripture. Moreover, the fact that Gospels continued to be produced long after the apostolic age and that they departed further and further from the ancient tradition would, in the course of time, have made necessary some definition of what the authentic Gospel was, and such a definition would have been tantamount to canonization.

To say, however, that certain developments within the life of the early church would have led eventually to the canonization of a Gospel is not the same thing as saying that they would have led to the formation of a New Testament, much less to the formation of the particular New Testament we have. The Gospel might have been merely added to the Scriptures, without the idea of New Testament, as distinguished from Old Testament, being involved at all.<sup>12</sup> This was the more likely because what we know as the "Old Testament" was not thought of by churchmen like Justin as being such at all. The conception "Old Testament" as applied to the Jewish canon arose only with the formation of the "New Testament."<sup>13</sup> For Justin and probably the larger num-

<sup>12</sup> Eusebius reports that Hegesippus described sound doctrine as according to what is "declared by the law, the prophets, and the Lord" (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 22). Is this a three-part Scripture? Probably not; "the Lord" is no doubt a reference to the tradition as such, not to documents or a document. In either case, however, no idea of a New Testament is involved.

<sup>13</sup> This is a common statement and, I believe, a true one. Melito of Sardis (*ca.* A.D. 180) refers to "books of the Old Covenant" (*Eusebius, Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26), and this has usually been taken to mean that he knows books of the

ber of his Christian contemporaries the "Old Testament" was a truly Christian Scripture, dealing principally with the career and significance of Jesus. What had been simply the Jewish Bible had become as truly and completely Christian as the Gospels.<sup>14</sup> For a long time it would not have appeared either necessary or appropriate to add to this Scripture at all. But even if a Gospel should be added, why, I repeat, should it not be merely added, not set over against the whole of the ancient Scriptures as a "New Testament"?

On the other hand, it may be urged, with no little plausibility, that the idea "the Scripture and the Lord" has in it the seed not only of an enlarged Scripture but also of a twofold Scripture. But even if this contention should be granted and the likelihood be allowed both that the churches' inherited Bible would under any circumstances have been enlarged and also that the enlargement would have taken the form of a new division distinguished from the whole of the previous Scripture even more sharply than, within that Scripture, Law was distinguished from Prophets—even if this be allowed, there is nothing in the situation as we have so far examined it to lead us to expect that the new canon would have assumed the specific structure, the particular dual form, which it actually possessed apparently

---

"New Covenant" as well. This is probably true, but Paul's words in II Cor. 3: 14 ff. keep me from being too sure. Harnack is certainly right in urging that the idea, old covenant versus new covenant, helped create the conception of the New Testament (see *Origin*, pp. 12 ff.).

<sup>14</sup> References to this Bible as the "law and the prophets" suggest that the books later given the vague classification of "writings" were at this period included among the prophets. Justin prefers to speak simply of "the prophets," including among them both Moses and the Psalms.

from the moment of its inception. There was no New Testament at all until it existed in the form "Gospel and Apostle." Surely we would have expected the new canon to be merely "Gospel," or, at the most, we should have expected it to be "Gospel" *before* it was also "Apostle." But that is not true.<sup>15</sup> The writings of the "Apostle" including the Book of Revelation<sup>16</sup> were apparently given the status of Scripture at the same time the "Gospel" achieved the same status. The general developments we have considered would perhaps have issued in a New Testament but not in *the* New Testament. For the explanation of that particular emergent we must turn to

<sup>15</sup> Harnack accounts for the very occasional use of *γέγραπται* in introducing a quotation from a Gospel in the period before the New Testament had taken form by the practice of public lection (*Origin*, pp. 28 f.). This may well be true, especially for the several cases in Justin. Since in earlier cases, however, it is the words of Jesus which are always quoted, is not reverence for these words—a reverence which placed them on a par with or even beyond the Scriptures in importance—a more likely explanation? As a matter of fact, however, can we be sure that any of these cases occur in the pre-Justin period with the possible exception of the one in Barnabas (iv. 14)? Uncertainty of the text of Polycarp xii. 1 makes highly precarious the claim that he quotes from Ephesians as though it were Scripture. In all probability he did not do so; if he did, it is fair to surmise that he has forgotten the source of his quotation or has confused it with a passage in Ps. 4:4.

<sup>16</sup> Apparently there was an earlier tendency to regard apocalypses as having unique authority. Justin may have thought of Revelation in this way, and I Clement (chap. 23) cites an unidentified apocalypse as Scripture. But this estimation of prophecy does not reflect the existence of a New Testament. That this is true is proved, if in no other way, by the quotation in Eph. 5:14 which is introduced by *λέγει* (see Harnack, *Origin*, pp. 28 ff.). Leipoldt finds in the attitude toward prophecy in the early church an important ground for the development of the idea of the New Testament (*op. cit.*, pp. 28 ff.). There may well be some connection between this attitude and the later acceptance of the possibility of distinctively Christian Scriptures, but the decisive fact is that the New Testament took form not as "Prophet" or as "Gospel and Prophet" but as "Gospel and Apostle." Tertullian in his *Ado. Marc.* has the characteristic Montanist esteem for prophecy, but, when he refers to Revelation, it is to "the apostle" (ii. 5; iii. 14, 24).

the Christian Scripture which Marcion set up in place of what we have come to know as the Old Testament. That Scripture was actually in the form "Gospel and Apostle"; it was dual in form, perhaps in some measure, because the Scripture it was meant to replace was dual in form. This new Scripture, which for thousands of Christians displaced the "law and the prophets," became the model for the churches' ampler canon. The structural principle of Marcion's canon became the organizing idea of the catholic New Testament. Here is the fundamental fact in the relation of Marcion and the canon. Here is the principal ground for holding that it was Marcion's distinction between Scriptures "false" and "true" which forced the church, almost against its will, to distinguish between Scriptures "old" and "new."<sup>17</sup> Marcion is primarily responsible for the idea of the New Testament.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Tertullian accuses Marcion of having "separated the New Testament from the Old." This is in *De Praesc. Haer.* 30 (see also *Adv. Marc.* i. 19). What he means is not clear, and, besides, one cannot ever be confident that Tertullian knows what the situation a half-century earlier was. Still, if we take his statement at face value, he is saying that the Old Testament and the New Testament in two separate canons did not exist until after Marcion. It is interesting to take this statement in connection with Tertullian's assertion in chap. 36 of this same work that the Roman church had united the Law and the Prophets with the evangelists and apostles.

<sup>18</sup> Although I do not know how far he would go in agreeing with the argument of this book in detail, a very similar estimate of the importance of Marcion for the idea of the New Testament is given by M. S. Enslin in his *Christian Beginnings* (New York and London, 1938), pp. 455 ff. These twenty pages contain the best brief summary of the early history of the canon I have seen. See also B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (New York, 1925), pp. 5 ff.

Harnack's emphasis upon Marcion's importance for the formation of the New Testament (see *Marcion*, pp. 242 ff. [2d ed., pp. 210 ff.]) was challenged by Bauer, von Soden, and others. Harnack answers his critics in *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (Leipzig, 1923), pp. 20 ff.

## III

But this conclusion is supported by other important considerations, which I shall list and, at this point, only briefly discuss. Most of them will engage our attention again in the course of this book.

1. The New Testament came into existence as a conscious creation between A.D. 150 and 175, which was probably the period of Marcion's most vigorous and influential activity. The emphasis here is upon "conscious creation." The basis for the belief that the New Testament as such (i.e., in its characteristic form) was deliberately created and did not merely grow into itself has already, perhaps, been indicated clearly enough, and much in this book will further confirm it. To say that the New Testament did not exist in A.D. 150 (the time of Justin) and did exist in A.D. 175 (the time of Irenaeus) is itself almost equivalent to saying that it was consciously brought into existence.<sup>19</sup> Things do not grow so fast as that. Harnack points out that the inclusion of Acts in the canon is alone enough to indicate the presence of "reflection, of conscious purpose, of a strong hand acting with authority; and by such conscious action the canon began to take form as Apostolic-Catholic."<sup>20</sup> The high regard which had previously been bestowed upon Gospels and upon other early Christian

<sup>19</sup> It is true that Irenaeus cannot be shown to have used the phrase "New Testament" in referring to a collection of books, but he undoubtedly knew the books of the New Testament as Scripture in the full sense. He also makes much of the two covenants. As Harnack says (*Origin*, p. 40), "the name only is wanting."

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97. See Harnack's whole discussion of the question whether the New Testament was consciously created (*ibid.*, pp. 94 ff.). The significance of the presence of Acts in the canon is discussed at length below, pp. 114 ff.

writings and the use of them in services of worship prepared the way for the New Testament, but do not account for its sudden emergence as precisely the thing it was. Some occasion is obviously to be found. That occasion was Marcion's canonization of "Gospel and Apostle."

2. The New Testament probably took its form at Rome, the place where Marcion first became conspicuous as a heretic and where Marcionism was first and most vigorously attacked. The primacy of the Roman church even as early as the second half of the second century, the interest of that church in uniformity among the churches, its leadership in the defining of and the fight against heresies, the fact that Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Muratorian fragment<sup>21</sup> (our first clear witnesses to the existence of the New Testament) reflect the position of the Roman church—all these considerations point to Rome as the place where the *idea* of the New Testament first came into clear focus. Can it be mere coincidence that it was in Rome that opposition to Marcion and to Marcionism first became acute?

3. This indication is confirmed by what A. C. McGiffert has demonstrated about the place and time of origin of the Apostles' Creed and about the purpose it was designed to serve. In an important study<sup>22</sup> McGif-

<sup>21</sup> See pp. 53 f. below. For discussions of the early importance of Rome see Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), pp. 231 ff., and George La Piana, "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century," *Harvard Theological Review*, XVIII (1925), 203 ff.

<sup>22</sup> *The Apostles' Creed: Its Origin, Its Purpose and Its Historical Interpretation* (New York, 1902). The relation of the creed to the Lukan writings is pointed out by K. Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, II (London, 1922), 202 ff., and "The Apostles' Creed," *Harvard Theological Review*, XVII (1924), 173 ff. This fact may, or may not, have significance for this study (see chap. v, below).

fert established the very great probability that the Apostles' Creed was based on a somewhat shorter creed known as the Old Roman Symbol, which was composed in Rome between A.D. 150 and 175, and that it was designed particularly to refute the errors of Marcionism. It is not necessary to review here the evidence upon which McGiffert's conclusion was based; it is enough to say that not many students of early Christian history would take issue with him. Now, canon and creed are generally recognized to have been parallel developments—two phases of a movement, beginning around the middle of the second century, toward the unification and consolidation of Christendom. This movement is commonly known as the catholic movement, and Rome is commonly recognized as assuming the leadership of it, although Ephesus and Corinth were probably not far behind. While many factors were present and contributed to this result, opposition to the activities of the "heretics" is regarded as by all odds the most important. If McGiffert was right in affirming that Marcionism was the particular heresy which precipitated the first creed, is it not likely that it also precipitated the first canon, especially when it is remembered that the canon also arose in Rome between A.D. 150 and 175? This seems the more likely when we consider that a distinctive canon was one of the most important and characteristic features of Marcionism.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Harnack is disposed to emphasize the role of Montanism in the formation of the New Testament. He writes: "All goes to show that, though the Gnostic crisis [he is, no doubt, including a reference to Marcionism here] did indeed create the idea of the Apostolic-Catholic as applied to writings, and brought about a *selection* of works which included the whole material of the future New Testament, it was the Montanist, not the Gnostic, crisis, that brought the idea of the New Testament to final realization and created the

4. This probability appears greater when it is observed that of the so-called Gnostics at the middle of the second century—Basilides, Valentinus, and others—Marcion was by far the most important and influential. Evidence for this statement appears not only in the bulk of the explicitly anti-Marcionite polemic in the literature of A.D. 150 and later (much of it known to us only by title)<sup>24</sup> and in the many references in the Apologists and elsewhere to the great extent and strength of the Marcionite movement, but also in the large number of pseudepigraphical refutations which appeared in the same period. Among such refutations Martin Rist in a recent article<sup>25</sup> cites the rule of faith which Tertullian ascribes to Jesus in his *On Prescription of Heretics*, the *Didascalia apostolorum*, the *Epistle of the Apostles, III Corinthians*, and the Pastoral Epistles. If it was in considerable part as a weapon against heresy that the canon was devised, the very importance of Marcionism creates

---

conception of the closed canon." Although opposition to Montanism undoubtedly led the church to lay emphasis upon the "closedness" of the canon and more vigorously to seek (or impose) uniformity among the churches as to what was to be included and excluded, the formation of the New Testament *in idea* antedates the Montanist controversy. Harnack himself is not consistent here, as a reading of the several pages in the course of which the statement just quoted is made will disclose (*Origin*, pp. 28 ff.). See also n. 3, p. 118, below.

<sup>24</sup> To be sure, Irenaeus devotes relatively little space to Marcionism in his *Adv. Haer.*, but that is because he plans to devote an entire work to this heresy (iii. 25). This work, if it was written, has been lost. Hippolytus also wrote a separate refutation of Marcionism which has not survived. Other "lost" works against Marcion are those of Justin, Rhodo, Theophilus of Antioch, Dionysius of Corinth, Philip of Gortyna and Modestus (see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 23, 24, 25).

<sup>25</sup> "Pseudepigraphical Refutations of Marcionism," *Journal of Religion*, XXII (1942), 39 ff. For indications of positive influence of Marcion on the catholic church see J. R. Harris, "On the Trail of Marcion," in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann* (Tübingen, 1927), pp. 97 ff.



the presumption that it was *this* heresy at which it was particularly aimed. In that case, it becomes even more difficult to regard as accidental the correspondence in form between the Marcionite canon and the New Testament.

5. The predominant position of Paul in the canon points to the influence of Marcion. We are so accustomed to the fact that thirteen of the twenty-seven writings in the New Testament are ascribed to Paul and that a fourteenth (Acts) deals in large part with his career that the real strangeness of the fact does not at first strike us. It is undeniable that Paul bulks larger in the New Testament than he bulked in the life of the early second-century church. Justin can write relatively voluminously without ever mentioning Paul's name. There are other signs to which I shall have occasion to refer later in this book that Paul was under suspicion in wide sections of the church at the middle of the second century.<sup>26</sup> This situation hardly prepares us for a New Testament in which Paul is so overwhelmingly important. The most obvious explanation is that Marcion forced the churches either to repudiate Paul or to receive him wholeheartedly and without reservation. Marcion forced the issue for the canon-makers: either none of Paul or all of Paul. For reasons which will be discussed elsewhere<sup>27</sup> the answer they made to this issue was inevitably the positive one; but the issue would not have been raised in so acute and extreme a form but for Marcion—another evidence of his importance in the formation of the New Testament.

6. Finally, I may point to the so-called Marcionite

<sup>26</sup> See below, pp. 76, 115 ff., etc.

<sup>27</sup> See below, p. 116.

Prologues to the letters of Paul as a sign of this importance. In many Latin manuscripts of the New Testament (first in *Fuldensis*) the epistles of Paul are introduced by short prefaces<sup>28</sup> which are so obviously Marcionite in origin that it is strange this fact was not pointed out until 1907, when Dom de Bruyne devoted a notable article to demonstrating it.<sup>29</sup> His conclusion, as far as I know, has only twice been questioned.<sup>30</sup> The fact that these Marcionite prefaces (which probably go back to the second century) are to be found in many ecclesiastical manuscripts, although it must not be pressed too hard, strikingly confirms other evidence of important Marcionite influence on the makers of the New Testament.<sup>31</sup>

## IV

We may conclude, then, that the more conservative churches, confronted with the fact that various "heretics" and particularly Marcion had exalted certain apostolic writings to the status of Scripture, were forced either to canonize these writings on their own part or else to appear less appreciative of them than their ad-

<sup>28</sup> The text of these prefaces is presented in Appen. I, pp. 169 ff., and their significance in several connections is discussed on pp. 42 ff., 175, etc.

<sup>29</sup> "Prologues bibliques d'origine Marcionite," *Revue bénédictine*, 1907, pp. 1-16.

<sup>30</sup> First, by W. Mundle, "Der Herkunft der 'Marcionitischen' Prologe zu den Paulinischen Briefen," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXIV (1925), 56 ff. Harnack answered this article in "Der Marcionitische Ursprung der ältesten Vulgata-Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen," *ZNTW*, XXIV (1925), 204 ff. An attempt to answer Harnack in turn is made by M. J. La Grange, "Les Prologues prétendus Marcionites," *Revue biblique*, XXXV (1926), 161 ff.

<sup>31</sup> Harnack sets great store by this argument (see his *Marcion*, pp. 245 and 135\* ff. [2d ed., pp. 213 and 127\* ff.], and *Origin*, pp. 59 ff.).

versaries. The choice here was so clear that it is probably false to call it a choice at all: they canonized the writings, but they did so by adding them to their traditional Scripture, not by substituting them for that Scripture. Where they could not deny the authentic apostolicity of the heretics' authorities (and this was pre-eminently true in Marcion's case), they undertook to break the force of their authorities by absorbing them into their own canon. Thus, they would not have denied that Marcion's Scripture was correct (except for his "mutilations"); but it was partial and inadequate,<sup>32</sup> and therefore capable of being falsely interpreted. Only the catholic church had the full Scripture—the books of the whole covenant of God with men, both in its new and in its older form.

So much for the significance of Marcion for the idea of the New Testament. But idea cannot be sharply separated from actuality, and if the idea of the New Testament is Marcionite in origin, that fact will appear also in a comparison of the actual content of the Marcionite and the ecclesiastical canons. To that comparison and a discussion of its implications the rest of this book will be devoted.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Clement, *Strom*, vii. 16.

## CHAPTER III

### MARCION'S "APOSTLE" AND THE PAULINE CORPUS

SO FAR my concern has been to show that it was Marcion's canonization of certain Christian writings which created the idea of the New Testament and provided the immediate occasion for its formation. The non-Marcionite churches, unwilling to allow that their regard for the apostolic documents was in any degree less devoted than that of Marcion and other heretics, accepted the principle of a distinctive Christian Scripture, but this "new" Scripture was conceived not as replacing the old but as complementing and consummating it. It had come not to destroy but to fulfil. These churches adopted the policy—adopted it no less surely because unconsciously—which enabled them to say to the heretics: "We have all you have and more. We have the Old Testament *and* the New."

It is my conviction that this method of answering the heretics not by rejecting their Scripture but by absorbing it into a larger whole not only explains the church's acceptance of the principle of the New Testament but also accounts, in considerable part, for the particular contents of the catholic canon. The rest of this book will be devoted to testing this conviction, with regard both to the "Apostle" and to the "Gospel." The present chapter will deal with the contents and arrangement of Marcion's "Apostle" and with its relation to the

church's corpus of Pauline Epistles. A consideration of its relation to the Catholic Epistles and Acts and of the relation of Marcion's "Gospel" to the Gospel of Luke and the fourfold Gospel will occupy us in subsequent chapters.

## I

Allowing for some differences in text, the Apostle section of Marcion's Bible was composed of ten of the fourteen "letters of Paul" which belong to the catholic corpus—that is, of all of these letters except the three to Timothy and Titus and the Epistle to the Hebrews. This fact the evidence of Tertullian makes quite clear. That writer devoted the fifth book of his *Against Marcion* to a kind of running commentary on Marcion's "Apostle," and there can be no doubt that the documents which he examines, one after the other, are in substance equivalent to the ten letters of Paul we know, although they were apparently arranged in an order different from that with which we are familiar. Tertullian's titles must have named the letters and, except at one point, the names were almost surely those which the letters still bear. Marcion evidently had no epistle called "Ephesians"; but it is clear that only the name was missing, for the letter itself was plainly identical with the epistle which in Marcion's canon bore the name "Laodiceans." The identity of the two letters Tertullian explicitly affirms,<sup>1</sup> and his commentary on "Laodj-

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Marc.* v. 17. Reference may appropriately be made here to the short pseudepigraphical Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, which began to appear in Latin manuscripts in the sixth century and persisted as a part of many Latin Bibles for ten centuries afterward. It is an obvious forgery on the basis of the accepted letters of Paul, especially Galatians and Philippians. For the text of this document and some discussion of its sources, etc., see

ceans" (in which passages from our Ephesians are quoted) places it beyond any possible doubt. We can be as sure as though we had a Marcionite Bible before us that its Apostle section contained, at least in substance, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans, I and II Thes-

---

J. B. Lightfoot, *Colossians* (London and New York, 1886), pp. 272 ff.; Westcott, *Canon* (Cambridge and New York, 1889), pp. 580 ff.; Harnack, *Die Apokryphen Briefe des Paulus an die Laodiceer und Korinther* (Bonn, 1905), in H. Lietzmann (ed.), "Kleine Texte für Theologische Vorlesungen und Übungen"; Souter, *Text and Canon* (New York, 1913), pp. 193 ff. Professor Goodspeed notes that this spurious letter is of almost exactly the same length as Philemon and finds in that fact some confirmation of his view that Philemon was originally known as the Epistle to the Laodiceans. According to this view, Philemon failed to keep its original title, but the tradition that there had been a letter to the Laodiceans of about the same length persisted and led to the composition of the spurious epistle (see E. J. Goodspeed, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* [Chicago, 1927], pp. 52 ff. and 62 f.; but cf. my *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* [Chicago, 1935], pp. 18 ff. and 49). As to the date of this forgery one is safe in saying with Souter that it is not later than the fourth century. The question of date is complicated somewhat by the fact that the Muratorian writer refers to false Marcionite epistles to the Laodiceans and the Alexandrians. Is this reference to "Laodiceans" the result of confusion growing out of Marcion's having given that title to the letter which the Muratorian writer knows as Ephesians? Or did the Marcionites in A.D. 200 have an additional letter to the Laodiceans? (There seems to be a confused reference to an extra epistle "to the Laodiceans" in Epiphanius, *Panarion*, I, Haer. xlii. 9.) In this latter event, is the additional letter, which the Muratorian writer repudiates, the composition we are discussing? These questions cannot be answered with assurance. It has usually been felt that the Latin "Laodiceans" does not show the Marcionite character which the Muratorian reference would lead us to expect. But Harnack has argued the contrary and identifies the Muratorian "Laodiceans" with the document in question. This conclusion seems to me somewhat doubtful (but see Harnack, "Der Apokryphe Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Laodiceer, eine Marcionitische Fälschung aus der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* [Berlin, 1923], pp. 235 ff.; also *Marcion* [2d ed., 1924], pp. 134\* ff.). But even if this be established, it still must be asserted that this Epistle to the Laodiceans was added to the Marcionite Bible by later Marcionites, not by Marcion himself. Tertullian refers to no such epistle and clearly indicates that in the Marcionite Bible which he possessed Ephesians was called by this title. We can be sure that in Marcion's canon there were not two letters with the same name.

salonians, Ephesians (Laodiceans), Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians—in a word, all the letters of Paul except the Pastorals—and that it contained them in approximately, if not exactly, that order. . . .

It is important to note, however, that Marcion's canon did not contain these ten letters as ten separate items.<sup>1</sup> The Corinthian correspondence was presented as one item, instead of as two as in our New Testament, and the same was true of the Thessalonian letters. Less certain, but I believe quite likely, was the association together under a single title of Colossians and Philemon. Thus the "Apostle" of Marcion would have fallen into seven, or at most eight, sections, distinctions between letters to the same church being disregarded. †

The principal grounds for this view of the organization of Marcion's "Apostle" are two. The first of these is the evidence of the so-called Marcionite Prologues, to which reference was made in the preceding chapter and which are presented in Appendix I of this volume.<sup>2</sup> There is one of these brief prefaces *Ad Corinthios* and another *Ad Thessalonicenses* without any indication that in each case more than one epistle is being introduced. There can be no doubt of the primitive date of these prologues. They go back almost, if not quite, to Marcion's own time. Obviously in the Bibles for which they were first designed no important distinction was made between letters to the same church. The important thing was what Paul said to the Corinthians (or the Thessalonians), not the number or the integrity of the separate communications in which he said it.

Once these prefaces came to be used in Bibles (such

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 36 f. and 169 ff.

as those in which alone we have access to them) where clear distinctions were made between the "First" and "Second" letters to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians, it was inevitable that new prefaces would be written to cover the "second" letter in each case. These prefaces are actually found, but even the most cursory examination is enough to disclose their secondary character. They all lack the marks which enable us to identify the other prologues so certainly as Marcionite. This is also true of the prefaces to the Pastoral Epistles which some of the manuscripts contain.<sup>3</sup> It can also be said that there is nothing to indicate that the Philemon preface is not of later date, although this must be less certain, since even a Marcionite might have had difficulty writing a recognizably Marcionite preface for this little note. Still, there is at least one positive indication that this prologue was composed subsequently to the Colossians preface. Attention will be paid later in this study to the interesting fact that several of the epistles were, according to the prefaces, written in Ephesus.<sup>4</sup> At the moment it is enough to remark that, whereas Colossians is said to have been composed there, Philemon is assigned to Rome. These two letters could hardly have been originally divided in that way. The Philemon preface may well reflect the time when the tradition of a Roman imprisonment, embodied in the Book of Acts,

<sup>3</sup> But see Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 140\* (2d ed., p. 132\*). Harnack argues that, although these prefaces are later than the others and certainly later than Marcion, they are nevertheless Marcionite. The view that the Pastoral Epistles, not accepted by Marcion, were later accepted by the Marcionite church leads Harnack to the decision that Marcion did not explicitly reject the Pastorals (see *ibid.*, pp. 150\* f. [2d ed., pp. 170\* f.], and below, p. 175).

<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 175.



was obscuring the importance of the Ephesian imprisonment to which the Colossian preface refers.<sup>5</sup> Altogether, the Prologues indicate clearly that the Marcionite Bible contained no II Corinthians or II Thessalonians (i.e., of course, as separate letters under separate titles) and, to say the least, offer no obstacle to our suggestion that Colossians and Philemon similarly made up a single section.

This view of the organization of the Marcionite "Apostle" is strikingly confirmed by what we know of the order of the letters in Marcion's Bible. Tertullian does not explicitly refer to the order in which the letters stood in the Marcionite document which lay before him, but it is to be inferred that they were arranged there in the order in which he discusses them. This is especially likely in view of the fact that the order of the letters with which Tertullian himself was more familiar is known to have differed radically from that in which he takes them up in his reply to Marcion.<sup>6</sup> Undoubtedly, then, we are justified in assuming that the sequence of the letters in Tertullian's treatise provides a true clue to the order of the epistles in the Marcionite collection.

<sup>5</sup> That there was an important and prolonged imprisonment at Ephesus I believe Deissmann, Duncan, and others have placed beyond great doubt. See Duncan, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (London, 1929) for a defense of the view that the "imprisonment epistles" were written from Ephesus. Duncan gives an adequate account of earlier literature on the subject (*ibid.*, pp. 59 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> One would gather from *Adv. Marc.* iv. 5 that Tertullian's own order was Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Thessalonians, Ephesians, and Romans (no mention is made here of Colossians), but it is perhaps precarious to argue that Tertullian means to be naming the letters in the order in which they came in his canon. Still, the fact that Corinthians is in first place and Romans in last, as in the Muratorian list (see below, pp. 53 f.), would suggest as much (see Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* [Erlangen, 1888], II, 344 ff.).

This fact is put beyond any possible doubt by the evidence of Epiphanius.<sup>7</sup> This writer not only takes up the letters (with one exception) in the same order as Tertullian but he explicitly indicates the order in which the several letters came in the Marcionite Bible, carefully differentiating it from the order which he as a catholic churchman received. The evidence of Tertullian and Epiphanius agrees in indicating that the first six letters (I and II Corinthians and I and II Thessalonians standing as two letters) in the Marcionite "Apostle" were Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Ephesians, and Colossians. The evidence of the two writers is somewhat conflicting as to the relative positions of Philemon and Philippians. Tertullian refers last to Philemon, but Epiphanius definitely and on two occasions puts Philippians in final place. I have given elsewhere my reasons for regarding the report of Epiphanius as more accurate at this point.<sup>8</sup> But if it is true that Philemon stood between Colossians and Philippians, the most plausible explanation of this position is that Colossians and Philemon stood in Marcion's canon under a single title, just as did the Corinthian and also the Thessalonian correspondence.

As I have pointed out in the same book to which I am forced to refer more than once in this part of our discussion,<sup>9</sup> this order is not haphazard. Galatians is in first place because Marcion for obvious reasons preferred it. It was for him the most important Pauline epistle. With this exception, however, and one other (that involving

<sup>7</sup> *Panarion*, I, Haer. xlii.

<sup>8</sup> *Philemon among the Letters of Paul*, pp. 43 f.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 39 ff.

the relative positions of Ephesians and Thessalonians, an exception with which I must deal later in this chapter), the order is the order of length. But this fact, which I submit cannot be the result of mere accident, emerges (and this is the point to which we have been coming throughout this discussion of order) only when Corinthians, Thessalonians, and Colossians-Philemon are taken as single items. May we not conclude, therefore, that Marcion's "Apostle" contained the substance of what we possess as ten letters of Paul, arranged as follows: Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon, Philippians—a corpus of seven letters to seven churches.

## II

Thus far we have been dealing with the general contents of the "Apostle" of Marcion and have not raised the question of exact form. The raising of that question—the question of the text of Marcion, whether "Apostle" or "Gospel"—confronts us with one of the most intricate problems of the whole intricate field of the textual criticism of the New Testament. Just now we are concerned with the text of the "Apostle" only, but a few general remarks about the text of both parts of Marcion's Scripture may appropriately be made.

It has already been observed more than once that we do not have a copy either of a Marcionite Bible or of any part of it. Our whole knowledge of it is derived from references to it and quotations of it in certain Fathers.<sup>7</sup> These references and quotations indicate that for the larger part, at least for the "Apostle," the documents in Marcion's canon were identical in text with

the corresponding books in our New Testament. Often, however, a quotation will involve a departure from the accepted text (whether "received" or "critical"); occasionally the ancient critic of Marcion will call attention to some variant which he regards as particularly obnoxious; and not infrequently, especially for the "Gospel," he will refer to some passage in our text as being missing (he will use such terms as "cut out" or "omitted") in Marcion's.

The difficulty of the task confronting the scholars who have from time to time undertaken a reconstruction of Marcion's text will be obvious enough from this brief account, but it may be well to enumerate the more important sources of uncertainty: (1) The text of Marcion can be recovered only from the text of Tertullian, Epiphanius, and others. How certain can we be of the original text of these sources themselves? (2) Of the words in Marcion's Scriptures only a very small proportion happen to be quoted in any of our sources. What can we know of the text of the unquoted passages? (3) When one of the critics of Marcion, basing his remarks (as Tertullian does in his fourth and fifth books against Marcion) on the Marcionite Bible, passes by without a word a passage which appears in Luke or Paul, are we to assume that it did not appear in Marcion's text or merely that the critic did not think it important enough to deserve comment or for some other reason failed to allude to it? (4) It is notorious that in the first few centuries exact quotation of Christian writings was not regarded as being especially important. What assurance, then, do we have that, even when a passage is quoted from Marcion's Scripture, it is quoted correctly? (5) It

has been clearly established that the text of the Marcionite Scriptures underwent continuous and extensive changes after Marcion's own time.<sup>10</sup> How confident can we be that the Marcionite text criticized by Tertullian in A.D. 200 or by Epiphanius a century and a half later is the text of the original Marcionite Scriptures?

None of these questions can be answered with any certainty or precision. But they are crucial questions, and the modern critic cannot ignore them. So long as they remain unanswered, they stand stubbornly and effectively in the way of any assured reconstruction of Marcion's text.

For our knowledge of the text of the Marcionite "Apostle" we must depend almost entirely upon Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Adamantius (i.e., the *Dialogus de recta in deum fide*, once falsely ascribed to Origen), who are also our principal sources for the "Gospel" of Marcion. Of modern attempts to reconstruct the text of Marcion's "Apostle," the best as well as the latest is that of Harnack, and the reader is referred to his masterful work<sup>11</sup> for a full treatment of the problem as well as for a bringing-together of the references and quotations from the Fathers. To this work my indebtedness will be apparent both in this discussion of the "Apostle" and in the later discussion of the text of Marcion's "Gospel." For what can be known as to the precise readings of Marcion's "Apostle" the reader must go directly to Harnack or to the sources. I shall try to indicate

<sup>10</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 39 f. (2d ed., p. 43).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 39\* ff. (2d ed., pp. 67\* ff.). The best earlier reconstruction is that of Zahn, *op. cit.* II, 495 ff. This work of Zahn, to which reference will frequently be made, will henceforth be cited simply as *Geschichte*.

merely the major discrepancies between his text and ours.

From our Galatians Harnack finds that the following passages were "certainly" missing: 3:6-9; parts of 3:10-12; 3:14a; 3:15-25; and 4:27-30. He also lists 1:18-24 and 2:6-9a as probably missing. One notes, however, that there is no positive evidence that 4:27-30 was lacking in Marcion's Galatians, so that this passage too should perhaps be included in the doubtful category. Harnack can find no evidence of large-scale "omission" in either I or II Corinthians, although he is inclined to believe that the seventh chapter of I Corinthians may have been somewhat shorter in Marcion's Bible than in ours. Similarly there is no reason to believe that the Thessalonian letters, Philippians, or Philemon differed extensively from ours. In Laodiceans (Ephesians) Harnack was unable to discover signs of any important differences from our text, noting only that 1:21 (there seems to be some reason to believe that this verse appeared in connection with Gal. 4:24)<sup>12</sup> and 6:2b-3 were "probably" missing and that the passage 5:28-32 was differently arranged, with verse 30 perhaps missing. And in Colossians Harnack is sure only that 1:15-17 read somewhat differently from the same paragraph in our own text.

This leaves only Romans, the differences between which in the Marcionite text and the same letter in our own are sufficiently extensive to make it a special case. According to Harnack, Marcion's text of this epistle did not contain 1:17b; 1:19-2:1; 3:31-4:25; 8:19-22;

<sup>12</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 73\* f. (2d ed., p. 76\*), and J. R. Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text* (London, 1894), pp. 19 ff.

9:1-33; 10:5-11:32; and the whole of the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters. An examination of the evidence indicates that in most of these cases the passage is merely passed over in the source. This, as we have seen, does not constitute decisive evidence of its absence from Marcion. Still, Harnack is well aware of this fact,<sup>13</sup> and his judgment, in most of these cases at least, is probably to be trusted. It is quite certain that chapters 15 and 16 were missing.

As to the significance of these variants, I do not believe that one can examine them with open mind without reaching two conclusions about them. First, many of them represent omissions by Marcion from the original text of the epistles. Marcion undoubtedly believed quite sincerely that the theological position he had come to hold was Paul's position. He did not think of himself as an innovator; he was a faithful disciple. Later Marcionites were ready to attribute an originality to Marcion which there is no adequate ground for supposing Marcion ever claimed for himself. When, therefore, he discovered in one of the epistles of Paul a statement which could not be harmonized with what he knew to be the true Pauline position, it was inevitable that he

<sup>13</sup> Harnack writes (*Marcion*, p. 61 [2d ed., p. 65]): "Sehr misslich und bedauerlich ist es, dass die Zahl der Stellen sehr gross ist, an denen es zweifelhaft bleiben muss, ob Marcion sie getilgt hat oder ob sie zufällig von seinem Gegnern nicht erwähnt worden sind. Die älteren Kritiker haben in diesen Fällen mehr oder weniger umfangreiche Erwägungen angestellt, um zu Entscheidungen zu gelangen, und auch Zahn hat sich, jedoch mit Zurückhaltung, an ihnen beteiligt. Ich habe mich von ihnen mit ganz geringen Ausnahmen vollständig fern gehalten, weil eine wirkliche Erweiterung unserer Kenntnisse der Lehre Marcions durch sie doch nicht erreicht werden kann, da die Entscheidungen auf Grund des Bekannten getroffen werden müssen und sie ausserdem bei den notorischen Inconsequenzen Marcions fast niemals ganz sicher sein können."

should have construed it as an interpolation, as the result of later tampering with the letters of Paul by "Jewish" editors or copyists. As I had occasion to point out in the previous chapter, Marcion would think of himself as restoring the original text of the apostle when he made what changes seemed necessary. This editing of the text in the interest of his peculiar theological doctrines is what we would have expected in the case of both "Gospel" and "Apostle," and that is what we undoubtedly find. To take a passage in Romans as an example—it is all but certain that 4:1-25 (dealing with the faith of Abraham), if, as is probable, it was lacking in Marcion's text, was lacking because Marcion deliberately omitted it. Any number of other gaps in Marcion's "Apostle" can be reasonably accounted for only in this same way.

But this cannot be said of all of them, and one must conclude, second, that some of the "omissions" are not omissions at all but genuine primitive readings. Consider Romans, chapters 15 and 16, for example, much the largest of the missing passages: No one has made a plausible suggestion as to why Marcion should have cut these chapters off entirely; and, besides, there is abundant evidence that the Epistle to the Romans circulated in this short form very widely in the early church and among others than Marcionites.<sup>14</sup>

These same two conclusions hold with reference to the innumerable smaller variants. Many of them clearly represent editorial changes in the interest of one or another of Marcion's distinctive views, but others are

<sup>14</sup> See the discussion of the text of Romans in Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of Paul* (London, 1914), esp. pp. 350 ff.



genuine variants.<sup>15</sup> Again to take examples from Romans—that “born of the seed of David according to the flesh” (1:3) is lacking in Marcion’s text is unquestionably due to Marcion’s omission of an objectionable phrase; but that in the sixteenth verse of the same chapter the word “first” is missing after “Jew” (“to the Jew first and then to the Greek”), although it is logically explicable as a Marcionite omission, is not so certainly to be explained in that way (B also reads Ἰουδαίῳ simply); and, to cite two trivial cases, that in Rom. 7:7 Marcion reads ὅτι and that in 3:22 he agrees with B (as against Aleph, C, D, etc.) in omitting Ἰησοῦ are obviously examples of ordinary variants.

In general, it may be said that the text of Marcion, both in “Apostle” and in “Gospel,” is of the so-called Western type. Recent researches have made clear, however, that the “Western” text was not a particular local or regional text but was rather the uncriticized and uncontrolled text of the second century, both East and West. To say that Marcion’s text is “Western” may mean merely that it shows signs of being more primitive (although not necessarily on that account more accurate) than the text of the great recensions of the fourth and fifth centuries at Alexandria and Antioch. It should be added, however, that Marcion’s text displays a special affinity for D and Irenaeus and other witnesses of

<sup>15</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 130\* f. (2d ed., pp. 155\* f.). Harnack’s estimate of the number of these variants is in my opinion much too conservative. The fact that Marcion’s text contains many readings, including many long sections, which one would surely have expected him to omit should render the critic slow to decide that every passage in our text which is missing in Marcion’s is missing there because Marcion omitted it, even when a good motive for the “omission” can be found. See the important study of August Bludau, *Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker* (Münster, 1925), pp. 19 ff.

the Old Latin, although the number of places where it agrees also, or instead, with the Old Syriac is very considerable. Harnack finds in this fact evidence that Marcion received his text at Rome.<sup>16</sup> This may, of course, be true; but it is an exceedingly precarious conclusion. It leaves out of sufficient account the possibility that Marcion, bringing his text from Asia Minor to Rome, helped in an important way to form the Old Latin text, as well as the fact (to which Lake<sup>17</sup> calls attention) that both Justin and Irenaeus, the two other second-century witnesses to the Italian text, also came, like Marcion, to Rome from the East.

From this description of the contents of Marcion's "Apostle" we now turn to a consideration of its relation to the corpus of Pauline Epistles in the catholic canon.

### III

In 1740 an Italian scholar discovered in a very corrupt Latin manuscript of the seventh or eighth century what is in some ways the most important single document in the history of the New Testament canon. It is an account of the contents of the canon as some unknown writer, probably in Rome at about A.D. 200, received it, and from the name of its discoverer, L. A. Muratori, the document has come to be known as the Muratorian Canon. To this document I shall have occasion to refer often again in this study—indeed, it has been cited

<sup>16</sup> *Marcion*, pp. 126\* f. (2d ed., p. 152\*). It should be said, however, that in the second edition (*ibid.*, p. 152\*) Harnack adds this footnote: "Der W-text ist dem Abendland nicht eigentümlich, aber doch am stärksten vom Abendland bezeugt. Immerhin muss die Möglichkeit offen gelassen werden, dass M. seinen Text doch schon im Orient bearbeitet hat."

<sup>17</sup> *The Text of the New Testament* (London, 1928), p. 51.

several times already—for it is the primary source for the state of the New Testament in the Western churches at the end of the second century.<sup>18</sup>

Just now we are interested in that section of the document which concerns the epistles of Paul. It tells us that the "Apostle Paul, following the example of his predecessor John," wrote to seven churches; and it names these churches in the following order: Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, and Romans. We are also told that Paul wrote to Philemon, to Titus, and twice to Timothy, and that there were two letters to the Corinthians and two to the Thessalonians. The testimony of Irenaeus and Tertullian, the great Western Fathers of the period, agrees with this canon so far as the number of the Pauline epistles is concerned, although not necessarily as to their order.<sup>19</sup> We have evidence, then, of the existence of a Pauline corpus of thirteen letters at the end of the second century, and it is appropriate to ask whether Marcion's ten-letter corpus was derived from it or whether the Muratorian corpus represents an enlargement of a more primitive collection of Pauline epistles to which Marcion's corpus more closely corresponds.<sup>1</sup> As I have already indicated, it is my conviction that the latter alternative is the true one.

The most obvious consideration in support of this

<sup>18</sup> For the text of this document see Westcott, *op. cit.*, pp. 486 ff., or Lietzmann, *Das Muratorische Fragment* (Bonn, 1908), in his "Kleine Texte."

<sup>19</sup> Clement of Alexandria and Origen go even further and include Hebrews, as does the Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Letters. But even in the more liberal circles, which Clement and Origen represent, Hebrews does not have so secure a place in the collection of letters as do the others and may be suspected of being a recent arrival there.

view lies in the simple fact that the date of Marcion's canon is more than fifty years earlier than the date of the Muratorian list or of its confirming witnesses. Marcion's is the earliest collection of Pauline epistles of which we have definite and indubitable documentary knowledge. This fact establishes a strong presumptive case for its priority to the other corpus, for whose existence the documentary evidence is a half-century later. The burden of proof must lie with those who claim that the collection of which we first hear was not actually prior. But this a priori case is enormously strengthened by evidence that there had appeared before the end of the first century a ten-letter collection of Pauline letters, the original order and at points the original text of which are better preserved in Marcion than in the catholic canon. To a consideration of this evidence we now turn.

One of the most striking facts about early Christian literature is the prominence of the letter form. There are twenty-seven books in the New Testament. Of these, no fewer than twenty-one are letters, and, of the remaining six, one contains an apostolic letter to the churches of Syria and Cilicia, and apparently also Galatia, and another is introduced by a corpus of letters to the churches of Asia. There are no fewer than thirty letters in the New Testament.<sup>20</sup> But this strange devotion to the letter form (a form so poorly adapted to become a sacred literature) is by no means confined to the documents which ultimately became canonical. Clem-

<sup>20</sup> Deissmann's useful distinction between letters and epistles can be disregarded as irrelevant to the point we are considering (*Light from the Ancient East* [New York, 1927], pp. 288 ff.).

ent addressed (at about A.D. 95, it is commonly believed) a letter to the church at Corinth. Ignatius' contribution to the literature of the early church took the form of seven letters (somewhere in the period A.D. 107-117), and Polycarp's, the form of a letter, or probably two letters,<sup>21</sup> to the church at Philippi (somewhere between A.D. 107 and 135). Later came the quasi-epistle, II Clement, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle to Diognetus, the Martyrdom of Polycarp (also a letter in form), not to mention many another. For our purpose, it is enough to say that down to, say, A.D. 140 or 150, almost the whole of formal Christian writing seems to have been letter-writing. /

When we look for an explanation of this curious phenomenon, we think at once of the letters of Paul. Paul was the first Christian writer of whom we know, and Paul happened to write letters to churches. There must be some connection between this fact and the other. It must have been the letters of Paul which led later Christian writers to cast what they had to say to the churches in epistolary form.

But this effect does not seem to have followed at once. Paul's literary career, in so far as it can be recovered, ended certainly no later than A.D. 64, and possibly, I am inclined to believe, as early as A.D. 57 or 58;<sup>22</sup> but it is not until the decade 90-100 that the literary effect, which can be traced so surely to his letters, begins with appar-

<sup>21</sup> P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge, 1936). See above, pp. 10 ff.

<sup>22</sup> I have ventured to express my own views (I hope with sufficient tentativeness) on the intricate problem of the Pauline chronology in two articles, to which reference has already been made in another connection (see n. 24, p. 15, above).

ent suddenness to show itself. In the thirty-year interval the only extant Christian documents to appear are Matthew, Mark, Luke (in some form), and perhaps Acts (also in some form)<sup>23</sup>—and none of these is a letter. But after A.D. 90 or thereabouts, for another thirty or forty years at least, not only is there a considerable volume of important Christian writing, but almost the whole of it takes epistolary form. It is such considerations as these which have led Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed to propose that early in the last decade of the first century the epistles of Paul were first published and that it was this *publication* which provided both stimulus and model for subsequent Christian writing. The fact that not only individual letters but corpuses of letters begin to appear adds immeasurably to the plausibility of this suggestion. There is a corpus of letters to churches at the beginning of Revelation; there is an Ignatian corpus, also of seven letters. The reader is referred to Dr. Goodspeed's books for an argument which cannot be felt in its full force when presented in any summary.<sup>24</sup> That late in the first century there was a definite publication of Pauline letters has, I believe, been established with better than reasonable certainty.<sup>25</sup>

As to the letters comprised in this collection there can be little doubt that they were the same ten letters

<sup>23</sup> See chap. v. below.

<sup>24</sup> See especially *The Formation of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1926), pp. 20 ff.; *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 1-64; *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago, 1937), pp. vii ff. and 210 ff.

<sup>25</sup> See an extended note on pp. 172 ff. for a fuller discussion of this view, with references to important literature on the problem of the collection of the Pauline letters.

(whether counted as ten or fewer) which belonged to the Marcionite canon. This conclusion rests upon the following facts: (1) that a knowledge of all these letters is reflected in I Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, although all the letters cannot be traced in any one of these writers; (2) that both the Ignatian and the Revelation corpuses suggest the shorter, rather than the thirteen-letter, Pauline collection as their prototype; (3) that there is almost irrefutable evidence for the dating of the three Pastoral Epistles well into the second century—which means that if there was a publication of a Pauline collection before A.D. 100, it cannot have contained these letters; and (4) that what seems to be the most reasonable explanation of the nature and function of the Epistle to the Ephesians requires the view that the collection contained only the ten letters of the Marcionite corpus.

The view of Ephesians to which I have just referred is the view hinted at by Johannes Weiss<sup>26</sup> and fully elaborated and brilliantly defended by Dr. Goodspeed, that Ephesians was written not by Paul but by a Paulinist who was familiar with the genuine epistles and that it was designed to serve as a kind of preface to the published collection of Pauline letters.<sup>27</sup> This view does not necessarily identify the collector with the writer of Ephesians, but it brings the two into the closest possible association. This interpretation of the epistle, better than any other, makes room for the two apparently con-

<sup>26</sup> *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1917); English translation by Frederick Grant and others, *The History of Primitive Christianity* (New York, 1937), II, 682 ff.

<sup>27</sup> See *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago, 1933) and *New Solutions to New Testament Problems*, pp. 11 ff.

tradictory facts which create the problem of Ephesians: (1) that the internal evidence overwhelmingly suggests that Paul did not write this letter and (2) that the external evidence equally strongly indicates that he did. Every early Christian writer who knows the letters of Paul at all knows Ephesians, and yet many stylistic, theological, and other features of the epistle are strikingly un-Pauline. But if we suppose that this epistle was composed at the time when the first collection of Paul's letters was published and that it became the covering letter for the collection, the fact that it is as well known and as soon known as any other letter is explained quite as plausibly as it would be on the supposition that Paul was actually its author, since none of the letters became well known, or at least widely known, until all of them were published.

Two additional facts confirm this view of the function of Ephesians. The first is that there is strong manuscript and other evidence that originally the epistle was a general letter—that is, a letter addressed to no particular church but to all the churches—and that the words which explicitly connect it with Ephesus (*ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* in 1:1) are a later insertion. This "general" character would admirably fit the epistle to be the beginning epistle of a collection of letters to churches, for the collector and publisher would be concerned that Paul should be thought of by his readers as addressing not particular churches merely but all the churches.<sup>28</sup> The second fact is that, although the writer of Ephesians

<sup>28</sup> Notice the pains of the Muratorian writer to make this clear about both Paul's letters and those in Revelation. The original publisher could depend upon the opening general letter to make this point for him; but by A.D. 200 this letter had become "Ephesians," another church letter.



has a distinct style of his own, his work was manifestly based upon other letters of Paul. It has always been recognized that he made use of Colossians, but Dr. Goodspeed has presented a strong case for the view that he used all the other letters with the exception of the Pastorals.<sup>29</sup> If Ephesians stood as the first and covering letter in the original Pauline letter collection, that collection was undoubtedly the shorter ten-letter corpus.

#### IV

But not only is it clear that Marcion has preserved the true number of the original collection; it is also likely that he has preserved in general the original order of the epistles. It has commonly been said that Marcion "re-arranged" the letters according to some whim of his.<sup>30</sup> This is a more plausible supposition, however, when the Marcionite order is thought of as being haphazard, as Zahn, for example, thought it was, than when it is recognized to be the order of length. The fact that in our own New Testament the epistles of Paul are arranged in that order and that a tendency so to arrange them can be discerned in the whole history of the corpus strongly indicates that Marcion was but following in his canon the original pattern of the corpus. Why, indeed, should he have altered it?

This conclusion is confirmed by two striking facts. The first of these is the strange place of Ephesians in Marcion's canon. It follows Thessalonians whereas it

<sup>29</sup> These, however, probably show the influence of Ephesians as well as the other letters (see A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* [Chicago, 1941], pp. 251 ff.).

<sup>30</sup> Zahn writes: "Unterliegt es keinem Zweifel, dass Marcion in dieser Anordnung seine eigenen Wege gegangen ist . . ." (*Geschichte*, II, 346 f.).

“ought” to precede it. As we have already noted, Ephesians is (not counting Galatians) the one exception to the rule of length in the Marcionite list. Harnack explained this exception by the fact that the additional title for II Thessalonians would make the Thessalonian letters appear longer.<sup>31</sup> But, as we shall see later, there was probably at first neither title nor salutation for II Thessalonians, which means that the Thessalonian letters were, as compared with Ephesians, even shorter in Marcion’s canon than in ours. A more likely explanation is that, when Marcion put Galatians in first place, it displaced Ephesians, which had originally stood at the head of the corpus. Galatians is shorter than Thessalonians, but Ephesians is longer. Marcion’s transposition of the two letters disturbed an originally “correct” arrangement. That a shorter letter preceded Corinthians in the first collection is also suggested by the consideration that if the collection was published on two rolls (as would almost certainly have been the case), the Corinthian letters and a shorter epistle would in all probability have occupied one roll, and the rest of the letters the other. In the Marcionite Bible this shorter letter was certainly Galatians; in the original collection it was almost certainly Ephesians.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *Marcion*, p. 149\* (2d ed., pp. 168\* f.).

<sup>32</sup> An additional consideration giving some support to the view that, when Marcion put Galatians in first place, it replaced Ephesians, is to be found in the fact that he gave this epistle the title, “To the Laodiceans.” Tertullian clearly hints that for a long time before his own period this letter had been known as “Ephesians,” although his words indicate that the name of this church appeared only in the title, not in the text, of the epistle (*Adv. Marc.* v. 17). Tertullian charges that Marcion arbitrarily altered the name to “Laodiceans” in order to appear clever and original; but it is much more likely that if Marcion had known the letter as “Ephesians,” he would have let that title stand. It is not easy to see that he would have had any adequate motive

The second argument confirming this reconstruction of the original arrangement of the corpus consists essentially in the fact that certain features of the text of the opening verses of our II Thessalonians and II Corinthians indicate that the catholic Pauline corpus was based upon a collection of letters arranged along the lines of the Marcionite canon. This argument can be stated only at some length.<sup>33</sup>

## V

It has already been pointed out that the principle of arrangement in the Marcionite "Apostle" (i.e., according to length) emerges only when we take I and II Corinthians as a single item and I and II Thessalonians as another. This manner of computing the length of the epistles implies, as we have seen, that in Marcion's list the distinction between two or more letters to the same church was not very formally drawn. Now it is clear that within the Corinthian correspondence one such distinction was not drawn either in the Marcionite or in the ecclesiastical corpus. I refer, needless to say, to the distinction between II Corinthians, chapters 1-9, and II Corinthians, chapters 10-13. Some scholars find

---

for changing it. On the other hand, if Ephesians was the general letter opening the corpus and as such had no church title, Marcion's decision to call it "Laodiceans" is altogether understandable. When he puts Galatians in first place, he must find a church title for this general epistle. The mention of Laodicea in Col. 4:16 would naturally suggest the answer to his problem. Incidentally, this is an additional evidence of the early date of Marcion's list: it arose before Ephesians had become established under that title.

<sup>33</sup> In the following paragraphs I have drawn heavily upon an article of mine, "A Conjecture as to the Original Status of II Corinthians and II Thessalonians in the Pauline Corpus," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LV (1936), 145 ff.

Philippians similarly composite. Such a joining of letters must have been the work of the first publishers. But if it was the plan of the original editors to combine letters to the same church in the way II Corinthians, chapters 1-9 (not to mention the possibility that even this section may be composite), and II Corinthians, chapters 10-13, are combined, why should they have made the formal and important distinction with which we are familiar between the "first" and "second" letters to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, respectively? I believe that as a matter of fact they did not and that the arrangement of Marcion's canon in this respect follows the arrangement of the primitive corpus.<sup>34</sup>

A very interesting test of the truth of the conjecture that our corpus was based upon a corpus which, like Marcion's, did not differentiate sharply what we know as II Corinthians and II Thessalonians from their companion letters should lie in the opening paragraphs of these epistles. If the conjecture is true, these "second" letters were probably first *published* without address and salutation—that is, whatever address and greeting Paul originally affixed to these epistles were dropped by the editors as unnecessary since the preceding epistle in

<sup>34</sup> As to when and why such a distinction came later to be drawn I can only make what seems a fairly plausible surmise. The original Pauline letter collection probably contained seven units, and this seven-fold character was one of its important features. It is possible also that seven churches were addressed, Colossians-Philemon being directed to the Laodiceans also. It is obvious that important distinctions within Corinthians and Thessalonians would have obscured somewhat this seven-fold character. When the Pastoral Epistles, however, were incorporated (in my judgment sometime after A.D. 150), the maintenance of this character (except as to the number of churches addressed) was no longer possible, and the consideration which had led to the distinctions we are discussing would be no longer relevant. The "thanksgivings," if nothing else, would indicate that two letters were written: why not publish them as such?

each case would have carried an adequate salutation. When later—say, soon after the middle of the second century—a clearer distinction was felt appropriate at the points in Corinthians and Thessalonians where second letters so evidently began, the original opening sections would have been lost and new ones would have had to be composed. If anything like this really occurred, these paragraphs should show some sign of their post-Pauline origin.

And what will this sign be? It seems to me almost inevitable that the creators of an address and salutation for II Thessalonians and II Corinthians would follow rather closely the forms found in the first letter in each instance. In what we know as I Thessalonians would appear the manner in which Paul had actually addressed the church at Thessalonica; would not that manner be important for one who was devising an address for a "II" Thessalonians? In the same way, would not the creator of an address for "II" Corinthians naturally follow the address which had been retained in the letter which has come down to us as I Corinthians? On the other hand, I see no reason why originally Paul's manner of addressing the Corinthians or the Thessalonians should not vary as much from time to time as would his manner of addressing different churches. There would appear to be no more cause to expect Paul's opening sentences in a letter to Corinth or Thessalonica to resemble those in a former letter to the same church than to expect them to resemble the salutation paragraph in Romans, Philippians, or any other epistle. Since the salutations in all of Paul's letters reveal both conformity to a characteristic pattern and also continuous variation

of it, no absolute proof of the secondary character of any one of these salutations is possible. Nevertheless, an examination of these sections of the Pauline letters undoubtedly provides this conjecture with a considerable measure of support.

I present below an analysis of these salutation paragraphs in the ten letters:

## THE SENDER

Rom.	Παῦλος δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κλητὸς ἀπόστολος
I Cor.	Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Σωσθένης ὁ ἀδελφός
II Cor.	Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός
Gal.	Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων
Eph.	Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ
Phil.	Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δούλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
Col.	Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός
I Thess.	Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανός καὶ Τιμόθεος
II Thess.	Παῦλος καὶ Σιλουανός καὶ Τιμόθεος
Philem.	Παῦλος δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός

## THE RECIPIENTS

Rom.	πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις
I Cor.	τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὖσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ
II Cor.	τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὖσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ
Gal.	ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας
Eph.	τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
Phil.	πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις
Col.	τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ
I Thess.	τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ
II Thess.	τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ
Philem.	Φιλήμονι τῷ ἀγαπητῷ

## THE GREETING

- Rom., I Cor., II Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Philem. *Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*  
 Col. *Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*  
 I Thess. *Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*  
 II Thess. *Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*

Now, if this exhibit is examined, it will appear at once that I and II Thessalonians begin in almost identical fashion. The senders and recipients of the two letters are described in precisely the same terms. And if the greeting in I Thessalonians is enlarged to its usual form by the addition of *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* and then the *ἡμῶν* is lifted out of the benediction and placed after the *πατρί* in the preceding clause (a likely scribal error), there is obtained in exact and complete form the opening paragraph of II Thessalonians. The virtual identity of the two sections suggests that one of them is an editorial product, and the particular character of the differences between them indicates that it is the paragraph in II Thessalonians which is less primitive, since it alters I Thessalonians only to make it more regular.

But are any other of Paul's letters so alike in this respect? None quite so much so, and in only two cases does a resemblance even remotely approximating to it appear. One of these is the case of Ephesians and Colossians, which are definitely alike in all three parts of the introductory paragraphs. Except that there is no place-name in Ephesians and that Timothy is not associated with Paul in the sending of it—two differences readily accounted for by the less local and personal character of

the letter—there is little difference in the description of the sender and recipients; and in the third section, the greeting, it is again true that Ephesians alters Colossians only to make it more regular. But Ephesians is widely recognized as a post-Pauline composition based in considerable part upon Colossians. Can the much more striking resemblance between I and II Thessalonians be differently accounted for?

The only analogous case involves I and II Corinthians. Here again, it will be seen, the similarity is close in all three sections. Notice the identity of the phrase *τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ σῴσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ* and the trace of the long expression, *σὺν πᾶσιν . . . ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ . . . ἐν σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσι ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ*. The substitution of the usual *Τιμόθεος* in II Corinthians for the unfamiliar *Σωσθένης* of I Corinthians is understandable.<sup>35</sup>

The fact that the six letters involved in these cases are I and II Thessalonians, I and II Corinthians, and Ephesians and Colossians can hardly be altogether accidental. Is it not likely that the kind of connection which is acknowledged to account for the resemblance

<sup>35</sup> Dr. Goodspeed (*New Solutions of New Testament Problems*, p. 56), in commenting upon Harnack's suggestion that the phrase in I Corinthians beginning *σὺν πᾶσιν . . .* is itself an interpolation designed to render I Corinthians an encyclical, insists that if this phrase is secondary, it entered the text of the letter not when the corpus was first published but when Corinthians took the place of Ephesians as the opening epistle. We have already seen that the Muratorian list and other evidence indicate that Corinthians did for a while occupy this place, at any rate in some quarters. I agree thoroughly with Dr. Goodspeed and would remind the reader again that if the suggestion I have ventured to make about the order of the epistles in the original collection is sound, Corinthians would be *left* in first place when Ephesians dropped in the list, as it did when it came to be thought of as another church letter. This change in order and the consequent change in the text of I Corinthians probably occurred before the hypothetical creation of "II" Cor-



of the opening forms of Ephesians and Colossians also explains the even more striking phenomena exhibited in the cases of II Thessalonians and II Corinthians?

I have not mentioned in this connection the case of Colossians and Philemon, which were also almost certainly closely associated with each other in the original corpus. The sort of textual assimilation which we have been observing in the paragraphs of greeting in II Thessalonians and II Corinthians we should hardly expect to find in Philemon. The original address of Philemon, because it is essential to an understanding of the letter's contents, would not have been dropped by the first editors of the collection, no matter how near to Colossians they may have placed it. It may not be without significance, however, that Colossians is the only letter of Paul which closes with a benediction even nearly so short and informal as ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν. It is at least not unlikely that this probably original benediction escaped editorial enlargement only because it was followed so closely by Philemon. It is with the last sentence of Philemon that these two epistles to the church at Colossae formally ended: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit."

The fact that there is no manuscript or other textual evidence for the "omission" of the salutations of what

---

inthians took place. On the other hand, it may have happened at the same time or even later; in which case it is possible that in the *σὺν . . . πᾶσιν . . . ἐν . . . Ἀχαλᾷ* of II Corinthians we have a clue to what was originally the text of I Corinthians at the corresponding point. What we *now* find in I Corinthians would thus be not so much an interpolation as a variation of a genuine phrase in the interest of catholicity—something like "in all of Greece" would have become "everywhere." This is, of course, purely conjectural; but the fact that a *σὺν πᾶσιν . . .* phrase is found only in I and II Corinthians surely has some significance.

we know as II Thessalonians and II Corinthians in the first collection must be allowed. Still, it is undoubtedly true that evidence for the state of the text in the second century is not adequate to support a negative judgment. Besides, the first official recension would almost immediately have established the newly devised paragraphs. It would have seemed obvious to later editors and copyists that the salutations ought to appear, and there would have been no older competing forms.<sup>36</sup>

This discussion of text, which could hardly have been presented more briefly, strongly confirms the view, plausible on other grounds, that Marcion has preserved the original order as well as the original number of the published epistles of Paul and that the Muratorian list represents a later, rather than a prior, stage in the development of the Pauline corpus. The fact that Marcion's text of the letters (however much "omitting" and "corrupting" he may have done; and he undoubtedly did some of both) indubitably contained many readings which are more primitive than the corresponding readings of the ecclesiastical text strengthens this hypothesis. We cannot enter here into a discussion of such intricate questions as that of the text of Romans, for example; but there is no doubt that the Marcionite divergences cannot be explained simply as Marcion's

<sup>36</sup> It is a curious fact which may or may not have some bearing on the question of editorial work on the letters of Paul—that the arrangement of our letters in the order of length does not require the separating of letters to the same church. II Corinthians is shorter than I Corinthians, II Thessalonians than I Thessalonians, and II Timothy than I Timothy. But II Corinthians is longer than Ephesians or Galatians, and II Timothy is longer than Titus. II Thessalonians does not need to be as long as I Timothy to justify its position ahead of it, since it is a church letter and naturally has precedence over any personal letter.

“omissions.” There is too much additional evidence, as I have already had occasion to point out, that Romans was widely circulated, early and outside Marcionite circles, in the shorter form.

## VI

So far in this chapter I have been interested in showing that Marcion's canon of Pauline epistles is more primitive than the catholic corpus to which the Muratorian fragment, Irenaeus, and Tertullian are our first witnesses. Earlier I presented grounds for the view that it was Marcion's canonization of “Gospel” and “Paul” which led immediately to the church's creation of the New Testament, in which a corpus of the letters of Paul has so important a place. I should like now to urge that these two statements must not be taken to mean that the church's Pauline corpus was based directly upon the Marcionite.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, I believe it can be shown that, although Marcion virtually forced the church to accord to Paul's letters the value of Scripture, and although he preserved more exactly the form of the first Pauline letter collection, still the ecclesiastical corpus was based upon this original collection rather than upon the specifically Marcionite edition of it.

In support of this position at least three arguments can be made. The first of these is the likelihood a priori that the churches would go back to the original collection rather than to a heretical edition of it. It is in the highest degree improbable that there was ever a time when the original published corpus of Paul's let-

<sup>37</sup> This position is taken by P. L. Couchoud, “La première édition de St. Paul,” *Revue de l'histoire des religions* (Paris, 1926), pp. 242 ff.

ters existed only in the Marcionite form. However influential Marcion's exaltation of the letters may have been in determining their eventual status, it would not have been to Marcion's Bible that the churches would have turned for the text of these letters. They would have had access to the original corpus and would undoubtedly have availed themselves of it.

This a priori argument is confirmed by what we can make of the order of the Muratorian list. The point of particular importance here is that Galatians is in the center of the list and that Ephesians, which almost certainly headed the first collection, is second only to Corinthians, which originally followed it. The Muratorian order is exceedingly perplexing. That Ephesians, the shorter letter, should have dropped beneath Corinthians is understandable, particularly when it came to be thought of as "Ephesians" rather than as a general letter; and that Philemon should have been pulled away from its close association with Colossians in order to take its place as a personal note with the newly incorporated notes to Timothy and Titus—this also was to be expected. But what rhyme or reason can one find in the order of the other letters: Philippians, Colossians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Romans? That this represents anything like the original order, I have given grounds for denying. Perhaps it is the result of an early attempt to place the letters in their chronological order, although in that event it is difficult to see by what possible chance Philippians was assigned so high a place in the list. I have no solution to this problem, but I cannot refrain from calling attention to a very curious fact: If, as we have seen reason to believe, the original collection

was published on two rolls—Ephesians and Corinthians on one of them, and Romans, Thessalonians, Galatians, Colossians-Philemon, and Philippians on the other—it is interesting to observe that the order of the Muratorian list is the exact opposite of this order. Is it possible that some early scribe copied the letters in reverse order? This supposition is probably altogether too fanciful, but that one of our two earliest lists of the letters of Paul—that of Marcion—indicates an order in the original collection which our other earliest list exactly reverses is, to say the least, interesting. And this fact does not become less striking when it is remarked that the Muratorian order of the “personal” epistles in the Pauline corpus seems also to be in reverse: Philemon, Titus, Timothy. That Philemon is placed before the Pastorals is not unnatural—although I do not believe there is another ancient list in which this is true—but that Titus precedes Timothy is certainly surprising.

A much more conclusive argument for the belief that it was upon the original collection rather than upon the Marcionite edition of it that the churches built their *Corpus Paulinum* lies in a consideration of the text of Marcion’s “Apostle.” As we have seen, it is unquestionably true that Marcion edited his text (who didn’t, as a matter of fact?) and that he omitted phrases and passages whose presence in Paul he believed could be accounted for only on the assumption of interpolation by Judaizing editors or scribes. There is no indication that the catholic text is derived from this edited text, although it was at points undoubtedly influenced by it.<sup>38</sup> That this is true will be generally agreed, and I have not

<sup>38</sup> See n. 33, p. 95, below.

troubled to present evidence which Zahn, Harnack, and others have fully marshaled.

It does not follow from this, however, that Marcion's text was derived from any middle-second-century ecclesiastical text. I am quite sure that it was not and that Marcion's corpus is more primitive than that reflected in the Muratorian list, not only as to contents and order, but also as to many of its readings. But this does not mean that there is direct dependence either way. The text of Marcion and the text of the church almost certainly go back by different routes to the original Pauline letter collection.

## VII

I have left to a final section of this chapter the consideration of the place of the Pastoral Epistles in the catholic corpus. That the two letters to Timothy and the one to Titus took shape only after the beginning of the second century is a conclusion all but universally shared among students of the epistles. As I have already pointed out, this is enough to establish the fact that they did not belong to the collection of Pauline letters published (probably at Ephesus)<sup>39</sup> during the last decade of the first century. But by what process and in response to what needs were they later added to the corpus?

Before we come directly to this question, however, the prior question may profitably be raised: Why were the Pastoral Epistles written at all? No reader of these notes can miss the fact that they are seriously concerned with sound doctrine. But as against what heresy is this con-

<sup>39</sup> See below, Appen. II.

cern particularly felt? Perhaps several; but it is almost certain that one of them is Marcionism. The evidence for this has been presented more than once, most recently by Dr. Martin Rist,<sup>40</sup> and I have nothing to add to his impressive statement. Besides any number of more subtle evidences, there are the validation of "all Scripture" in II Tim. 3:15 ff. and the almost explicit reference to Marcionism in I Tim. 6:20: "Guard that which has been entrusted to you; keep away from the profane jargon and the antitheses of what is falsely called *gnosis*, through professing which some have made a failure of the faith."

That this sentence contains an allusion to Marcionism can hardly be questioned. It is true, as we have seen, that a sound distinction can be drawn between Marcionism and Gnosticism, but it is also true that the first opponents of Marcionism did not draw it. They constantly identified Marcion with the Gnostics, and there is no reason to deny that the author of the Pastorals may have done so. It is, however, the use of the word "antitheses" which puts the reference to Marcionism virtually beyond doubt. Harrison,<sup>41</sup> although he sees his way both to dating the Pastorals as late as 130 and to dating the beginnings of Marcionism as early as that same year, nevertheless follows Harnack in regarding this particular verse as an interpolation, since he does not believe the *Antitheses* had been written or even the idea of them conceived until after Marcion reached Rome, and yet does not find it easy to interpret the

<sup>40</sup> "Pseudepigraphical Refutations of Marcionism," *Journal of Religion*, XXII (1942), 39 ff.

<sup>41</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 244.

verse otherwise than as a reference to the heretic's work.

But such views rest upon the assumption, surely questionable, that the Pastorals could not have been written as late as A.D. 140 or 150, as well as (in Harrison's case) upon somewhat too rigid views as to how far advanced Marcion's thought may have been before he went to Rome. Surely the most natural way to interpret the passage is as a reference to Marcionism, especially when any number of other less explicit indications point in the same direction.

Walter Bauer,<sup>42</sup> who is inclined to think that Irenaeus is our first witness to the existence of the Pastorals, is willing to admit the probability that I Tim. 6:20 carries an allusion to Marcion's *Antitheses*, "perhaps before they were committed to writing"; and he associates the Pastorals (as Rist does also) with the *Acts of Paul* (particularly, *III Corinthians*) as seeking to draw Paul into the second-century battle against the heretics.<sup>43</sup>

Altogether, it is more than probable that, although the Epistles to Timothy and Titus were undoubtedly concerned with other issues also, they are nevertheless in considerable part to be explained as an attempt to answer Marcion's teaching, whether at an earlier or later stage in the development of the heresiarch's thought. Everything depends here, as will be seen later,<sup>44</sup> upon whether the parallels between Polycarp's "second" letter to the Philippians and the Pastorals are regarded as indicating literary connection between

<sup>42</sup> *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), p. 229.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> See below, Appen. II.



them; and, if so, whether they are interpreted as meaning that Polycarp used the Pastorals or the author of the Pastorals used Polycarp. But in any event, that the author of these three letters, especially of I Timothy, was aware of Marcion's activities and concerned to warn the church in Paul's name against the teacher who was so flagrantly misinterpreting him is highly probable.

But, likely as this conclusion is, it is neither so clear nor, so far as this study is concerned, so important as that the canonization (as distinguished from the composition) of these epistles grew immediately out of Marcion's use of the original Pauline collection. This use would inevitably have driven the church to the search for other letters of the apostle; and these three letters, adapted, even if not consciously designed, to make of Paul a catholic churchman, could hardly have been overlooked. They might almost have been created for the purpose of taking their place beside the other ten and thus modifying, if not Paul's portrait of himself, at least the portrait which the heretics with some measure of plausibility were able to justify on the basis of the traditional ten-letter collection.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Bauer (*op. cit.*, p. 228) writes: "Von hier aus möchte ich die Pastoralbriefe verstehen als einen Versuch der Kirche, Paulus unmissverständlich in die antihäretische Front einzugliedern und den Mangel an Vertrauen zu ihm in kirchlichen Kreisen zu beheben." The same writer also points out that "der Zutritt der Pastoralbriefe die Paulinische Briefsammlung recht eigentlich erst kirchenfähig macht" (*ibid.*, p. 230).

## CHAPTER IV

### MARCION'S "GOSPEL" AND THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

UP TO this point in our study we have seen that the non-Marcionite churches in their reaction to the Marcionite canon followed the principle of accepting and enlarging. The primitive ten-letter Pauline corpus, which Marcion adopted and all but appropriated, becomes the longer thirteen-letter ecclesiastical corpus; and—if I may anticipate the argument of later chapters of this book—the canonization of Acts and the so-called Catholic Epistles represents a further enlargement of the "Apostle" just as the fourfold Gospel does of the Marcionite "Gospel." In all these cases the longer form is the later form. But what of the relation of the Gospel of Marcion to the longer Gospel of Luke? Few facts about the New Testament are commonly thought of as being more certainly established than that Marcion simply abridged the canonical Gospel. If this is a fact, it constitutes an exception to the rule. But is it a fact? Have we a right to be so sure? Is it possible that the principle of "longer and later" applies here also and that Marcion's Gospel is the more primitive?

#### I

The question of the relation of Marcion's Gospel to the canonical Luke has been at times the subject of

vigorous controversy. Tertullian, Epiphanius, and other ancient witnesses, all of whom knew and accepted the same Gospel of Luke we know, felt not the slightest doubt that the "heretic" had shortened and "mutilated" the canonical Gospel; and, on the other hand, there is every indication that the Marcionites denied this charge and accused the more conservative churches of having falsified and corrupted the true Gospel which they alone possessed in its purity. These claims are precisely what we would have expected from the two rival camps, and neither set of them deserves much consideration. Still, once the Marcionites themselves were silenced, the orthodox view that Marcion had simply mutilated our Gospel was not challenged until near the end of the eighteenth century. At that time Semler<sup>1</sup> urged that Marcion's Gospel was not derived from Luke but that both could be traced to an earlier Gospel. He was immediately supported by other scholars; and J. E. C. Schmidt<sup>2</sup> went so far as to claim that the Gospel of Marcion came near to being the original Luke, which was later enlarged and otherwise altered. Eichhorn,<sup>3</sup> Schleiermacher,<sup>4</sup> and not a few others agreed. But the tradi-

<sup>1</sup> To Semler's work, *Vorrede zu Townson's Abhandlung über die vier Evangelien* (1783), I have not been able to get access. But references to it in Storr (see below, n. 5) and in many later works leave no doubt as to its position on this question.

<sup>2</sup> "Über das echte Evangelium des Lucas," *Magazin für Religionphilosophie und Kirchengeschichte*, V (1796), 468 ff. The same general position is taken in Schmidt's *Historisch-Kritische Einleitung ins Neue Testament* (Gießen, 1804).

<sup>3</sup> *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Leipzig, 1804), I, 40 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Einleitung ins Neue Testament* (Berlin, 1845), pp. 64 f., 197 f., 214 f.

tional position was defended by Storr,<sup>5</sup> Neander,<sup>6</sup> Hug,<sup>7</sup> and most effectively by Hahn,<sup>8</sup> whose attempt at reconstructing the text of the Gospel of Marcion is one of the classical studies in the history of this problem.

The contrary position, however, was vigorously reaffirmed by Schwegler<sup>9</sup> and by Ritschl,<sup>10</sup> who after a detailed analysis of the evidence (giving particular attention to the question of the use of canonical Luke by Justin) decided that Luke was based on Marcion rather than the contrary. Baur<sup>11</sup> took approximately the same position.

This brings us to the work of Volkmar<sup>12</sup> and Hilgenfeld,<sup>13</sup> who held that Marcion's Gospel was most prob-

<sup>5</sup> G. C. Storr, *Über den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und die Briefe Johannis* (Tübingen, 1786), 259 ff.

<sup>6</sup> A. Neander, *Genetische Entwicklung der Vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme* (Berlin, 1818), pp. 309 ff. See also his *General History of the Christian Religion* (Boston, 1848), I, 473.

<sup>7</sup> T. L. Hug, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1821), pp. 68 ff.

<sup>8</sup> A. Hahn, *Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt* (Königsberg, 1823). A sentence will indicate Hahn's conclusion: "So wird die Kritik zu dem Ausspruche gezwungen, Marcion habe seiner Parthei nicht ein Evangelienbuch zum Gebrauche übergeben wie er es aus der Hand der Zeit selbst erhalten, sondern das Evangelium Lucas, wie er es für sein System und seine Kirche abgeändert, d. h. verfälscht und verstümmelt hatte."

<sup>9</sup> A. Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung* (Tübingen, 1846), I, 260 ff.

<sup>10</sup> A. Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas* (Tübingen, 1846).

<sup>11</sup> F. C. Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältniss zueinander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung* (Tübingen, 1847), pp. 393 ff.

<sup>12</sup> "Über das Lukas-Evangelium nach seinem Verhältniss zu Marcion und seinem dogmatischen Charakter," *Theologische Jahrbücher*, IX (1850), 110 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's* (Halle, 1850), pp. 391 ff. See also Hilgenfeld's

ably based on a document closely resembling our Gospel of Luke but acknowledging that many of its readings were no doubt more primitive than the canonical Gospel's.<sup>14</sup>

On the basis of their arguments both Ritschl<sup>15</sup> and Baur<sup>16</sup> modified their previous positions, Ritschl giving up his claim that Luke was based on Marcion, although he was careful to point out that this did not mean a return to the traditional position, since neither Volkmar

---

"Das Marcionitische Evangelium und seine neueste Bearbeitung," *Theologische Jahrbücher*, XII (1853), 192 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Because of the great importance of Volkmar in this controversy, I quote a paragraph from his article (*loc. cit.*): "Nur so viel scheint mir wahr—and das theils von Neuem erinnert, theils zuerst geltend gemacht zu haben, ist jedenfalls das positive Verdienst Ritschl's und Baur's hierbei—nicht bloss dass bisher die Depravation des Lukas durch Marcion nur mit grosser Willkür behauptet und eigentlich noch nie stichhaltig bewiesen ist, sondern dass auch die alten Gegner Marcion's ihn mit Unrecht so geschmäht, gegen ihn mit Leidenschaft und oft selbst blind aufgetreten sind, ihm sogar Manches ganz mit Unrecht aufgebürdet haben, dass vielmehr das Marcion-Evangelium keineswegs bloss in willkürlicher Corruptur zu dogmatischen Zwecken besteht. Vielmehr bietet dasselbe zum Theil nur andere Lesarten, als unser gewöhnlicher Lukastext hat, von denen einige sogar die ältern und ursprünglicheren sind, obwohl die Gegner, die übrigens zum Theil nur andere Handschriften des Lukas-Evangelium gehabt haben als Marcion, auch darüber Fälschung schreien. Dabei ist es dem ganzen Thatbestand gegenüber nicht bloss möglich, dass auch einzelne Verse oder selbst ganze Stücke, die bei Marcion fehlen, erst später in unsern Lukastext eingedrungen sind, sondern es scheint dies auch in Bezug auf das Evangelium wenigstens hinsichtlich eines Stückes nicht wohl anders möglich, wie in Betreff des Apostolicums z.B., die beiden letzten Kapitel des Römersbriefes und drei Pastoralbriefe, welche Marcion fehlten, wirklich erst aus einer spätern Zeit stammen."

<sup>15</sup> "Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien," *Theologische Jahrbücher*, X (1851), 480 ff.

<sup>16</sup> *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter, nebst einem Anhang über das Evangelium Marcion's* (Tübingen, 1851), pp. 191 ff. See also the reference which Ritschl makes to Baur's position in the passage quoted in the following footnote. For a recent discussion of Baur's position see Mary E. Andrews, "Tendenz versus Interpretation," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII (1939), 263 ff.

nor Hilgenfeld held that Marcion's Gospel was derived from the canonical Luke; and Baur likewise agreeing that Marcion emended his original but insisting even more strenuously that this original was not identical with our Luke. That Gospel, he continued to hold, took its present form (the first two chapters being most obviously in the nature of an addition) only in reaction to Marcionism.

It is important to note that, contrary to many assertions, this controversy in Germany over the relation of Marcion to Luke ended not in the vindication of the traditional position which Hahn had defended but in the establishment of a new view which denied both that Luke was derived from Marcion and that Marcion was derived from the canonical Luke. This view was held not only by Ritschl and Baur but also, more conservatively, by Volkmar and Hilgenfeld.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> This point is of the greatest importance and is constantly ignored. I have already quoted from Volkmar (n. 14 above). Below is a paragraph from the work of Ritschl cited in n. 15: "Die von mir vortragene Hypothese, dass nicht Marcion das Evangelium des Lukas geändert habe, sondern dass sein Evangelium eine Vorstufe des kanonischen Lukas sei, sehe ich als durch Volkmar und Hilgenfeld widerlegt an. Wer die übertreibende Einseitigkeit bedenkt, mit welcher Hahn die hergebrachte Ansicht vertreten hat, wird es zu entschuldigen wissen, dass ich durch ihn zu der entgegengesetzten Einseitigkeit geführt wurde. . . . Das Verhältniss der beiden Texte wird nun aber durch Hilgenfeld, trotz seines Widerspruches gegen meine frühere Hypothese, dennoch nicht auf den alten Stand zurückgeführt, sondern er nimmt für einzelne Abweichungen des Marcionitischen Textes von dem Lukas die Priorität vor diesem in Anspruch (*Evangelium Justini u.s.w.*, S. 469 f.) und begründet darauf die Annahme, dass das kanonische Evangelium doch erst nach Marcion seine gegenwärtige Gestalt gewonnen habe. Der weiteren Ausführung dieser Annahme ist der Anhang zu Baur's Schrift über das Markusevangelium gewidmet, und sie gewinnt durch ihn eine solche Erweiterung, dass das Zugeständniss der durch Marcion vorgenommenen Emendation im Vergleich mit den Consequenzen der neuen Ansicht als sehr indifferent erscheint. Baur bleibt doch dabei stehen, dass die letzte Redaktion des Lukas mit Beziehung auf Marcion, also in der Mitte des Zweiten Jahrhunderts, von dem Verfasser der Apostelgeschichte vorgenommen sei, und dass namentlich erst damals die beiden ersten Kapitel dem Evangelium hinzugefügt seien."

The most important subsequent contribution to this discussion was an article by William Sanday,<sup>18</sup> later published as one of the chapters of *The Gospels in the Second Century* by the same writer.<sup>19</sup> In this influential article Sanday, admitting the inconclusiveness of the previous arguments for the traditional position (arguments based almost entirely upon theological considerations), undertook to put that position beyond any question by an analysis of the vocabulary of Luke in which he demonstrated that the characteristic Lukan terms appear both in the passages of that Gospel which Marcion included and in those which he lacked. This article, taken with the work of Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, and others, had the effect of apparently settling the issue; and in recent decades the orthodox position has been taken for granted with only occasional hints of dissatisfaction.<sup>20</sup>

But one cannot read the literature of this discussion

<sup>18</sup> "Marcion's Gospel," *Fortnightly Review*, XXIII (1875), 855 ff.

<sup>19</sup> (London, 1876), pp. 204 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Morton S. Enslin, e.g., writes: "That his [Marcion's] text of the Gospel was not a fair approximation of the one he had inherited is not lightly to be assumed" (*Christian Beginnings* [New York and London, 1938], p. 463). Kirsopp Lake, in his *Paul: His Heritage and Legacy* (New York, 1934), pp. 112 f., writes as follows: "Marcion . . . did not find the original text, either of the Epistles or of the Gospel of Luke, quite adequate to support his teaching, and he emended the text of both. I suspect, though I cannot prove, that his opponents did the same, so that very probably neither the Marcionite nor the Catholic text of the Epistles or of the Gospel of Luke is identical with the original text. . . . Of course, it is theoretically possible that Marcion preserved the original text both of the Gospel and of the Epistles. All the evidence that he emended them comes from the statements of his opponents. Personally, I think that he did not emend them quite as much as Tertullian states, but some of the passages quoted as emendations seem to be intrinsically improbable as the original text; and on general grounds I should find it harder to believe that Marcion, or any one else of his time, copied a text without change, than that he emended it freely." (Quoted by permission of the Oxford University Press.)

without realizing that (unless an exception should be made in the case of Sanday's article, to which I shall return later) not one of the defenders of the traditional view really proves his case. A position from which so many able scholars have dissented can, in the absence of new evidence, hardly claim indubitability. Even Volkmar and Hilgenfeld must be included among the dissenters if the traditional position is defined sharply and simply; and, as we shall see later, it is only as that position *is* defined sharply and simply that I have any interest in questioning it. In these days when so many well-established views in the field of Gospel origins are having to undergo some modification, a re-examination of the question of the relation of Marcion's Gospel to Luke may not be inappropriate. Is the case for the view that Marcion simply abridged our Luke the open-and-shut case it is commonly supposed to be?

## II

Our principal sources for the text of Marcion's Gospel are the same as those for his "Apostle"—Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Adamantius<sup>21</sup>—and the same difficul-

<sup>21</sup> Of these, Tertullian and Epiphanius are more dependable than Adamantius. The reader is referred to Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 159\* ff. (2d ed., pp. 177\* ff.), and to Zahn, *Geschichte*, I, 603 ff., and II, 409 ff., for full discussions of the value of these witnesses. I quote a paragraph from Harnack: "Dass sein Zeugniß [Adamantius] in der Regel von geringerem Belang ist als das des Tert. und Epiphanius, gilt auch hier, da er nicht aus Marcion selbst, sondern aus Gegenschriften geschöpft hat; auch bleibt es an mehreren Stellen unsicher, ob sie überhaupt aus M.'s Evangelium stammen. Dazu kommt, dass Citate aus einem Synoptiker stets unsicherer sind als die aus den Briefen. Dass der Grundtext und die Lateinische Übersetzung Rufins öfters erheblich auseinandergehen, erhöht noch die Schwierigkeiten der Verwertung. Die Citate aus dem 2. Dialog sind, wie bei dem Apostel, die zuverlässigsten. An einigen Stellen muss man zu der Entscheidung kommen, dass der Marcionitische Text selbst Veränderungen erlitten hat." See also W. H. Van de



ties which were recognized as standing in the way of an assured reconstruction of the text of the "Apostle" apply also in the case of the "Gospel," although fortunately the evidence for the Gospel is somewhat more abundant and detailed.<sup>22</sup> This evidence is assembled in Harnack, and the reader is referred there both for these data and for an admirable discussion of the problems involved in the reconstruction of the Marcionite Gospel text.

An examination of the evidence will convince one that no reconstruction of the Gospel of Marcion, even as to its general content, can be more than approximate. In general, the following statements can be made: Marcion's Gospel contained nothing which is not in our Luke; it is known to have contained in some form many materials which Luke also contains; it is known to have lacked other materials which Luke includes; and there are still other sections of our Luke about which we must be uncertain whether Marcion had anything corresponding to them or not. Below, on page 86, the results of an attempt to divide the verses of the Gospel of Luke as between those belonging to sections of the Gospel to which there seems to have been some Marcionite equivalent (A), those to which there is known to have been no Marcionite equivalent (B), and those to which

---

Sande Bakhuyzen, *Der Dialog des Adamantius* (Leipzig, 1901), p. xv, and Zahn, *Geschichte*, I, 607 f., where the same general judgment is expressed. For the value of Ephraim of Syria and other Old Syrian sources for Marcion's text see, in addition to Zahn and Harnack, J. Schäfer, *Eine Altsyrische Antimarkionitische Erklärung von Parabeln des Herrn* (Münster, 1917), esp. pp. 208 ff.

<sup>22</sup> This greater abundance may be due largely, however, to the fact that the discrepancy between the ecclesiastical Gospel of Luke and Marcion's Gospel was evidently far more extensive than that between Marcion's text and the ecclesiastical text of the ten primary Pauline epistles.

there may or may not have been an equivalent in Marcion's Gospel (C).<sup>23</sup>

Now if the passages in B—that is, the passages belonging to our Luke which are known to have been missing in Marcion—are examined with open mind, I believe that one will reach the same two conclusions to which a consideration of similar evidence in the case of the "Apostle" has led us: namely, that some of the gaps are most reasonably to be explained as Marcionite omissions and that others do not so readily lend themselves to that kind of interpretation. That Marcion, for example, did not have the account of John the Baptist's announcement of Jesus as Messiah or the story of Jesus' temptation is almost certainly to be accounted for by Marcion's omission of these passages. Not only are they inconsistent with Marcion's theological position but (more important) they are also deeply imbedded in the Synoptic tradition, and to explain them as late additions to a Gospel which was already dependent (as Marcion's was) upon that tradition is next to impossible. On the other hand, why should Marcion have omitted the parable of the Prodigal Son, or the story of the mas-

<sup>23</sup> Although the verses known to have been missing from Marcion's Gospel ("B" in the table) can be designated with considerable precision, it is often not possible to know whether other pericopes should be classified under "A" or "C." Only when we are explicitly told by an ancient writer that Marcion did not have a pericope or a verse have we included it under "B." When all our sources are silent about a pericope, we have included it under "C." But when an ancient witness, presumably with a copy of Marcion's Gospel open before him, quotes the text of a Lucan pericope, even though only a few words of it, we have assumed that the whole pericope was there in some form. But obviously it is precarious to count verses on the basis of such an assumption. There is no doubt that many verses I have placed under "A" should fall under "C." The classification proposed below is as accurate as I can make it, although only approximate correctness can be claimed for the results of this or any similar attempt.

sacre of the Galileans, or the conversation in which the Pharisees tell Jesus that Herod wishes to kill him? The best answer that Plummer, defending the traditional

## A (MARCIONITE)

3:1a	11:27-29	17:11-32	22:39-41
4:16-35	11:33	18:1-23	22:47-48
4:40-5:38	11:37-48	18:35-19:9a	22:63-23:3
6:1-46	11:52	19:10-26	23:6-12
7:1-28	12:1-5	20:1-8	23:18-25
7:36-8:18	12:8-27	20:19-36	23:32-34a
8:20-31	12:29-32	20:39-44	23:44-46
8:42b-48	12:35-59	21:5-17	23:50-24:21a
9:1-30	13:10-28	21:19-20	24:25-26
9:32-10:11	14:12-24	21:25-22:15	24:30-31
10:16-25	15:1-10	22:19-23	24:37-43
10:27	16:1-17:4	22:33-34	24:47
11:1-22			

## B (NON-MARCIONITE)

1:1-2:52	11:49-51	17:10b	21:18
3:1b-4:15	12:6-7	18:31-34	21:21-24
5:39	12:28	19:9b	22:16
8:19	13:1-9	19:29-46	22:35-38
9:31	13:29-35	20:9-18	23:39-43
11:30-32	15:11-32	20:37-38	

## C (UNCERTAIN)

4:36-39	11:34-36	19:47-48	23:26-31
6:47-49	11:53-54	20:45-21:4	23:34b-38
7:29-35	12:33-34	22:17-18	23:47-49
8:32-42a	14:1-11	22:24-32	24:21b-24
8:49-56	14:25-35	22:42-46	24:27-29
10:12-15	17:5-10a	22:49-62	24:32-36
10:26	17:33-37	23:4-5	24:44-46
10:28-42	18:24-30	23:13-16	24:48-53
11:23-26	19:27-28		

position, can give at this point is: "Our knowledge of his [Marcion's] strange tenets is imperfect, and these passages probably conflicted with some of them."<sup>24</sup> But

<sup>24</sup> A. Plummer, *Gospel According to St. Luke* (New York, 1925), p. lxix. We have seen that the evidence that Romans, chaps. 15 and 16, were missing from many ancient sources (see above, p. 51) keeps many scholars from

he would agree that this answer, although from the traditional point of view the best possible, is not satisfactory.

There are still other missing passages which, although it is virtually certain that Marcion would have omitted them if he had found them in his source, can equally plausibly be accounted for as catholic additions to a shorter Gospel. Into this category the first two chapters of Luke fall. Marcion would surely not have tolerated this highly "Jewish" section; but how wonderfully adapted it is to show the nature of Christianity as the true Judaism and thus to answer one of the major contentions of the Marcionites! And one cannot overlook the difficulty involved in the common supposition that Marcion deliberately selected a Gospel which began in so false and obnoxious a way.

---

ascribing the absence of this section from Marcion's text to his own "omission" of it. The same thing can be said of a few passages in Luke. Luke 5:39, e.g., is missing in Marcion, but it is also missing in D and other Old Latin authorities. Zahn cites Hilgenfeld as finding in this verse an instance of later catholic addition (*Geschichte*, I, 714). Zahn rejects this explanation but is forced to agree that the considerable manuscript attestation which the "omission" has makes difficult the ascribing of it to Marcion. Apparently, in that case, Marcion received a Gospel in which that verse did not appear. It seems to me, however, exceedingly precarious to decide the question whether Marcion is responsible for any one of these "omissions" merely by asking whether there is other non-Marcionite evidence for the same "omission." Not only must the fact that Marcionite readings undoubtedly had influence upon the textual tradition be taken into account (this is Harnack's explanation of the Old Latin "omission" of 5:39 [*Marcion*, p. 224\* (2d ed., p. 247\*)]), but the possibility that "omissions" for which Marcion was not responsible have failed to leave any independent trace must likewise be recognized. As a matter of fact, there is no direct manuscript evidence in the case of Romans, chaps. 15-16. It is quite conceivable that all evidence of the absence of these chapters from ancient manuscripts might have been lost. There is no telling how many cases of the same kind have failed to leave any trace. The larger the amount of material involved, the more quickly would the "omissions" be repaired in the tradition, once the fuller official text was promulgated. Also see nn. 13, 14, and 15, in chap. iii, above.

So far as the theological implications of the "B" passages are concerned, it is simply not true to say that all of them can be plausibly explained only as omissions by Marcion.<sup>25</sup> In many cases it is equally or even more reasonable to suppose that they were not to be found in the document upon which Marcion based his Gospel. While a consideration of these passages from this theological point of view (the point of view which dominated the German discussion) does not establish the view that our Luke is based on Marcion, it fails also to establish the contrary opinion that Marcion is based on Luke. Indeed, one can sum up the results of the German discussion by some such statement as this: Our Luke cannot be explained simply as an enlargement of Marcion's Gospel—this must be accepted as proved—but that Marcion's Gospel can be explained simply as an abridgment of our Luke is just as certainly *not* proved.

### III

Reference has already been made to the argument for the traditional position which was advanced by Sanday. There are two reasons for giving this argument particular attention. One is that the argument, if sound, conclusively settles the point which I have just said the German discussion left open. The other is the fact that

<sup>25</sup> In this connection it is important to observe that many passages actually appear in Marcion's text which one would have expected him decisively to repudiate. Harnack writes: ". . . da M. nicht immer consequent gewesen ist, wie nicht wenige Stellen beweisen, die ihm deutlich ungünstig sind und die er doch stehen gelassen hat" (Marcion, p. 41 [2d ed., p. 44]). Tertullian is forced to offer a very subtle explanation of Marcion's failure to "omit" many passages: "Now Marcion was unwilling to expunge from his Gospel some statements which even made against him—I suspect, on purpose, to have it in his power from the passages which he did not suppress, when he could have done so, either to deny that he had expunged anything or else to justify his suppressions if he made any" (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 43).

it has been, at least among British and American writers, decisively influential. Charteris refers to it as "irresistible";<sup>26</sup> Lightfoot calls it "unanswerable";<sup>27</sup> other writers use similar language.

I shall let two of these later writers summarize the argument. Burkitt states it as follows:

The linguistic evidence is fatal to the priority of the Marcionite edition. If the parts rejected by Marcion did not actually belong to the third gospel but were later accretions, there should be some difference of style between these portions and the rest. But as a matter of fact, there is none. The characteristic style of the Lucan writings equally pervades the passages rejected and the passages retained by Marcion.<sup>28</sup>

Plummer, who bases his assurance of the priority of our Luke almost exclusively upon this same argument, has this to say:

The chief evidence (in itself amounting to something like demonstration) that Marcion abridged our Luke, rather than the Evange-

<sup>26</sup> *Canonicity* (Edinburgh and London, 1880), p. 394.

<sup>27</sup> *Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion"* (London, 1889), p. 186. It is interesting to observe that in the last edition of this "work" to which Lightfoot's title refers (*Supernatural Religion* [London, 1902], p. 361) the following statement occurs: "In the earlier editions . . . we contended that the theory that Marcion's Gospel was a mutilated form of our third Synoptic had not been established, and that more probably it was an earlier work, from which our Gospel might have been elaborated. Since the sixth edition of this work was completed, however, a very able examination of Marcion's Gospel has been made by Dr. Sanday, which has convinced us that our earlier hypothesis is untenable; that the portions of our third Synoptic excluded from Marcion's Gospel were really written by the same pen which composed the mass of the work, and, consequently, that our third Synoptic existed in his time and was substantially in the hands of Marcion. This conviction is mainly the result of the linguistic analysis, sufficiently indicated by Dr. Sanday and, since, exhaustively carried out for ourselves. We still consider the argument based upon the dogmatic views of Marcion, which has hitherto been almost exclusively relied on, quite inconclusive by itself; but the linguistic test, applied practically for the first time by Dr. Sanday, must, we think, prove irresistible to all who are familiar with the comparatively limited vocabulary of New Testament writers."

<sup>28</sup> *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (Edinburgh, 1906), p. 315.

list expanded Marcion, is found in the peculiarities and characteristics of Luke's style and diction. These run through the Gospel from end to end, and on the average are as frequent in the portions which Marcion omitted as in the rest. In the first two chapters they are perhaps somewhat more frequent than elsewhere. It is quite incredible that the supposed interpolator made a minute examination of the style and diction of Marcion's Gospel, practised himself in it, and then added those portions of our Gospel which Marcion did not include in his Gospel: and that he accomplished this feat without raising a suspicion. Such a feat in that age would have been a literary miracle. Only those who have worked through the passages expunged by Marcion, carefully marking what is peculiar to Luke or characteristic of him, can estimate the full force of this argument.<sup>29</sup>

Neither Burkitt nor Plummer presents the evidence upon which this decisive argument is based; both refer the reader to Sanday's essay. But, when we consult Sanday, we are confronted by this amazing fact: Sanday's whole inquiry into the vocabulary and style of Marcion's Gospel seems to have been conducted without any reference to the text of Marcion's Gospel. It apparently has been assumed that if Marcion had a Lukan pericope, he had it in precisely the form in which it is found in our Luke. The consequence is that Sanday's elaborate demonstration resolves itself into a proof merely of the linguistic homogeneity of our Gospel of Luke, a matter which has never been in doubt, and the evidence cited has no necessary relevance to Marcion's Gospel. Sanday points to any number of characteristic or peculiar Lukan words and shows that they are found in parts of our Luke which Marcion did not have. This will be very impressive if they are also to be found in

<sup>29</sup> *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (New York, 1925), pp. lxix f. (quoted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers). It may be worth noting that both Burkitt and Plummer beg the question by using such words as "omitted," "rejected," "expunged."

what Marcion *did* include. But this is precisely the point ignored in the analysis. As a matter of fact, most of the terms cited by Sanday are not to be found in the recovered text of Marcion's Gospel. There is no way of knowing whether they were originally there or not.

To take an example: "With Matthew," writes Sanday, "ἄλεος is masculine, with Luke neuter; so five times in chapter one and in 10:37, which was retained by Marcion." The point is, of course, that if Marcion had 10:37, but did not have chapter 1, the appearance of the neuter ἄλεος in both places is an indication that the writer of chapter 1 also wrote 10:37, and therefore wrote the Gospel which Marcion used. But not only is it by no means certain that Marcion's Gospel contained the parable of the Good Samaritan (to which 10:37 belongs)—it belongs to the "C" category in the analysis above—but it is also quite certain that no single fragment of Marcion's text of the parable, if he did possess it, has been found. But the argument first takes for granted that Marcion had the parable, then assumes that in the form in which Marcion had it the parable must have contained the word ἄλεος, and finally that it contained it as a neuter rather than as a masculine.

Sanday summarizes: "The verified peculiarities of St. Luke's style and diction are found in the portions of the Gospel which Marcion omitted in a proportion averaging considerably more than one to each verse." But the "verified peculiarities" are peculiarities of our Luke, not necessarily of Marcion's Gospel unless the actual recovered text of Marcion's Gospel can be shown to contain them. To show that the characteristic terms are to be found in sections of the *canonical* Gospel to which sec-



tions of Marcion's Gospel more or less closely corresponded is not enough. For it is quite obvious that the author of Luke-Acts would have placed his imprint upon the style of Marcion's Gospel if he had used it as a source, just as he is generally recognized to have done in his use of Mark. If I may quote Plummer again, making what is obviously a necessary emendation: "Only those who have worked through the passages expunged by Marcion, carefully marking what is peculiar to Luke or characteristic of him [and is also known to have belonged to Marcion's Gospel], can estimate the full force of this argument." But this vital question as to whether Marcion's Gospel (as distinguished from that part of our Luke corresponding in some degree to Marcion's Gospel) is known to have contained the peculiar or characteristic Lukan terms is altogether ignored by Plummer and all his predecessors, including the author of *Supernatural Religion*, who had the strongest reasons for not ignoring it.

So far I have been trying merely to point out a defect in Sanday's method. The matter cannot be left there, however. We must ask whether the use of a sounder method would give us results significantly different from those which Sanday achieved and which appear to place the derivation of the Gospel of Marcion from our Luke so definitely beyond doubt.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> I contributed to the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for September, 1939 (LVIII, 193 ff.), an article, "On the Vocabulary of Marcion's Gospel," in which I reported the results of an exploratory investigation of this problem. Because since then certain minor changes have taken place in my conception of how the material in Luke should be divided and because I made in my former paper the methodological error of not taking Acts into consideration along with the "B" passages in Luke at one important point in the process, I have performed the experiment again, more carefully and on the basis of

With a view to answering this question, I made a list of words peculiar to or characteristic of Luke-Acts or Luke alone (I did not include any terms which appear only in Acts). I then counted the appearances of these 492 words in each of the three sections into which Luke has already been divided: "A," those parts of Luke for which it is safe to say there was some kind of parallel in the Marcionite Gospel; "B," those parts of Luke to which it is known that Marcion had no parallel; and "C," those parts of Luke about which one must be uncertain whether Marcion had a parallel or not. I found that 166 of the 492 terms are to be found only in "A" (or in "A" and "C"), 105 only in "B" (or in "B" and "C"), 59 in "C" only (or in "C" and Acts), and 162 in both "A" and "B" (or in "A" and "B" and "C," or in "A" and Acts, or in "A" and Acts and "C"). These 492 words, divided into the four classes, are presented as Lists 1-4 in Appendix III of this book (see pp. 177 ff.).

It is clear at once that we are not concerned with the terms which appear only in "B" and "C" any more than we are concerned with the terms which appear only in Acts, since such terms cannot be regarded as characteristic of Marcion's Gospel. But it is almost equally obvious that we are likewise not concerned with the terms which appear only in "A" (or in "A" and "C"). For terms only in "A" may be characteristic only of Marcion or of some unidentified source of his Gospel

---

amplifier data. The results are in general the same as those arrived at before, but they are now stated with greater fulness and, I trust, with greater accuracy; although a claim of absolute accuracy, even if I were rash enough to make it, would be rendered irrelevant by the fact that the large element of uncertainty attaching to the text of Marcion itself would make anything approaching precision impossible in the final result no matter how exact my count might be.

and not of Luke or Luke-Acts as such at all; that is, such terms may appear in Luke only because they belonged first to Marcion or to a source common to Luke and Marcion. Thus, the only words which are relevant are the 162 which are to be found in both "A" and "B" or in "A" and Acts.

But not even all of these "A-B" terms are strictly relevant, for, as we saw in the discussion of Sanday, we cannot be sure that a word in "A" really belonged to Marcion's Gospel unless we actually find it in Marcion's recovered text. But when we examine the recovered text of Marcion's Gospel as Harnack has assembled it,<sup>32</sup> we find that only 75 of the 162 terms appear there—those followed by superior numbers in the fourth list. Only these 75 words appear at all, and they appear a total of 110 times. Eight of these terms, however, appearing 10 times, can be at once eliminated because they occur in Marcion's text only at points where they also appear in Matthew or Mark. Their presence in Marcion can be accounted for, therefore, without reference to Luke's characteristic style. Likewise a single appearance each of 4 other terms and 3 appearances of a fifth can be similarly explained (see p. 180). This reduces the significant total to 93 appearances of 67 words.

When we explore the ground for Harnack's judgment in these 93 cases, we are forced to recognize that in many instances the evidence for the appearance of particular words is meager indeed, unless one holds on other grounds, as Harnack did, that the Marcionite text was derived from the text of canonical Luke. For a total of 36 appearances of 30 words there is evidence in the

<sup>32</sup> *Marcion*, pp. 165\* ff. (2d ed., pp. 183\* ff.).

Greek of Epiphanius or Adamantius; but it has already been pointed out that we cannot be sure that the Greek sources always quote the original Marcionite text. Indeed, it is unlikely that Adamantius had a Marcionite Gospel,<sup>32</sup> but 10 words, occurring 11 times, rest entirely upon his evidence, as far as the Greek sources are concerned, and 6 appearances of other terms are met with only there.

The appearance in Harnack's reconstructed text of 48 words (64 times) is supported largely or altogether by Tertullian's Latin.<sup>33</sup> Some of the Latin words reasonably allow for only the Greek terms which Harnack uses,

<sup>32</sup> See pp. 83 f., n. 21.

<sup>33</sup> Whether Tertullian's text of Marcion was in Greek or Latin is for our present purpose irrelevant. The point has been the subject of vigorous discussion. Zahn (*Geschichte*, I, 51 ff.) held that Tertullian had a Greek text of Marcion before him and made his own translations into Latin. Harnack was certain that he used a Latin version (*Marcion*, pp. 47\* ff. [2d ed., pp. 48\* ff.]). Von Soden ("Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian," in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher* [Tübingen, 1927], pp. 229 ff.) is convinced by Harnack, as are also A. d'Alès (*Novatien: Etude sur la théologie romaine au milieu du III<sup>e</sup> siècle* [Paris, 1924], pp. 76 ff.) and La Piana ("The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century," *Harvard Theological Review*, XVIII [1925], 223); but Ernesto Buonaiuti is critical ("Marcione e il nuovo testamento latino," *Ricerche religiose*, II [1926], 336 ff.). On the related question of whether Marcion's Latin text is older or later than the catholic version Harnack is noncommittal. Lietzmann at first regarded Marcion's version as being perhaps older (*An die Römer* [Tübingen, 1919], pp. 14 f.), but repudiated this suggestion in the 1928 edition of the same work. Von Soden (*op. cit.*, pp. 229 ff.) also takes the catholic text to be older. On the further question of how influential Marcion's Latin text was in shaping the catholic textual tradition see, in addition to the works already cited, Harnack, *Marcion*, pp. 135\* and 222\* ff. (2d ed., pp. 160\* and 242\* ff. [esp. 247\*]); J. Rendel Harris, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the Gospels, Texts and Studies* (Cambridge, 1891), II, 1, pp. 226 ff., and "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," *Expositor*, VII (1914), 317 ff.; Henry J. Wordsworth and John White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine* (Oxford, 1913), II, 1, 41; R. S. Wilson, *Marcion: A Study of a Second Century Heretic* (London, 1933), pp. 145 ff.

but that is by no means always true. In some cases (I count at least 8: *ἀνὴρ* in 5:12; *ἔβην* in 4:41; *ἐνώπιον* in 15:10; *ἕτερος* in 16:13; *παύειν* in 8:24; *ἐπαίρειν* in 11:27; *ὄρθρος* in 24:1; *χαρά* in 15:10) I cannot find even an approximate equivalent in the Latin text. For the remainder (56 appearances of 44 terms) which rest on Latin support the evidence is presented as the seventh item in Appendix III. I have not attempted any division among these 56 cases as between those where the particular Greek term employed by Harnack is clearly indicated and those where another Greek term may, on purely intrinsic grounds, be quite as probable. That *ἀδικία* is represented by Tertullian's *iniustitia*, *λαός* by *populus*, *χάρις* by *gratia*, etc., is much more certainly indicated than that *adnuntia* refers to *διαγγέλειν* (but *adnuntiare* to *ἐναγγελιζεσθαι*), *paralyticus* to *παραλθεσθαι*, *multitudo* to *πλήθος*, *tamen* to *πλήν*, *et* to *τε*, etc.

The absence of perfect controls renders exact decision impossible, but it is not rash to say that in no more than one-half of the 56 cases is it possible to feel complete assurance that the particular Greek word now found in our Luke *must* have stood back of Tertullian's Latin term. Of course, if one assumes that Marcion simply abridged the canonical Luke and then observes that Tertullian's comments indicate the presence in Marcion's Gospel of the substance of a particular Lukan sentence, it is natural to decide that Marcion had the sentence in its Lukan form, especially when there is no manuscript evidence of a variant from the usual text of the sentence. Harnack has worked on this assumption. But when the assumption itself is the subject of question, even reasonable certainty cannot in many cases be reached.

Vocabulary is only one aspect of style and merely as such is perhaps not the most important one. We cannot dismiss Sanday's argument without giving some attention to the question of how far other characteristic literary habits of the author of Luke-Acts can be identified in the text of the Gospel of Marcion. Here, on the basis of the studies of the Lukan style made by Cadbury, Plummer, and Hawkins,<sup>34</sup> I chose the 32 usages presented on pages 181-2 as characteristic and typical. Of these 32 usages, 14 do not make an appearance at all in Harnack's reconstruction, and I count only 34 appearances of the remaining 18. The reader is referred to Appendix III for a discussion of this evidence. It is, even at its maximum limits, amazingly meager. Here, as in the case of vocabulary, there is far too little to support Sanday's argument. We conclude that our knowledge of Marcion's Gospel is too scant to justify any confidence in its literary homogeneity with, and thus its dependence upon, Luke-Acts.

The whole point of this discussion of words and style has been to discredit an argument, not to produce one. I have tried to show that we do not know enough of the text of Marcion's Gospel (and we do not know surely enough even the little we know) to use its vocabulary and style as an argument either for or against the traditional view. I cannot refrain from pointing out, however, that some of the facts do tend to confirm the question I am raising. Of perhaps a dozen characteristic Lukan words it can be said that not only is Marcion's text not known to have contained them but it *is* known to

<sup>34</sup> Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge, 1920); Plummer, *op. cit.*; J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (Oxford, 1909).

have lacked them. Sometimes such words are merely absent from the quoted Marcionite text, and sometimes other more common words stand in their place. For example, Marcion is not known to have used *λίμνη* of the Sea of Galilee, but he *is* known to have used *θαλάσση*, which Luke rejected in that connection. Again, Marcion's recovered text does not contain the word *κλινίδιον*, but it does contain *κράββατος*, which Luke apparently seeks to avoid. Besides these, *προσφέρειν* once stands for *εισφέρειν*, *ἀνομία* for *ἀδικία*, *φάντασμα* for *πνεῦμα*, *πάραυτες* for *πάρεχε*, *ἄλλος* for *ἕτερος*, *συμφέρει* for *λυσιτελεῖ*. The word *ὑπάρχοντος* is in one place obviously missing, and the same thing can be said of *μεριστής* and *βλητέον*, both of which occur in Luke but once.

In this same connection another—and rather striking—fact may be pointed out. I have already called attention to the fact that words found only in "A" cannot be used to prove the literary homogeneity of our Luke with Marcion, since such words may be characteristic only of Marcion or his source. Their presence in Luke-Acts is thus thoroughly compatible with the view that Luke is later than Marcion's Gospel. Let us assume for a moment that our Gospel *is* later and that it used Marcion's Gospel or its source. Now on that assumption we should expect the terms appearing only in "A" and thus presumed to be primarily characteristic of Marcion (rather than of Luke) to be found more frequently in Marcion's recovered text than the terms appearing in both "A" and "B," since, if Marcion is prior, these latter terms would for the most part have been written into Marcion's text by the final author. Now if we take Marcion's text at its maximum (i.e., as reconstructed by

Harnack), there are, as we have seen, 110 appearances of 75 Lukan terms appearing in both "A" and "B" (or in "A" and Acts). There are also 73 appearances of 62 such words occurring in "A" only. But the 75 "A-B" terms occur in the "A" sections of Luke approximately 348 times, and the 62 "A" terms occur in "A" 107 times. This means that, of the occurrences in our Luke of terms found only in "A," Marcion's recovered text (taken at its maximum) contains all but 34 out of a possible 107, while of appearances in "A" sections of Luke of terms which also appear in "B" or Acts, Marcion lacks 238 out of a possible 348. Marcion's recovered text contains 68.2 per cent of all possible appearances of the words peculiar to "A" and only 31.3 per cent of all possible appearances of the words belonging to "B" and Acts as well. Although this interesting fact is not to be pressed too far, it surely justifies one in raising a question about the usual view of the relation of the Marcionite to the canonical Gospel. The linguistic evidence is far from decisive, either for or against the traditional view—but, if some of the facts lean in the direction of tradition, others lean away from it just as definitely.

#### IV

A related and perhaps more fundamental question than this one of vocabulary and style, however, needs to be raised at this point. Not only does the author of Luke-Acts have a distinctive literary method; he also has a distinctive and recognizable personality which makes itself felt in his work and which accounts for the impression of unity which his work succeeds in making. This personality is, of course, involved in all the subtle-



ties of style and vocabulary which we have been considering. I hold that these, so far as we are in a position to know, may have been imparted to that section of the work to which Marcion's Gospel corresponds only when it was embodied in the larger final work which has come down to us. But in so far as this personality was expressed (as it would certainly have been to a considerable degree) in the *selection* of materials, not only can it be said that *Marcion's Gospel*, if prior or independent, would have been found free from its distinctive marks, but also (and this cannot be said of style and vocabulary) those sections of *Luke-Acts* to which that Gospel roughly approximates will likewise be found free of them. It is important to add, however, that here, too, the matter of the actual known text of the Marcionite Gospel cannot be left entirely out of account; for sometimes one of the supposed characteristic interests of the compiler of *Luke-Acts* appears not in a particular pericope as a whole but in some detail that may or may not have appeared in Marcion's version of it.

In chapters 17-19 of his *The Making of Luke-Acts*<sup>35</sup> Cadbury summarizes admirably, with many new suggestions of his own, what are usually identified as the special features and interests of the author of this work in its final form. Now if, with Professor Cadbury's pages open before him, the reader will examine the passages of *Luke* falling in "A" (those passages, i.e., which can with some certainty be identified as belonging in some form to the Gospel of Marcion), he will discover that most of the interests identified as *Luke's* are by no means conspicuous and that some of the most important of them hardly appear at all.

<sup>35</sup> New York, 1927.

For example, it is frequently noted that the author of Luke-Acts is greatly concerned about the local color of the incidents he narrates and that he is amazingly accurate in painting it in; but I doubt that any such impression would be obtained of the author of the "A" passages or, at least, that it could be obtained from the recovered text of those passages. Indeed, most of the evidence for this feature of Luke-Acts is to be found either in Acts or in "B." Closely connected with this is the author's obvious interest in political events and arrangements; but if Luke, chapters 1 and 2, 3:1b, and 13:1-6 (all in "B") and the whole of Acts are eliminated from account, little is left of a quite ample body of evidence.

There is a good deal of material in Luke-Acts suggesting interest in and tolerance of the soldier. This material consists of various friendly references to soldiers in Acts, like the allusions to Cornelius the centurion, the Philippian jailer, and the like, and of two Gospel passages peculiar to Luke: the address of John the Baptist to the soldiers in 3:14 and the parable of Jesus about the king who sits down to estimate the chances of his army against a stronger force in an approaching battle (14:31 f.). None of these passages occurs in Marcion's recovered text: 3:14 is known to have been missing, and 14:31 f.—indeed, the whole passage, 14:25-35—belongs to "C."

Cadbury presents impressive evidence that the author of Luke-Acts was interested in cities, noting particularly his habit of using the word "city" in connection with the appropriate proper name; but *πόλις* is found only three times in Marcion's recovered text (once with a parallel in other Synoptic Gospels), and such phrases as

“the city of Nain” and “the city of Bethlehem” nowhere appear. A special interest in Jerusalem is often noticed in Luke-Acts; but except that in Marcion’s Gospel the resurrection appearances apparently took place there<sup>36</sup> (an undeniably important exception), that Gospel does not offer any ground for the supposition that its author shared that interest. The word “Jerusalem,” found 28 times in Luke and 41 times in Acts, occurs only once in Marcion’s recovered text.

Cadbury makes the interesting point that the author of Luke-Acts gives a great amount of attention to matters of lodging and entertainment. Taking up the evidence for this interest more or less in the order in which Cadbury presents it (pp. 249 ff.), we find that the notes upon “night” apply in Marcion’s recovered text only in the case of the man whose soul was “this night” required of him (a reference which, as far as I can see, has little to do with lodging); that Marcion is not known to have had the parable of the Good Samaritan or the story of Mary and Martha and is known not to have had the parable of the Prodigal Son; that from the fourteenth chapter of Luke (almost filled with talk either at the table or about eating) verses 1-11 and verses 25-35 belong to “C” and of the thirteen remaining verses of the chapter (i.e., the verses known to have belonged in some form to Marcion) all but three are paralleled more or less closely in Matthew; that what we know of the story of the unjust steward as it appeared in Marcion gives no ground for assurance that the steward was anxious for others to receive him “into their homes”; that

<sup>36</sup> But see Epiphanius on Luke 24:6. The absence of reference to Galilee in this source makes this exception less certain.

the specifications about eating in the directions to the disciples as they departed on their mission are not found in Marcion's recovered text; and that the promise of Jesus that his disciples should eat and drink with him in the Kingdom of God is in "C."

Cadbury quotes Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles*:<sup>37</sup>

From these passages (Luke 15:23, 24, 29, 32) and from 12:19 and 16:19 one sees that Luke likes to connect, indeed almost exclusively connects, *ἐφφαίνεσθαι* with the partaking of food. Just in the same way we read in Acts 14:17 that God fills men's hearts with "food and gladness" (see also Acts 7:41), and in Acts 2:46, "they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." Luke evidently had a feeling for the joy that springs from the common festal meal, and regarded it also in a religious light.

But none of these verses is specifically attributed to Marcion by any of our sources except 16:19, and there we have only the questionable evidence of Adamantius. The verses from Luke, chapter 15, are known to have been missing.

This leads me to point out that the characteristic Lukan exaltation of joy and grace is not a feature of Marcion's Gospel. The same thing can be said of the emphasis upon divine guidance and control, which belongs to Luke-Acts. It is also striking that of such interests of Luke-Acts as signs and wonders (especially punitive miracles), angels, visions, and the Holy Spirit, not one appeared conspicuously, if at all, in the Marcionite Gospel.

Streeter writes:

The desire to represent Christ as the Savior of the world, accepted by Gentiles but rejected by His own people, is the main theme of the Acts,—witness the Preface, the whole development of the

<sup>37</sup> *The Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 252.

history as related with special emphasis on each stage in opening the Gospel to a wider field—to a eunuch, to Samaritans, to Cornelius a proselyte, to pagans—and the fact that it ends on the last words of Paul, "We go to the Gentiles, they will hear." Similarly the editor of Luke (or Proto-Luke) carries on some lines further the quotation from Isaiah which he found in Mark or Q in order to reach the words "all flesh shall see the salvation of God"; he traces the genealogy of Christ, not (like Matthew) to Abraham the father of Israel, but to Adam the father of all men; he records as the Master's final commission (xxiv: 47) the command to go to the Gentiles; most significant of all, he narrates, as if it were the first act of our Lord's ministry, the Rejection at Nazareth (though he knew it was *not* the first, since he alludes to previous miracles in Capernaum), because it seemed to him to sum up the history of the Christian message—the prophet has honour, but not in his own country; and just as Elijah and Elisha had been sent, not to the widows and lepers of Israel, but to her of Zarepta and to Naaman the Syrian, so it had been with Christ himself.<sup>38</sup>

Now it is a striking fact that except for the commission to preach to the Gentiles, which appears in Matthew also, only one of these passages is to be found in Marcion. That is the story of the rejection at Nazareth (although it is clear that Marcion had this pericope in a much shorter and quite un-Lukan form); but this story is not placed first in Marcion's Gospel (the order which, as Streeter points out, reflects so conspicuously Luke's peculiar interests) but comes only after an account of Jesus' activities in Capernaum. That Marcion should have omitted the other passages is rather more likely than that he should have troubled to modify the order of this. Streeter continues:

There is throughout the Lucan writing an atmosphere of extraordinary tenderness, somehow made quite compatible with the sternest call to righteousness, sacrifice, and effort—an atmosphere which can be felt rather than demonstrated—and finding expression in a

<sup>38</sup> *The Four Gospels* (New York, 1925), pp. 219 f. (quoted by permission of the Macmillan Co., publishers).

unique sympathy for the poor, for women, for sinners, and for all whom men despise. But this attitude can be felt equally in the Infancy stories, in Proto-Luke, and in the Acts.<sup>39</sup>

Now this atmosphere of tenderness is undoubtedly present in the "A" passages, although I do not believe it is as conspicuous there as in Luke-Acts as a whole. The stern note and the interest in the poor, however, are certainly more obviously characteristic of the body of Luke than of the first two chapters and Acts.

Interest in Gentiles, in women, and in Samaritans (although we cannot be sure that the Good Samaritan was in Marcion) can be found in the Marcionite sections of Luke as well as in other parts of Luke-Acts, though it should be said that the interest in women in Luke, chapters 1 and 2, and in Acts does not often appear as a phase of that sympathy for the weak and oppressed which characterizes the major part of Luke but appears rather as either an aspect of Luke's so-called "domestic" interest or a recognition of the importance of women in the work of the churches—interests which appear also in Marcion's Gospel.

What I have been saying is not to be taken as an attempt to do more than to show that if we had only those sections of the canonical Gospel to which Marcion's Gospel corresponds, we should have a somewhat different picture of the author of the Gospel than we now have. The picture would not be altogether different—after all, there are many points of similarity between Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as they now stand—but it would be sufficiently different to make at least possible the claim

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 220 f. (quoted by permission of the Macmillan Co., publishers).

that the author or compiler of the source of Marcion's Gospel is a different person from the later author or compiler of the work we know as Luke-Acts.

## V

In the discussion of vocabulary and style I was concerned to make only the negative point that there is not enough evidence in the known text of Marcion's Gospel to require that *all* the Lukan materials missing in Marcion be taken as representing the heretic's omissions. And in what I have just been saying about the special interests of Luke-Acts I have not gone further than to urge the possibility that many of the missing sections were added by the final author of Luke to a shorter Gospel to which Marcion's more closely corresponded. This possibility assumes something of the aspect of likelihood, however, when we observe the relation of the Gospel of Marcion to the peculiarly Lukan elements in Luke, on the one hand, and to the common Synoptic elements, on the other.

The bearing of this relation on the question of priority is apparent. If Marcion's Gospel could plausibly be identified with one of the structural elements in our Luke, its use as a source of Luke would be virtually demonstrated; on the other hand, if all the elements in our Luke were found to be present in Marcion and *in the same proportions*, the use of Luke by Marcion would be established equally surely. This fact accounts for Paul-Louis Couchoud's effort<sup>40</sup> to identify Marcion's

<sup>40</sup> "Is Marcion's Gospel One of the Synoptics?" *Hibbert Journal*, XXXIV (1936), 265 ff. A reply to this article was made by A. Loisy in the following issue of the same journal (XXXIV, 378 ff.).

Gospel with Streeter's "Proto-Luke," an effort which, I believe, cannot be convincing because of the large Markan element the Gospel of Marcion evidently contained. Nevertheless, although that particular attempt did not succeed—and it is not my intention to offer any other specific suggestion—there are some striking facts concerning the distribution of distinctively Lukan and common Synoptic materials in Marcion's Gospel which are not easily explicable on the usual assumption that this Gospel was simply an abridgment of our Luke.

If the verses in the three categories into which the Gospel of Luke was divided earlier in this chapter are examined in a "harmony" of the Gospels, the following facts appear:

Total verses in Luke.....	1,148
Total verses peculiar to Luke.....	578 <sup>41</sup>
Total verses with Synoptic parallels.....	570

## A

*(Verses in sections of Luke which there is evidence to show belonged also in some form to the Gospel of Marcion)*

Total such verses.....	682
Such verses peculiar to Luke.....	262½
Such verses with Synoptic parallels.....	419½

## B

*(Verses in Luke which there is evidence to show did not belong to Marcion in any form)*

Total such verses.....	283
Such verses peculiar to Luke.....	225½
Such verses with Synoptic parallels.....	57½

<sup>41</sup> I have adopted for the most part Hawkins' computation (*op. cit.*, pp. 15, 194), adding to his list of peculiar passages 3:19a and 20b, 22:16-17, and taking away 14:15-24 and 19:12-27 (both of these passages Hawkins marks as questionable).



## C

*(Verses in Luke which, as far as evidence indicates, may or may not have belonged to Marcion in some form)*

Total such verses.....	183
Such verses peculiar to Luke.....	91
Such verses with Synoptic parallels.....	92

It will be apparent at once that verses lacking in Marcion are predominantly from among the peculiarly Lukan materials in the Gospel. Although 50.4 per cent of the verses of the Gospel of Luke are peculiar to that Gospel, only 38.5 per cent of the verses which there is even the slightest positive reason to believe belonged to Marcion's Gospel fall within that category. In Luke as a whole there are 1.4 per cent more peculiar verses than common verses, but in "A" there are 60 per cent more common verses than peculiar. And of the verses which there is positive evidence to show did *not* belong to Marcion, 79.7 per cent are peculiar to Luke. Of all the verses of Luke which are peculiar to Luke, 39 per cent are known to be missing in Marcion, whereas of verses of Luke paralleled in Matthew or Mark or both, only 10 per cent are known to be missing from Marcion.

The 183 verses of Luke which I have classified as uncertain must not be left out of account. Ordinarily scholars have sought to reach a judgment as to which of these verses belonged to Marcion and which did not on the basis of Marcion's doctrinal interests, or they have decided that they must have been present since neither Tertullian nor Epiphanius noted the "omissions." It has already been pointed out that the doctrinal basis is precarious since it can be demonstrated on the ground of what Marcion is known to have included and to have lacked that his Gospel contained some elements which

cannot easily be harmonized with his teaching and to have lacked others to which it is not easy to say why he would have objected. The argument from the silence of Epiphanius and Tertullian is equally unreliable. I prefer to deal with this third category in the following quite mechanical manner: If this class of uncertain verses be excluded altogether, we are left with a Luke of 965 verses, of which 488 are peculiar to Luke and 477 belong to the common Synoptic tradition. Of the 488 peculiar verses,  $262\frac{1}{2}$  (or 53.8 per cent) are assumed to be in Marcion; and, of the 477 common verses,  $419\frac{1}{2}$  (or 87.9 per cent) are in Marcion. If we now assume that the uncertain verses were present in Marcion in just the same proportions, 49 verses should be added to the  $262\frac{1}{2}$  in "A" which are peculiarly Lukan, and 81 to the  $419\frac{1}{2}$  of "A" which have parallels in other Synoptic Gospels. Likewise, 42 should be added to the  $225\frac{1}{2}$  peculiar Lukan verses in "B" and 11 to the  $57\frac{1}{2}$  common verses in "B." We should then have in "A"  $311\frac{1}{2}$  verses peculiar to Luke and  $500\frac{1}{2}$  verses common to Luke and one or both of the other Synoptists; and in "B" we should have  $267\frac{1}{2}$  verses peculiar to Luke and  $68\frac{1}{2}$  verses of the common tradition. If this way of dealing with the uncertain verses be allowed, 79.5 per cent of all the verses known to have been missing from Marcion would be verses peculiar to Luke; and, of all the verses of Luke peculiar to Luke, no less than 46.3 per cent would be missing from Marcion, whereas, of the common material of Luke, only 12 per cent of the verses would be missing.

It need hardly be urged that these facts present difficulties for the traditional position. Even when allowance is made for error, for varieties of judgment at a

few points of detail, and for the possibility that the verses in "B" are shorter than those in "A" (although a sampling here indicates that they run to about the same length on the average), it still remains clear that Marcion "omitted" a much larger proportion of the peculiar Lukan material than of the common Synoptic material. Why should he have done this? If he did not like what was distinctively Lukan, why did he choose this Gospel, when, according to the usual view, he had all the Gospels at hand, including Mark and John? On the other hand, if our Luke is a later composition than Marcion's Gospel, the peculiarly Lukan character of the material in it which is not also in Marcion is precisely what we would expect. This is so true that even if it could be established that Marcion is prior, it would probably have to be stipulated that much, if not all, of the 10 per cent (or 12 per cent) of the *common* verses in Luke known to have been missing in Marcion represent omissions by Marcion rather than additions by the writer who put our Gospel into its present form.

This would mean that the relation between Marcion's Gospel and the canonical Gospel of Luke is not accurately described either by the simple statement that Marcion abridged Luke or by the assertion that Luke enlarged Marcion. The position would rather be that a primitive Gospel, containing approximately the same Markan and Matthean elements which our Luke contains and some of its peculiar materials, was somewhat shortened by Marcion or some predecessor and rather considerably enlarged by the writer of our Gospel, who was also the maker of Luke-Acts.

It has already been pointed out how precarious and

inconclusive the theological argument is; still I believe that any person examining the "B" passages in a harmony would agree that those having parallels in the other Synoptics can be more fully and fairly accounted for as omissions due to Marcion's peculiar biases than can those which belong to Luke alone. There is not one of the common passages the absence of which cannot be plausibly explained in this way; this is far from being true of the peculiarly Lukan materials which are lacking in the Gospel of Marcion.

Any exact reconstruction of the Gospel from which Marcion, on this hypothesis, derived his Gospel is quite impossible—just as any reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel itself is impossible. Almost certainly, however, the first two chapters of Luke did not belong to it. The advanced legendary character of this section of the Gospel, the highly developed liturgical interest which it discloses, the dependence upon Josephus which is possibly indicated at several points<sup>42</sup>—these are among the considerations suggesting a later date for this part than for most of the rest of the Gospel. I have already pointed out how well adapted these chapters are to emphasize Christianity's integral relations with Judaism, which was one of the major interests of the author of Luke-Acts. Streeter and others<sup>43</sup> have called attention to the fact that at some point in the evolution of the Gospel it began at 3:1. This is precisely where Marcion's Gospel began.

It should be noted in this connection that if a theory involving the claim that Marcion's Gospel was not de-

<sup>42</sup> See below, pp. 128 and 136 f.

<sup>43</sup> See Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

rived from Luke but from a shorter work to which our Luke made significant additions—if such a theory finds all the additional materials among the *peculiar* materials of the Gospel, the acceptance of it calls for no revision of the well-established results of research into the interrelations of the Synoptic Gospels. It can be harmonized with any serious theory of the sources of Luke-Acts and with any “solution” of the Synoptic problem.<sup>44</sup> For there is no way of checking on when or how *peculiar* materials got into Luke or any other Gospel, up to the moment when the finished Gospel emerged.

The argument so far has been based exclusively upon internal evidence. At least one piece of external evidence can be cited, although no great amount of weight can be rested on it. I have already indicated my agreement with Harrison and others that the false teacher to whom Polycarp (*Phil.* 1–12) refers is Marcion. Now one of the offenses with which Polycarp charges the heretic is that he has tampered with the logia of the Lord: *ὅς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας*. Harrison<sup>45</sup> faces the objection raised by Lightfoot and, in his later work, by Harnack that the term *μεθοδεύειν* does not describe the characteristic method of Marcion in dealing with the Gospel material—that it suggests tortuous interpretation, not the textual excision of which Marcion is later accused. Harrison answers this objec-

<sup>44</sup> Indeed, Marcion's Gospel, on this hypothesis, would correspond somewhat closely to Streeter's Proto-Luke plus Mark, if we can imagine the final editor of Luke-Acts adding other material besides the first two chapters. There is no essential reason, even on Streeter's theory, why the individual who combined Proto-Luke with Mark should also have put Luke-Acts into its final form. These two processes may well have been quite distinct.

<sup>45</sup> P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 176 ff.

tion by urging that Marcion had not resorted to this cutting and omitting until after he went to Rome. But another explanation is equally available. May it not be that Polycarp does not accuse Marcion of "mutilating" the Gospel because he did not know that he was guilty of it? Polycarp, it is possible, did not have before him, as Irenaeus and Tertullian later did, a copy of our Gospel of Luke with which to compare Marcion's Gospel. If Polycarp knew the "Gospel of Luke" at all, it may well have been in a form closely approximating the Marcionite Gospel.<sup>46</sup>

It may be argued that the date at which the completed Gospel of Luke is known to have appeared is so early that Luke could not have stood in the relation to Marcion's Gospel which I have been suggesting as possible. This objection can more appropriately be dealt with in the following chapter, in which the possible bearing of Marcion upon the creation of Luke-Acts will be considered.

<sup>46</sup> For a discussion of Polycarp's knowledge of the Gospels see below, pp. 143 f.

## CHAPTER V

### MARCION'S "GOSPEL-APOSTLE" AND LUKE-ACTS

WE HAVE seen that in the beginning "the Scriptures and the Lord" were the authorities to which Christians normally referred—"the Lord" meaning the words and, perhaps, the example of Jesus. Although, at first, reference to "the Lord" did not involve an allusion to any particular document or documents to which the words or acts of Jesus might have been committed (witness Papias' depreciation of written Gospels and his preference for "the living voice"), still it may reasonably be argued that the elevation of some Gospel or Gospels to a status equal and even superior to that of the inherited scriptures was an inevitable development—a development which Marcion's canonization of "the Gospel" at most only accelerated.

#### I

It is not so clear, however, that any such inherent necessity attached to the canonization of the "Apostle." Letters are not the kind of material of which one expects Bibles to be made. And even if it should be established (and it has not been) that the letters of Paul were *regularly and frequently read in the churches of the early second century*, it would by no means follow that they would ultimately have become a part of the sacred canon. The character of the letters as letters would in

the natural course of events have prevented any such result. One is forced to conclude that some *external* factor led to the creation of the "Apostle," as it hastened the establishment of a definitive "Gospel." And there can be, it seems to me, no possible doubt of what this external factor was. It was the heretics', and especially Marcion's, use of Paul. It was their exaltation of this apostle which determined that, when the New Testament should take definite form, it should contain "Apostle" as well as "Gospel."

The fact is that the more conservative churches (and this means Rome principally) in the middle of the second century were confronted with the necessity of a crucial choice as far as Paul is concerned: either they must canonize him or repudiate him (or at least seriously discredit him). It is interesting to reflect that the literary work of the man whose name is attached to thirteen—and, in sections of the church ever since A.D. 200, to fourteen—of the twenty-seven writings of the New Testament might have been lost entirely except for quotations of it in such treatises against heretics as that of Tertullian against Marcion. But, under circumstances somewhat different, such a development might well have taken place. Paul was at one time in grave danger of being lost to the heretics. Neither Justin nor Papias (as far as we can gather from Eusebius) so much as refers to Paul. This silence, especially as it seems deliberate, can most naturally be interpreted to mean that in some churches at least Paul was under suspicion; and one of these churches must have been the church at Rome.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Westcott (*The Canon of the New Testament* [London, 1870]) finds this meaning in Papias' silence, although not in Justin's (pp. 68 ff. and 150 ff.). Walter Bauer in his *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tü-



There came a point, then, when a decision must be made. Was Paul to be surrendered to the heretics, or was he to be claimed by those who were more or less consciously engaged in building the catholic church? The answer was clear—so clear that, as I have said of a similar issue, it may be false to refer to it as a choice at all: He was to be claimed. The epistles of Paul enjoyed too wide a circulation among the churches for any other answer to be really possible. The Epistle of Polycarp reveals in what regard they were held as late as A.D. 130 (according to Harrison), at least in parts of Asia Minor and Greece. In the Roman community itself, which had already assumed the leadership of the emerging catholic church, Paul was remembered as one of its early leaders whose name was often associated with Peter's in their tradition. To give him up to the heretics would have involved an intolerable sacrifice. Indeed, as matters actually stood, it would have been impossible to do so. To regard the letters of Paul as heretical would have been tantamount to regarding more than half of Christendom as heretical.

But if Paul was to be claimed, it would not do to

---

bingen, 1934), pp. 218 f., writes thus of Justin: "Bei Paulus fehlt nicht nur der Name, sondern auch jedes Eingehen auf seine Briefe. Das aber lässt sich bei einem gelehrten Kirchenmann, der in Rom um die Mitte des Zweiten Jahrhunderts sein Werk treibt, nur als absichtsvolles Verfahren begreifen. Und gezwungen, einen Grund dafür anzugeben, scheint mir auch jetzt der Hinweis auf Marcion das Nächstliegende."

After referring to Papias' acceptance of certain apostolic writings, Bauer writes: "Mit ihnen konnten die Paulusbriefe—solange man von den Pastoralbriefen noch absehen muss—in keiner Weise den Wettbewerb aufnehmen, um so weniger, als sie durch die Gönnerschaft von Leuten wie Marcion belastet waren" (*ibid.*, p. 218). Harnack writes: "The confident appeal of the Marcionites and Gnostics to the Apostle must have made churchmen nervous" (*Origin*, p. 52).

claim him in any halfhearted fashion. He could not be won from the heretics by any feeble gesture of respect. He must be fully, unreservedly, enthusiastically claimed. He must be accorded as high a place of honor among the orthodox as among the Marcionites or in any other group. Considerations like these led inevitably to the canonization of Paul's letters—to the canonization of a larger number of them than even the most ardent heretical devotee of the apostle could claim. This very difference in number—quite apart from the contents of the added letters—was significant. Paul in his entirety belonged only to the church; the heretics had only a part of him.

## II

But if it was inevitable, given Marcion's practice, that the letters of Paul be canonized, it was likewise inevitable that they should not be canonized alone. If there had been at hand no other works which were believed to have been written by apostles or if none such could have been found, it is highly doubtful if the letters of Paul, even including the Pastoral Epistles, could ever have achieved canonical status. It is all but inconceivable that such conservative churches as Rome and, perhaps, Corinth would, under any circumstances, have been willing to canonize Paul as "*the* Apostle." To do so would have been to give apparent assent to one of Marcion's principal contentions.

This being true, one has no trouble believing with Harnack that throughout the middle years of the second century "actual writings of the twelve apostles must have been sought for with ever more yearning and long-

ing eyes."<sup>2</sup> At hand (if we may take the point of view of the Roman church) lay two, perhaps three, epistles of John, an apocalypse of John and one of Peter, an epistle of Peter, and an epistle of Jude. An additional one of Peter and one of James were eventually found. A rather meager lot surely, but seized on, we may believe, with the greatest eagerness as material for the Apostle section of the emerging New Testament.<sup>3</sup>

But these were writings—most of them intrinsically unimpressive as compared with Paul's epistles—believed to have been composed by a few individual apostles, at least one of whom, Jude, did not belong to the original apostolic group.<sup>4</sup> How much would the leaders of the catholic movement in the middle of the second century not have been willing to give for some document worthily representing the authority of all the Twelve!

And there was another desideratum almost equally important. Marcion was claiming that Paul was quite independent of Jesus' original disciples, whose "Jewish" apostasy had corrupted the greater part of the church. Marcion could cite, moreover, references in Paul's letters to the "false apostles" and could point to fairly plausible indications that it was Peter, James, John, and others of the Twelve to whom he was alluding. For the

<sup>2</sup> *Origin*, p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to observe that opposition both to Marcionism and to Montanism forced the church to give attention to the category of the apostolic, but from quite different points of view. In its reaction against Marcion, the church sought to *enlarge* the "Apostle"; in its reaction against Montanism, it sought to define its limits. The category "apostolic" was invoked both against the narrowness and partialness of Marcion and against the wildness of the Montanists.

<sup>4</sup> Note, however, that Tertullian later can call Jude an "apostle" (*De cultu* i. 3).

more conservative part of the church, to take Marcion at his word would have meant being forced to repudiate Paul. But, conversely, to accept Paul meant to affirm with all possible vigor that the Apostle to the Gentiles, far from being independent of the Twelve, had acknowledged their authority, had been gladly accredited by them, and had worked obediently and loyally under their direction. But the letters of Paul gave only scant support to this view. Some book which, without reducing or disparaging Paul, subordinated him to the Twelve was obviously required.

Now it is a striking fact that a book which admirably fills both of these needs and *of which there is not a single clear trace before this time* was suddenly available to those who were engaged about A.D. 150 in building the New Testament of the church. I refer, of course, to the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>5</sup> It begins with an account of Jesus' authorization of the Twelve as his witnesses not only in Jerusalem and Judea but "to the uttermost parts of the world" and continues with the story of their administration of their task as the official heads of the expanding church. In due time Paul enters upon his work in association with Barnabas under the church at Antioch and thus indirectly under the supervision of the Twelve. It is they to whom the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles is referred and they who authoritatively

<sup>5</sup> Both Harnack and Goodspeed point out that the presence of Acts in the "Apostle" of the church indicates the operation of conscious design. See Harnack, *Origin*, p. 67: "The placing of this book in the growing Canon shows evidence of reflection, of conscious purpose, of a strong hand acting with authority." Cf. Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1926), p. 75: "It is this bringing forward of Acts to serve as the core of the new scripture that most clearly shows that it was something more than a spontaneous, unconscious process."

pass on it, addressing to the churches of Syria and Cilicia (and indirectly to Galatia) a letter on this issue which Paul and Barnabas are directed to deliver. The book of Acts serves the double purpose of exalting and idealizing Paul and at the same time definitely subordinating him to the leaders at Jerusalem.<sup>6</sup> This book, which the Muratorian document significantly calls "The Acts of All the Apostles," was almost as if made to become the leading book of the catholic "Apostle," the place to which it was at once assigned.

But Acts did not stand alone. It was the second part of a two-volume work—and the first part of it was a Gospel! In other words, this book, which makes its appearance so suddenly and so opportunely at the time when the church is creating its New Testament canon on the Gospel-Apostle pattern, is itself the Apostle half of a work formed on the same pattern. This is a remarkable fact to which not enough attention has been paid, but even more remarkable is the fact that *the Gospel half is Luke*. Why should it have happened that the Gospel which Marcion combined with his "Apostle" is (in large part) the *one* Gospel which, outside of Marcionite circles, does not stand alone but is closely associated with the document so well adapted to becoming the head of the catholic "Apostle"? I do not believe that we are dealing here with a mere coincidence. Either Marcion knew Luke in connection with Acts and, repudiating Acts as well as radically abridging Luke, substituted for the second part his edition of the epistles of Paul, or else Luke-Acts is a relatively late work, based, for the career of Jesus, upon the Gospel which Marcion had

<sup>6</sup> See Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* v. 1.

earlier appropriated and, for the apostolic age, either upon scattered sources or, as in the case of the Gospel section, upon some earlier unified work or works embodying these sources. I suggest that the second of these alternatives is the true one and that Luke-Acts as a finished work belongs to the middle of the second century.

There is, first of all, the improbability that Marcion (or anyone else, for that matter) could have known Luke without being aware of Acts, if the work Luke-Acts had already been in existence. It is commonly held that at a relatively early period (say, with Professor Goodspeed, around A.D. 125) the two were torn apart in order that Luke might take its place in the publication of the four-fold Gospel. For reasons which will be presented in the following chapter, I do not believe the publication of this enlarged "Gospel" can be put so early. But even if the separation then occurred, would the work with which Luke had been so integrally connected have dropped so completely from sight that Marcion did not even know of its existence? Yet our sources give us no warrant for supposing that Marcion was aware of Acts at all,<sup>7</sup> much less aware of it as standing in a special relation to what he had taken and adapted as his own Gospel. There is evidence that he accused his oppo-

<sup>7</sup> Harnack is inclined to believe that Marcion knew Acts and rejected it, but the evidence cited on pp. 152\* f. (2d. ed., pp. 172\* f.) of his *Marcion* is utterly inadequate to support this view. Naturally, later writers, who accept Acts as an early apostolic document, are going to accuse Marcion of "rejecting" it; but the accusation has no more evidential value than their charge that Marcion has mutilated the canonical Luke. It is interesting that Harnack does not believe that Marcion "rejected" the Pastorals, although Tertullian explicitly says that he did (*ibid.*, pp. 150\* ff. [2d ed., pp. 170\* ff.]). See n. 3, p. 43, above.

nents, or their predecessors, of having falsified the Gospel;<sup>8</sup> but he does not seem to have accused them of adding Acts to it. I shall later call attention to the difficulties involved in the usual view that Marcion chose Luke from among the four Gospels (why did he not take Mark?); but if it is difficult to see why Marcion would have chosen a work from which he had to eliminate at once the first 132 verses and a considerable part of the rest, the difficulty appears enormously greater when we recognize that on the usual theory he had also to repudiate its whole second half!

There is also the difficulty involved in the fact that in the period before its admission to the canon, soon after the middle of the second century, Acts apparently played so obscure a role. Harnack admits that there is no evidence that any attention was attracted to it until about A.D. 175.<sup>9</sup> Goodspeed speaks of it as emerging at this same time "from a long period of relative obscurity."<sup>10</sup> But what evidence is there that it had ever been anything else than obscure? Goodspeed, to be sure, regards the publication of it about A.D. 90 as having inspired the collection and publication of Paul's letters. But, as I point out elsewhere, other and deeper motives probably led to this development.<sup>11</sup> Besides, if Acts had not only been written *and written as a close sequel to Luke* but had been so decisively influential as to lead to the collection of the letters and the writing of Ephe-

<sup>8</sup> See Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 4.

<sup>9</sup> *Origin*, p. 51.

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>11</sup> See chap. i and Appen. II, "A Note on the Collection of the Pauline Epistles," pp. 172 ff.

sians, as Goodspeed holds, the obscurity into which it settled almost at once is even more inexplicable. The reasons which may account for the neglect of the epistles<sup>12</sup> in some sections of the church during the first part of the second century hardly apply to this book, which the "heretics" would not have liked and from which, indeed, they might have been effectively answered. Walter Bauer connects the silence of Papias about Paul with his silence about the Gospel of Luke:<sup>13</sup> this was the heretic's Gospel. But is it likely that Papias would have given over the work we know as Luke-Acts to the heretics? No more likely, it seems to me, than that the heretics would have wanted to use it or any part of it. The obscurity of Acts before Irenaeus, together with the book's obvious interest in catholicizing Paul, suggests the possibility that, far from being the occasion of the publication of the letters, it was itself in part occasioned by the misuse or partisan use of the published epistles.

But not only is there no adequate evidence for the existence of Acts before the middle of the second century; there is also no evidence for the existence of Luke in its present form until that same time. Not before Justin Martyr does our canonical Luke clearly appear. I suggest that the very skilful author responsible for its final form was also responsible for its association with Acts (and, of course, for *its* final form also) and that he did his work not far from A.D. 150.

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 115 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 217. Note also the depreciation of Luke in Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 2. A. Hilgenfeld's argument that Papias knew Luke's preface is not convincing (see *Der Kanon und die Kritik des Neuen Testaments* [Halle, 1863], pp. 16 f.), although Reuss apparently agrees with him (*History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament* [Boston, 1884], p. 292).



## III

I have just asserted that there is no clear evidence for the existence of Luke-Acts, either as a single work or as separate books, until about the middle of the second century. Although an adequate discussion of so complicated and controversial a question as the date of Luke-Acts is hardly possible here, I cannot avoid going far enough to indicate the grounds for this statement.

If one will consult the work, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*,<sup>14</sup> or the more comprehensive and (as far as the Gospels are concerned) more exhaustive work by L. V. Moore, "The Use of the Gospel Material in Pre-Catholic Christian Literature,"<sup>15</sup> one will be interested to note how meager are the even possible traces of either Luke or Acts in Christian writing before Justin. In the next chapter something will be said about the alleged traces of Luke in I Clement, the Didache, Ignatius, and other literature. In none of these cases are the claims of dependence upon Luke—claims, indeed, only rarely advanced at all—actually justified. The only other possible instance of dependence is the Fourth Gospel. Moore presents the evidence of John's use of Luke and concludes that the Fourth Gospel undoubtedly depended upon the Third. Frederick C. Grant, after a careful examination of the same body of evidence, reaches the following conclusions:

The evidence uncovered by our survey of the Johannine-Lucan contacts points, not to familiarity with or use of our canonical St. Luke, but rather to the following:

1. The author of the Fourth Gospel was acquainted with the

<sup>14</sup> Oxford: Oxford Society of Historical Theology, 1905.

<sup>15</sup> Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1929.

sayings contained in the hypothetical document—or cycle of tradition—known as “Q” and made some use of these sayings, though in an elaborated and altered form.

2. “John” also had access to the tradition contained in Luke’s special source (commonly designated by “L”).—It is surely significant that John’s contacts with Luke are limited to these passages, the remainder of his Synoptic contacts being almost all (or perhaps exclusively?) Marcan. In “Marcan” passages he has no trace of contact with (Matthew or) Luke.

3. He may have known the special source which Luke used in his Passion Narrative, though whether he knew this in an oral or in a written form cannot now be made out. It is most unlikely that he used the present Lucan Passion Narrative.

4. There is evidence that the text of Luke has been influenced by the Gospel of John, chiefly towards the end, and culminating in the longer glosses of the final chapter.<sup>16</sup>

As far as our thesis is concerned, the question whether the author of the Fourth Gospel was acquainted with the Third can be left open, since the date of the Fourth Gospel is itself so uncertain—and so probably late. There is really as much, or more, reason for dating the Fourth Gospel almost or quite as late as Justin as for dating Luke-Acts only slightly earlier.<sup>17</sup> It should also

<sup>16</sup> “Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, l.vi (December, 1937), 303 f.

<sup>17</sup> On the question of the alleged use of this Gospel by Justin see chap. vi, especially pp. 147 f. The strongest indications of an early date for John are two recently discovered papyrus—one, fragments of an unknown Gospel, and the other, a few lines from John. H. I. Bell, one of the editors of the “unknown Gospel” fragment, believes that its author knew the Fourth Gospel “whether in its present or some earlier form” (see Bell and Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* [London, 1935], and Bell, *Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyrus* [Oxford, 1937], esp. pp. 17 ff.). The date of this papyrus, however, cannot be placed with assurance before A.D. 150, and “or some earlier form” opens a wide range of possibilities. C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel* (Manchester, 1935), presents no decisive proof of a date much, if any, earlier than A.D. 150; besides, it is precarious to argue from the existence of a small fragment to the existence of our Gospel. But, as will be seen, this question of the date of John

be pointed out that, whatever may be thought of Dr. Grant's argument in detail, it certainly indicates that the greater part of the alleged evidence of connection has nothing necessarily to do with Luke *in its present form*. Perhaps the author of the Fourth Gospel knew, not Luke, but some primitive pre-Marcionite Gospel, or that Gospel and other sources of Luke also. As a matter of simple fact which any student of Moore or of the Oxford Committee can quickly verify, it is in Justin Martyr that the quotations first indicate not only *literary* dependence upon Luke but dependence upon Luke in its canonical form.<sup>18</sup>

So much for the Gospel, to which, as I have said, we must return in the next chapter; but what of Acts? Here the evidence is even more scanty. As far as the pre-Justin period is concerned, indeed, evidence in other writings of the existence of Acts is confined to a few possible reminiscences in I Clement and in Polycarp. Only one of these is in I Clement (xviii:1; cf. Acts 13:22), and this one is undoubtedly capable of easy explanation without reference to Acts, as the Oxford Committee acknowledges. As for the Polycarp passages, the Oxford Committee gives none an "A," or even a "B," rating, classifying four as "D" and one as "C." This last case (Poly. to Phil. 1:2; cf. Acts 2:24) is by all means the most impressive, and the whole case stands

---

is in considerable measure irrelevant. The conclusion that John used a Gospel roughly corresponding with the Gospel of Luke would be quite compatible with the conclusion that Luke-Acts in its present form took shape after John had been composed.

<sup>18</sup> It should be noted, however, that Ritschl was able to argue that even Justin did not know our Luke (*Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas* [Tübingen, 1846], pp. 130 ff.).

or falls with it. Polycarp writes: *ὃν ἤγειρεν ὁ θεὸς λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ ἄδου*; and in Acts we read: *ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου* (*ἄδου* is an early Western variant). Some connection is plainly indicated. P. N. Harrison is sure that Polycarp knew and used Acts,<sup>19</sup> and a categorical denial is obviously impossible. It is worth noting, however, that even if it be concluded that the manifest resemblance between the two passages indicates literary dependence on Polycarp's part, it would still remain a question whether the dependence was upon Luke-Acts (or upon Acts in its present form) rather than upon a source of Acts. Besides, if Harrison is right about the date of Poly. to Phil. 1:2, that passage was written after Marcion's heretical activities had become important, and therefore the assertion of dependence is not incompatible with our view that Luke-Acts represents under one of its aspects an early response to Marcionism.

The Oxford Committee, however, is rather inclined to believe that both Polycarp and Acts are falling back upon a more primitive source and that there is no real assurance of dependence of one upon the other. In view of the fact that this is the one instance of clear connection between Acts and other Christian literature down to Irenaeus (even Justin cannot be proved to have known Acts), I prefer to follow the Oxford Committee in believing that the connection is of this kind.<sup>20</sup> The

<sup>19</sup> *The Two Epistles of Polycarp to the Philippians* (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 288 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Martin Dibelius writes recently: "As far as we know, Acts in this period [in the first two-thirds of the second century] is never quoted. . . . The Acts passages listed in Goodspeed's edition of the Apologists are not quotations; we have here no more than similarity of material" ("The Text of Acts: An Urgent Critical Task," *Journal of Religion*, XXI [1941], 421 ff.).

passage in dispute would have belonged most appropriately within the primitive preaching, and the mistranslation of the Hebrew word for "cords" which the quotation in both cases involves ("pangs") would be explained quite as plausibly in this way as in the other. Perhaps this passage belonged to some early book of "Testimonies," involving as it does a conflation of two Old Testament passages.<sup>21</sup>

There is absolutely nothing in the nature of internal evidence to make impossible a date for Luke-Acts as late as A.D. 150 or even later, and many scholars have felt forced to place it at least as late as the beginning years of the second century. Perhaps the most important argument for this late dating lies in the apparent use of Josephus by the author of Luke-Acts. The reader is referred to H. Holtzmann, M. Krenkel, Burkitt, and others for a full account of the evidence pointing to this use of the historian.<sup>22</sup> Especially in the case of Luke 3:1-2 (cf. *Ant.* xx. 7. 1) and Acts 5:34 ff. (cf. *Ant.* xx. 5. 1 f.), the force of this evidence cannot easily be denied.<sup>23</sup> But if the author of Luke-Acts knew Josephus (even if that knowledge is confined to the *Antiquities*), his work was most probably not written until after the Domitianic period, and no other *terminus ad quem* ap-

<sup>21</sup> For a general discussion of this subject see J. R. Harris, *Testimonies* (Cambridge, 1916-20).

<sup>22</sup> See two articles by Holtzmann and Krenkel, respectively, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1873, pp. 85 ff. and 441 ff.; Krenkel, *Josephus und Lukas* (Leipzig, 1894); Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (Edinburgh, 1906), pp. 105 ff.

<sup>23</sup> The editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (II [London, 1922], 359) refer to "the probability that Luke was acquainted with Josephus."

pears before Justin, whose use of our Luke is all but indisputable.<sup>24</sup>

The view of the date of Luke-Acts to which the editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity* finally come is expressed in the following paragraph:

. . . . The extreme limits within which the composition of the two books must fall are c. 60 A.D. or a little earlier, when Paul reached Rome, and c. 150 A.D., when Marcion made use of the Gospel. The two extremes are improbable; but just as there is no decisive proof that Luke was not written before the fall of Jerusalem, *there is also none that it was used by any writer before Marcion* [italics mine]. Nevertheless, most students think that the rewriting of the Marcan eschatological discourse (Mark xiii) implies the influence of the last days of Jerusalem. On the other hand, it seems extremely unlikely that the Gospel would ever have been canonized had it not been generally known before the time of Marcion. In other words, Marcion more probably took the Gospel from the Church than did the Church from Marcion. These two arguments may be held to make the probable limits 70-115 rather than 60-150 [II, 358].<sup>25</sup>

The argument that the *terminus a quo* must be placed no earlier than A.D. 70 seems to me sound; but the placing of the later limit at A.D. 115 presupposes that the

<sup>24</sup> Professor Donald W. Riddle ("The Occasion of Luke-Acts," *Journal of Religion*, X [1930], 545 ff.) presents a very plausible case for the view that the threat of persecution under Domitian furnished the occasion of Luke-Acts. Theophilus is regarded (following H. J. Cadbury, "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," *Expositor*, VIII, No. 31 [1921], 431 ff.) as a person of social or political importance, an official in fact, whom the author of Luke-Acts is eager to persuade of the political inoffensiveness and the real ancientness of what might appear to be a new and illegitimate religion. But Riddle shares the view of Professor Goodspeed that the publication of Luke-Acts provided the occasion for the collection of the Pauline Letters and therefore must have antedated the collection. Once that view of the relation of Acts to the collection is given up, is there anything, even in Riddle's argument, to prevent one's deciding that a later threatened persecution would serve as well as that under Domitian as the occasion of Luke-Acts?

<sup>25</sup> Quoted by permission of the Macmillan Co., publishers.

making of Luke-Acts must have antedated the circulation *in any form* of the Gospel which we know as Luke. That is a gratuitous presupposition. "Luke" in some form undoubtedly circulated as early as A.D. 115—I should say considerably earlier—but the assumption that the Gospel, which *in its final form* was the first part of the two-part work Luke-Acts, must originally have existed in that form and in that relation to Acts is an altogether unnecessary assumption. I suggest that the circulation of the separate Gospel—the Gospel which was the basis of both Marcion's Gospel and the later canonical Gospel of Luke—*preceded* the making of Luke-Acts. The chief argument for the early circulation of Luke-Acts has always been Marcion's supposed use of Luke *after it had achieved its final form*. Once the support of that argument is removed, there is little if anything to indicate the existence of Luke in that form until the time of Justin, just before the middle of the century.

I say "in its final form"; and the importance of this phrase needs to be emphasized, particularly as it is so frequently ignored. Most of the arguments as to the date of a given New Testament book are concerned with the origin of the book *in some form*, not necessarily with its origin in the exact form in which it eventually survived. Unfortunately, evidence for the state of the text in the second century, especially in its first half, is exceedingly meager. Undoubtedly that text was marked by the greatest diversity. I have already had occasion to indicate certain rather extensive editorial changes made in the Pauline letters probably near A.D. 150; there were almost certainly many other such changes, made then

or earlier, which we have no way of detecting and identifying. It was pointed out in that same connection that, once a book came to be officially adopted in a particular form, older forms which lacked any such ecclesiastical approval tended to disappear. Manuscripts would gradually, and fairly rapidly, be conformed to the "correct" text. This process would never have become complete, and thus we have the various local texts, which emerge clearly enough in the early third century. These, however, differ relatively little from one another; and that is true not because the autographs were so faithfully followed in the late first and early second centuries but rather, on the contrary, because the official editions and publications so completely drove the autographs (if there were any surviving) and their descendants from the field.

What I have been saying about the date of Luke-Acts, therefore, is not so "unorthodox" as it may appear at first. If it is assumed, as many scholars seem to assume, that the Gospel of Luke could not have existed at all until it came to exist in its present form, and if the same assumption is made about Acts, then the position I am proposing must be acknowledged to involve a rather radical departure from the generally current view. But if such an assumption is not only gratuitous but, as I am inclined to believe in this case, false, then it will be recognized that my position is thoroughly compatible with many of the facts to which the arguments for an earlier date appeal. It is *Luke-Acts* in its final form which belongs, I believe, to the first half (and probably to the



very end of the first half) of the second century. In *that form* it belongs with the Apologists.<sup>26</sup>

## IV

One grave obstacle in the way of dating Luke-Acts so late must still be dealt with. This is Acts' apparent independence of the letters of Paul. I do not want to deny the gravity of this difficulty, but I do not believe it is decisive.

First of all, the possibility must be allowed for that Acts is not altogether independent of the epistles. At least one modern scholar, Morton S. Enslin,<sup>27</sup> is inclined to agree with many earlier ones that the author of Acts knew the Pauline letters. To be sure, that author does not make the large use of them which a modern historian would have made; but we cannot conclude from this fact that he did not know them at all.

Again, it ought to be recognized that the neglect (whether relative or absolute) of the letters of Paul by the author of Luke-Acts presents a problem on any theory of the date of Acts. I have already referred to the fact that there is no evidence of any knowledge of Paul's letters before A.D. 90 or 95 but that after this date they seem to be widely known, citing this fact (following Goodspeed) as evidence for a publication of the letters of Paul at about this time. But a writer on Paul might

<sup>26</sup> The apologetic character of Luke-Acts, especially the Acts section, was first conspicuously emphasized by F. C. Baur, from whom we undoubtedly have more to learn than, in our reaction from his more extreme positions, we have been willing to recognize. See the literature cited in nn. 11 and 16 of chap. iv; the Introduction to his *Paulus* (Stuttgart, 1845; English trans. Zeller [London and Edinburgh, 1876], I, 1 ff.); etc.

<sup>27</sup> " 'Luke' and Paul," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LVIII (1938), 81-91.

have been expected to make some search for epistles; and, besides, the author of Acts would almost certainly have been acquainted with some of the letters. If he wrote at Rome at any time after A.D. 60, he would presumably have known Romans at the very least; in Corinth he would have known the Corinthian correspondence; in Macedonia he would have been acquainted with the Thessalonian letters and with Philippians; in Ephesus, with Colossians and Philemon and probably with a number of other letters since most of the Corinthian correspondence, probably Galatians, and possibly Philippians were written from there. As far as Paul's thought is concerned, any of these letters would, it might be supposed, have given the writer of Acts a more intimate understanding than his work reveals. However Acts is dated, this fact constitutes a problem. It becomes only more conspicuous when Acts is thought of as having been written after all the surviving letters of Paul had become more widely known.

The probability, then, exists, on any view of the date of Acts, that the final author knew the letters (or some of them) but made little use of them in his narrative. This may have happened in several possible ways.

1. He may have construed his task as that of supplementing the letters, taking for granted a knowledge of them on the part of his readers. This is the least likely explanation.

2. He may have made little use of the letters because he was not primarily interested in what the letters disclose. He was not a theologian and was probably incapable of any profound or intimate understanding of Paul's mind. His religious experience differs at impor-

tant points from Paul's. He is concerned with the travels, activities, and influence of the apostle rather than with his inner life. The autobiographical materials in the letters are exceedingly meager and may well have been simply unnoticed. Besides, much of what the letters reveal as to Paul's relations with his churches would not have suited the irenic purpose of the author of Luke-Acts. This explanation is by no means the most likely, but it is not impossible.

3. The fact that Papias and Justin, as we have seen, seem to have avoided the letters of Paul suggests the possibility that the author of Luke-Acts did likewise, and for the same reason. The epistles of Paul are under a cloud; Acts undertakes to bring Paul, but *not necessarily his epistles*, into the light again. Acts nowhere refers to Paul as a writer of letters, but that its author did not know him and think of him as such is to me almost incredible. Important as the publication of Paul's letters was in making more of them more generally known, I cannot believe that it had the effect of making the churches aware for the first time that Paul had written some letters to churches. Ever since his martyrdom, at the latest, letters of Paul, although in no single case all the letters which were subsequently assembled, were undoubtedly among the most prized possessions of many churches; and in all the areas where he had labored—Galatia, Asia, Macedonia, Greece, and even Italy—it is unlikely that Paul was ever thought of without some letter of his being remembered. The omission of any reference to letters of Paul in Acts is, then, surprising, on any view of its date. Can the omission be intentional? It is striking that, although Paul does not write letters

in the Acts narrative, the Twelve *do* write a letter; moreover, although primarily addressed to Syrians and Cilicians, it is sent also to the Galatians, and it deals with the very subject with which Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, put first by the Marcionites, also deals. It is given to Paul and Barnabas to deliver. Paul's only connection with church letters in the Acts of the Apostles is as *the bearer of a letter written by the Twelve*.

4. The author of Luke-Acts may have had at hand for the construction of the Acts section not scattered sources merely but a unified work, or perhaps one work dealing with the early church in Palestine and Syria and another with Paul, which he merely altered and expanded, just as he probably altered and expanded an earlier Gospel. This earlier work (or these earlier works) would antedate the publication of the letters of Paul. The final author alters this original, as he alters the Gospel, in the direction of his own interests, not in the direction of making it conform with the letters. If it was the tradition that Luke wrote this earlier and less pretentious work, or some important part of it (as, for example, the "travel diary"), the final author prefers to let Luke's work stand except as changes are necessary to bring it into line with his style, his religious position, and his literary purposes.

Any or several of these considerations may be held adequately to explain that strange disregard by the author of Luke-Acts of what would appear to the modern historian to be his most important source.

It may be added that, as in the case of the Gospel of Luke, so in the case of Acts, the view that a second-century author put it into its final shape in no way con-

flicts with any view of the sources of the book or with any theory of its origin except as such a theory might call for an earlier date for the finished work.<sup>28</sup> It should be remembered, however, that if one accepts the view, defended in chapter i, that when Marcion came to Rome about A.D. 140 his thought and the movement which he founded were both well advanced, such a reaction to Marcionism as Luke-Acts under one of its aspects would represent may possibly be dated well before the middle of the century.<sup>29</sup>

## V

Two additional remarks may appropriately be made. In our discussion of the date of Luke-Acts reference was made to the evidence which leads many scholars to conclude that the author of this work was acquainted with

<sup>28</sup> Note, e.g., the analysis of stages in the growth of Acts which appears on pp. 168 ff. of Vol. II of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Point No. 5 of that analysis ("The whole of the preceding stages were revised by the editor of the two *λόγοι* sent to Theophilus") defines precisely the situation I have in mind. The final textual revision of Luke and Acts (separated), noted as point No. 7, probably occurred in connection with the official canon-making process soon after the middle of the century.

<sup>29</sup> It is important to add, however, that if Marcion's attitude toward Judaism, the Old Testament, and the Twelve did not become explicit until after he came to Rome, the making of Luke-Acts can hardly have been earlier than 140-45. But one must not be too sure of this date; Marcion's break with the Roman church may have been earlier than Harnack supposed. The fact that Justin, while making limited use of Luke, apparently makes no use at all of Acts suggests that the composition of this work may possibly have been in progress in A.D. 150. One would have expected Justin to make use of Acts in his *Apology* if he had known it. But some scholars hold that Justin *did* use Acts (see the citations in Goodspeed, *Die ältesten Apologeten* (Göttingen, 1914), and, among others, A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Tübingen, 1931), p. 474; see also Zahn, *Geschichte*, I, 579 f., and Overbeck, "Über das Verhältniss Justins des Märtyrers zur Apostelgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, XV [1872], 305 ff.).

several of the works of Josephus and certainly with the *Antiquities*. In that connection I referred to Krenkel's work, *Josephus und Lukas*, as giving a full list of the passages in Luke-Acts which have been suspected of reflecting its author's dependence upon Josephus. The evidence seems to me more than adequate to establish the probability of a connection of this kind between the two writers, although this does not mean that I regard each of the passages Krenkel cites as properly belonging to it. Here I am interested only in pointing out that not one of the more extensive, more important, and really significant passages indicating possible dependence is to be found in Marcion's Gospel. It is not simply that they do not belong to Marcion's recovered text; they are known *not* to have belonged to his Gospel. They belong either to "B" or to Acts.

The second remark has to do with the prologue of Luke-Acts, for it is widely recognized that Luke 1:1-4 is a preface to the whole work and not to the Gospel section only. Although it would be too much to claim that this prologue confirms our view that opposition to Marcionism had at least something to do with the compilation of Luke-Acts, it can certainly be said that there is nothing in it incompatible with this view. It is surely possible that among—indeed, the first among—the narratives which the author expects his work to displace (for no less, it is clear, was his ambition)<sup>30</sup> was the Gospel of Marcion. Emphasis upon "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word from the beginning" makes such an interpretation altogether plausible.

<sup>30</sup> Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 24. 15.

In this connection the following passage from Athanasius' Festal Letter (A.D. 367) is interesting:

But since we have made mention of the heretics as dead, but of ourselves as possessing the Divine Scriptures for salvation; and since I fear lest, as Paul wrote to the Corinthians, some few of the simple should be beguiled from their simplicity and purity, by the subtily of certain men, and should henceforth read other books—those called apocryphal—led astray by the similarity of their names with the true books; I beseech you to bear patiently, if I also write, by way of remembrance, of matters with which you are acquainted, influenced by the need and advantage of the Church.

In proceeding to make mention of these things, I shall adopt, to commend my undertaking, the pattern of Luke the Evangelist, saying on my own account: "Forasmuch as some have taken in hand, to reduce into order for themselves the books termed apocryphal, and to mix them up with the divinely inspired Scripture, concerning which we have been fully persuaded, as they who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word, delivered to the fathers; it seemed good to me also, having been urged thereto by true brethren, and having learned from the beginning, to set before you the books included in the Canon, and handed down, and accredited as Divine; to the end that any one who has fallen into error may condemn those who have led him astray; and that he who has continued steadfast in purity may again rejoice, having these things brought to his remembrance."<sup>31</sup>

Athanasius had a later heretic in mind, but the original composer of the preface may well have been thinking first of all of Marcion. And although the reference in Acts 20:29 ff. to the "savage wolves" who after Paul's death would get into the flock—men who from the very number of Paul's disciples would teach perversions of the truth and draw away many disciples after them—might well apply to earlier "heretics," there is no reason why the words may not refer to Marcion. He did spring out of the Pauline community; he did "pervert" the

<sup>31</sup> The text of this translation is that of P. Schaff and H. Wace, *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (New York and London, 1892).

truth as Paul especially had spoken it; and he did make many disciples. These words of Acts may well belong to the same period as II Peter's reference to those who "twist [the letters of Paul] to their own ruin."

The purpose of Luke-Acts as a finished work was, needless to say, a many-sided purpose. No one interest can be said to explain it, just as no one interest can explain the *Pastorals* or, for that matter, any other New Testament book. The only claim this chapter has been concerned to advance is that the finished work reflects an awareness of the attitude of Marcion (and perhaps others) to the Old Testament, toward Paul, and toward the earlier apostolic group and that it reflects a knowledge of the use such men were making of a particular Gospel and of Paul's letters. That the one work among early Christian documents whose primary purpose was to demonstrate the continuity of Christianity with Judaism<sup>32</sup> should have been deliberately selected and adopted by the one church leader whose primary interest was to deny that continuity is to me almost incredible. And that there is no causal connection between Marcion's use of a Gospel and Paul, on the one hand, and "Luke's" use of the *same Gospel* and Paul, on the other, is equally difficult to believe. I regard Luke-Acts as being under one of its aspects an early apologetic response to Marcionism. The "Gospel and Apostle" of "Luke" follow the "Gospel and Apostle" of Marcion, as they also anticipate the "Gospel and Apostle" of the official canon. The author of Luke-Acts sought to reclaim both a Gospel and Paul from the Marcionites.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. B. S. Easton, *The Purpose of Acts* (London, 1936), pp. 10-17.



## CHAPTER VI

### MARCION AND THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL

**T**HE Muratorian fragment is only one of many witnesses that at the end of the second century the four Gospels which we know had achieved a place of unrivaled leadership among the churches of both East and West. There were other Gospels—many of them—and some of these were held in high regard in various sections of the church. Clement of Alexandria, for example, does not hesitate to quote from apocryphal Gospels. But even Clement, who may be taken as representing liberal Alexandria about A.D. 200, places these Gospels in a distinctly lower category than the “four Gospels that have been handed down to us.”<sup>1</sup>

For Tertullian and Irenaeus, however, as well as for the Muratorian writer, the four Gospels occupied a place of even greater pre-eminence. They are the only Gospels. Tertullian makes this abundantly clear not only by using no others but also by naming them on more than one occasion as comprising “the Gospel.”<sup>2</sup> And Irenaeus is so sure on this point that he can refer to the number of the Gospels as being a matter not merely of fact but of necessity:

For as there are four quarters of the world in which we live, as there are also four universal winds, and as the church is scattered over all the earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and base of the church and the breath of life, it is likely that it should have four pillars

<sup>1</sup> *Strom.* iii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *As, e.g., in Adv. Marc.* iv. 2.

breathing immortality on every side and kindling afresh the life of men. Whence it is evident that the Word, the architect of all things, who sitteth upon the cherubim and holdeth all things together, having been made manifest to men, gave to us the Gospel in a fourfold shape, but held together by one Spirit.<sup>3</sup>

I have been using the phrase "the four Gospels," but it is important to note that Irenaeus here refers to one Gospel in four forms or parts. It is not the four Gospels but the fourfold Gospel which he is defending. Although elsewhere Irenaeus uses the word "Gospel" in referring to the work of one of the evangelists and the word "Gospels" in referring to them together, it is clear that, when he uses the term in its most exact sense, it has the larger meaning which is indicated in the famous quotation I have made. The Muratorian canon also can speak of "the third book of the Gospel, according to Luke." Traces of this use of the word "Gospel" are also to be found in many of the ancient canons and lists. The title of the Gospel section of the first catholic New Testament was not the "Gospels" but (precisely as in the Marcionite canon) the "Gospel"—the "Gospel according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John."

It is obvious that such a title was affixed at the time when the four were combined to make a single work, and it is itself sufficient evidence that such a combination took place. Whatever titles the books had separately were discarded in favor of this title for the collection as a whole. Here we see neither the hand of original authors nor the usage of churches but the conscious intention of the compiler, the editor, the publisher. The purpose of this chapter is to inquire when and why this compiling and publishing took place.

<sup>3</sup> *Adv. Haer.* iii. 11. 8. See also Origen *Comm. in Joan.* v. 4.

## I

Although, as I have just indicated, this bringing-together of the four Gospels must have been a conscious act, done at a definite time and place and with deliberate purpose, it had been led up to and prepared for by a long process of development.

The earliest external evidence for the existence of the several Gospels is to be found within the Gospel corpus itself. Thus Mark was clearly known to the authors of Matthew and Luke (even in the Marcionite or other early form) and was probably known to the maker of the Fourth Gospel. It is also possible that John knew both Matthew and some form of Luke.<sup>4</sup>

If we leave to the side the close and obvious literary connection between Luke and Acts and between John and the Johannine Epistles, the rest of the New Testament gives surprisingly little indication of knowledge of the Gospels. II Peter perhaps reflects a knowledge of Mark, Matthew, and John. But II Peter comes so late that it may well be only one of a host of contemporary witnesses to the existence and authority of the four Gospels. Its failure even remotely to reflect Luke, however, is interesting; it may not be accidental that this writer, *who is apparently aware of the Marcionites' use of Paul*,<sup>5</sup> shows not the slightest dependence upon the Marcionites' Gospel, even in its catholic form.

As to I Clement, although there is ample evidence that its author was familiar with some oral or written tradition of Jesus' teaching, it must be acknowledged that no case for actual literary dependence upon any of our Gospels can be demonstrated. The passage in 13:

<sup>4</sup> But see above, pp. 124 f.

<sup>5</sup> See II Pet. 3:16.

1-2, beginning, "Be merciful in order that you may be mercifully treated," while surely reminiscent of both the first and the third evangelists, and especially of Matthew, is in view of certain items in it and of its arrangement as a whole not easily accounted for as a quotation from either. The fact that in Polycarp (2:3) and in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 18. 91) this material occurs in a very similar form complicates the matter. It is known that Clement of Alexandria knew I Clement, so that the phenomenon in his case raises no difficulty. Of course, it is possible that Polycarp also is depending upon I Clement, but the presence of notable differences in the material makes it more probable that both are depending upon some unwritten account of Jesus' words.

In any case, this is the view almost universally held with regard to this passage. Souter<sup>6</sup> and Moore<sup>7</sup> take this position apparently. Goodspeed<sup>8</sup> certainly does. Leipoldt asserts that the use by I Clement of any written source of Jesus' words is not proved.<sup>9</sup> The Oxford Society of Historical Theology expresses the same opinion.<sup>10</sup> These scholars, with one exception, take the same view of the alleged Gospel citation in I Clement (46:8), beginning, "Woe to that man; it would be better if he had not been born (*καλὸν ἦν*)."<sup>11</sup> In neither case is there

<sup>6</sup> *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (New York, 1913), p. 153.

<sup>7</sup> "The Use of Gospel Material in Pre-Catholic Christian Literature" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1929), p. 116.

<sup>8</sup> *Formation of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1926), pp. 33 f.

<sup>9</sup> *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1907), I, 120.

<sup>10</sup> *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford, 1905), pp. 58 f.

<sup>11</sup> Dr. Moore, who is the exception referred to, feels that here is a clear quotation from Matthew and states his case as follows: "Matthew and Mark are followed more closely here [i.e., than Luke], and Clement has ἦν with Mat-

clear evidence of literary dependence. On the contrary, reliance upon the oral tradition is suggested by the introductory formula, followed in both cases, "Remember the words of the Lord Jesus." Gregory stands almost if not quite alone in being able to say that I Clement "can be claimed as full evidence for Matthew."<sup>12</sup>

Reference has already been made to Polycarp, and in this brief summary of the early use of the Gospels it is perhaps enough to say that the character of his two citations from the words of Jesus places them in this same category of allusions based probably upon an oral source (2:3 and 7:2). The first of these I have mentioned in connection with its parallel in I Clement. The second instance, "Praying . . . not to lead us into temptation," is classed by Moore as a direct quotation from Matthew.<sup>13</sup> It seems more natural, however, to regard it as a reflection of the oral tradition or, more probably, as a reflection of contemporary liturgical usage.<sup>14</sup>

---

thew against Mark. This is material of which Mark is the source for Matthew. As is Matthew's custom, he makes a small correction for reason of style, adding ἦν. Clement is clearly here following Matthew; and is not by accident making a two-fold agreement, first against Mark at this point, and then with Matthew and Mark against Luke in the addition of καλὸν [ἦν] αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη" (*op. cit.*, p. 122). This would be more convincing if we could be sure of the text of Mark at this place. The fact is, however, that the textual evidence for the presence of ἦν in Mark is very good, although it has been omitted in the WH text, which follows BL and some of the OL authorities against ACDP, the Harklean Syriac, and some of the OL witnesses.

<sup>12</sup> *The Canon and Text of the New Testament* (New York, 1924), p. 67.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>14</sup> In I Clement and in Polycarp there is material from the early and the late (or passion) sections of the Gospel tradition. In both, the material as a whole is, as we have seen, at some distance from being an accurate literary

Ignatius, however, who wrote in Asia at about this same period, is generally acknowledged to have known and used Matthew, and it is claimed by some that he was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. Moore feels that he knew all four Gospels,<sup>15</sup> but the evidence he presents does not seem to me to justify nearly so large a claim. It is true, as Moore points out, that the circumstances in which Ignatius wrote his letters would lead us to expect a certain looseness in quotation since he may well have been unable to refer to books, writing as he did in the midst of his travels; and, indeed, the liberties he does actually take with the Old Testament give this expectation a more than merely a priori ground. Still, it seems to me that the furthest we can go with complete confidence is to ascribe to him a knowledge either of Matthew or of a document closely resembling it. The evidence for the claim that Ignatius knew the Fourth Gospel consists not in direct quotation but in his use of characteristic Johannine words and phrases, as, for example, ὕδωρ ζῶν and ἄπρος τοῦ θεοῦ. This kind of thing would point more obviously to literary dependence if we could be more sure that such language had no circulation apart from the Gospel. Walter Bauer points out that the failure of Ignatius to make use of the prologue to the Fourth Gospel in his defense of Christ's heavenly

---

quotation of either Matthew or Luke. But, if the passion materials are isolated, it is found that, in both cases, Matt. 26:41 (Mark 14:38), quoted in Polycarp 7:2, and Matt. 26:24 (Mark 14:21), cited in I Clement 46:8, appear exactly as found in Matthew and Mark. This may be another indication that the passion narrative was the first part of the Gospel material to be committed to writing.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

pre-existence and in his emphasis upon the reality of Christ's humanity is a rather decisive indication that he did not know the Gospel.<sup>16</sup>

The Didache, it is commonly claimed, is referring to Matthew in such precepts as: "Reprove one another, not in anger but in peace, as ye find in the Gospel" (15:3; cf. Matt. 18:15) and "But your prayers and your almsgiving and your deeds, so do ye as ye find in the Gospel of our Lord" (15:4; cf. Matt. 6:2-15). If Matthew is in fact the "Gospel" alluded to, it would appear to have been available for reference to the readers of the Didache.<sup>17</sup> In Barnabas as well as in II Clement the few possible references to the Gospel tradition are not definite enough to prove dependence upon any of our Gospels. The same is true of Hermas unless the possible quotation of Mark 10:24 (*Sim.* ix. 20. 3) is an exception.

Papias is quoted by Eusebius<sup>18</sup> as referring to Mark and Matthew, but no reference is made to Luke and John.<sup>19</sup> And the argument that he was familiar with either or both of these later Gospels seems to me pre-

<sup>16</sup> *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), p. 213.

<sup>17</sup> One of the most striking facts about the use of the Gospels in this early period is the prevalence of Matthew. It would appear either that Matthew itself was widely known and favored very early or else (and this may be the more probable alternative) that the Gospel of Matthew embodied most fully and accurately the tradition of Jesus' words which the churches most generally received. This view would make our Matthew dependent upon the usages of the churches rather than the usages of the churches upon Matthew. This hypothesis is confirmed by the paucity of any references to the *deeds* of Jesus in this period.

<sup>18</sup> *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39.

<sup>19</sup> Reference to the argument of Hilgenfeld that the quotation from Papias reflects a knowledge of Luke's preface is made above, p. 123. The argument has not proved convincing.

carious. Streeter's<sup>20</sup> point, that Papias' apparent depreciation of Mark and Matthew implies knowledge of and loyalty to the Fourth Gospel, is unconvincing in view of the fact that Papias himself confesses his preference for the "living voice" and therefore might be expected to depreciate *any* written Gospel. I have already alluded to Bauer's contention that Papias deliberately avoided reference to the Third Gospel because of its association with the heretics; he makes the same point about John.<sup>21</sup> Whether this inference is justified or not in either case is certainly not settled (after all, we have only fragments of Papias in Eusebius), but whatever the meaning of Eusebius' silence about Papias' knowledge of Luke and John, it cannot be denied that Papias is a positive witness for only the two Gospels he is quoted as naming, and scarcely for them in their present form.

Justin apparently knew Mark, Matthew, and Luke—Matthew by far the best. But it is not at all clear that he knew the Fourth Gospel. It is often urged that his Logos theology implies a knowledge of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>22</sup> But this fact about his theology, taken with his disuse of the Gospel text, may well have a contrary implication. It has been several times pointed out that Justin makes forced use of the Synoptic Gospels to support views which he could have supported without dif-

<sup>20</sup> *The Four Gospels* (New York, 1925), p. 20.

<sup>21</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 207.

<sup>22</sup> E.g., Goodspeed (*op. cit.*, p. 53): "It is true that he [Justin] quotes John's phraseology decidedly less than that of the others, but the influence of John's principal ideas, such as the Logos and the incarnation, is very marked."



ficulty from the Fourth Gospel.<sup>23</sup> The same point, it will be recalled, Bauer makes with regard to the claim that Ignatius knew the Fourth Gospel.<sup>24</sup> We may at least say that if Justin knew the Fourth Gospel, he knew it neither so well nor so favorably as the Synoptics.

The Gospel of Peter and the *Epistle of the Apostles* are of uncertain date, and thus it is difficult to determine where they should be placed in this discussion of the use of the four Gospels before the middle of the second century or, indeed, whether they belong there at all. Goodspeed dates the *Epistle of the Apostles* ca. A.D. 140-60 and the Gospel of Peter as early as 120-40.<sup>25</sup> Certainly neither writing can be placed any earlier. That their authors were acquainted with some of the canonical Gospels is clear; that they knew Gospels, or at any rate Gospel materials, outside of "the four" is also clear; that they knew all four of the canonical Gospels is possible but by no means proved; but that they knew the fourfold Gospel is not indicated at all. No more than this can be said of the so-called "British Museum Gospel Fragment."<sup>26</sup> For there is a difference between knowing

<sup>23</sup> Bousset, e.g., writes: "Er ist wie Joh. durchdrungen von dem vorweltlichen Sein Christi, als des Logos, aber er nimmt seine Beweise nicht aus dem Johannesevangelium, sondern er sucht sie mühsam aus den Synoptikern zusammen. Die Wunderbare Geburt, das Bekenntnis Petri müssen dazu dienen" (*Die Evangeliicitate Justins des Märtyrers* [Göttingen, 1891], p. 118). See also Bauer, *op. cit.*, pp. 208 f., who makes the same point. W. von Loewenich, however, feels justified in beginning his discussion of the question with the flat statement: "Justin hat das Joh. Ev. gekannt" (*Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* [Giessen, 1932], p. 39).

<sup>24</sup> See above, pp. 145 f.

<sup>25</sup> *A History of Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1942), p. 309.

<sup>26</sup> This is the view taken by the editors of this important early manuscript (see Bell and Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* [London, 1935], p. 34; see also Bell, *Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri* [Oxford, 1937], p. 17).

four Gospels and knowing the fourfold Gospel—a difference which writers on the canon often fail to take into account.<sup>27</sup>

Up to the middle of the second century, then, there is no adequate evidence for the existence of the fourfold Gospel of which Irenaeus speaks. Although Justin may possibly have known and made use of all the four Gospels, it is clear that they do not enjoy the exclusive pre-eminence which they have a little later for Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Muratorian writer. Not only does he occasionally use other Gospels besides the four—or at least uncanonical Gospel materials—but also his manner of referring to the Gospels (either in the plural<sup>28</sup> or

<sup>27</sup> The only argument which could possibly justify a denial of the fact and significance of this difference runs as follows: In the early church the normal thing was for a Christian to know and use only one Gospel. The idea of using several Gospels would have seemed absurd and improper. This devotion to a single Gospel persisted so that when we find a later writer apparently using more than one Gospel, we are safe in concluding that he knew the separate Gospels only as parts of one, that is, the fourfold Gospel. This argument, however, does not make sufficient allowance for the fact that other Gospels besides the four were used by persons who also used the four, nor for the fact that the fourfold Gospel would hardly have proved acceptable in a given community if several of the constituent Gospels had not been known there.

<sup>28</sup> Streeter claims that, in line with the Jewish custom of taking the first word of a book as its title, the word "Gospel" probably became the title of the book of Mark almost at once. When Matthew incorporated Mark, this title would naturally pass to Matthew and thus become established for this type of book (*op. cit.*, pp. 497 f.). Is it not more likely, however, that this use of the term is an instance of metonymy? Having begun as the name for the message or story itself, it passed to the book or books which contained it. It is clear from the New Testament itself that the word "Gospel" originally meant simply the message (O. A. Petty suggests that the use of the word in this sense began with Paul [*Did the Christian Use of the Term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Originate with Paul?* (New Haven, 1925)]). This may well have been the sense of the term as used by Ignatius and the Didache, notwithstanding the fact that both of them may have had Matthew in mind: there is a difference between referring to a book and referring to a book as such. I suggest that there is no indubitable evidence of the use of the word to mean a book as such until Justin employs the word in the plural (*Apol.* i. 66; *Dial.* 103). There were several books; there could be but one story.

in a way which suggests a reference merely to the Gospel tradition)<sup>29</sup> indicates a status less formal and fixed than the fourfold Gospel. This can also be said of his phrase "memoirs of the apostles."

Justin wrote in Rome. He might be expected, therefore, to reflect the usages of the Roman church to which Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Muratorian writer are also devoted. A fair inference seems to be that in that church, at least, the fourfold Gospel, which was well established in A.D. 175, was not established in 150.<sup>30</sup>

## II

It is thus in the West between A.D. 150 and 175 that we get our first clear evidence of the existence of the fourfold Gospel. Is there any reason to believe that the original compilation took place earlier or elsewhere? Many scholars are sure that it occurred a generation earlier. "This [the making of the fourfold Gospel],"

<sup>29</sup> Bousset (*op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff.) writes: "τὸ Ἐβαγγέλιον war vielmehr in der alten Kirche ein Sammelname für alles das, was man von dem Leben und der Lehre des Herrn wusste, dann auch für die Schriften derartigen Inhalts die in der Kirche kuzierten." For an argument that Justin knew and quoted from a "lost" Gospel see F. R. Buckley, "Justin Martyr's Quotations from the Synoptic Tradition," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVI (1935), 173 ff.

<sup>30</sup> Tatian's *Diatessaron* was apparently composed about A.D. 170. It may be said to represent a stage where the four Gospels are recognized as belonging in a class by themselves but have not yet received canonical status or, I should say, the fourfold form. Otherwise, Tatian's free treatment of them would hardly have been possible. It must be remembered, however, that, besides being something of a schismatic, Tatian published his harmony in Syria, whereas the fourfold Gospel was most probably promulgated from Rome. Tatian's work and the fourfold Gospel represent alternative ways of making one Gospel out of four. In view of the hold which particular Gospels had by A.D. 150 secured in various communities, the fourfold Gospel would have succeeded against its "rival" even without the official support it undoubtedly enjoyed.

writes Harnack,<sup>31</sup> "did not happen (as in the case of Acts) when the two-fold New Testament took form, but at an earlier date." The same scholar argues elsewhere that the compilation took place at or around Ephesus well before the middle of the second century.<sup>32</sup> Goodspeed<sup>33</sup> dates this event about A.D. 125, also at Ephesus. He bases his argument largely upon the alleged use of the fourfold Gospel by Papias, Justin, the *Epistle of the Apostles*, and the Gospel of Peter, pointing out that Justin lived in Ephesus before coming to Rome, and also upon the belief that the principal motive for the publication of the fourfold Gospel was to win approval for the Fourth (the Ephesian) Gospel by joining it to the other three, which were well established. I have already given my reasons for regarding it as extremely improbable that Papias<sup>34</sup> or Justin or the two "apocryphal" sources knew the fourfold Gospel, and I am not persuaded by the argument that it was the special advocates of the Fourth Gospel who made the compilation.

Harnack, in defending the same general conclusion as Goodspeed on the time and place of the collection, makes much of the claim that Irenaeus speaks for Asia Minor as well as for Rome. He writes that the more inclusive Gospel can be traced back to the time and place of Irenaeus' youth, to before the middle of the second

<sup>31</sup> *Origin*, p. 69.

<sup>32</sup> *Chronologie*, I, 589 ff., 681-701.

<sup>33</sup> *Formation of the New Testament*, pp. 37 ff. In his most recent work, *A History of Early Christian Literature*, Dr. Goodspeed suggests an even earlier date.

<sup>34</sup> About Papias it may be added that even if it be decided that he knew all four Gospels, his apparent depreciation of Matthew and Mark is hardly consistent with the acceptance of the principle of the fourfold Gospel.

century in Asia Minor. He urges that Irenaeus does not know that the written Gospel ever existed except in this form, reminding us that the Father accounts for its fourfold form by a "Divine dispensation which answered to the dispensation of Nature and which was already foreshadowed in the Old Testament."<sup>35</sup> Although this inference is constantly drawn from Irenaeus' language, quoted early in this chapter, I can see no ground for it whatever. All that Irenaeus' statement can legitimately be construed to mean is that it was in the nature of things inevitable that four Gospels should come to be acknowledged in the churches. He certainly does not mean that there have always been as many as four Gospels; he knows that they were written separately and at different times.<sup>36</sup> Neither does he mean that no more than four Gospels had ever been written or read or accepted by churches. His statement would be quite compatible with the hypothesis that, when Irenaeus came to the West, he knew and acknowledged only one Gospel, although as a matter of fact he may have known all four and others besides. But now that the fourfold Gospel has been formed and officially authorized, he recognizes at once not only its validity but also its necessity—its necessity not less because it had come only recently to be seen and acknowledged.

I see no reason to hold any other view than that which the documentary evidence most naturally indicates: that the fourfold Gospel was made in Rome between A.D. 150 and 175.

<sup>35</sup> *Origin*, p. 71; see also Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (Leipzig, 1897), I, 681 ff.

<sup>36</sup> *Adv. Haer.* iii. 1. 1.

To say this, however, is virtually equivalent to saying that the fourfold Gospel was a part of the conscious effort to form the catholic New Testament, which took place also at Rome between Justin and Irenaeus. The fourfold Gospel was formed at the same time and place as the thirteen-letter Pauline corpus was formed, and Acts and the Catholic Epistles were brought into close connection with it—and with the same motive.

This matter of motive is important in this connection. Not only is there no real evidence of the existence of the fourfold Gospel before Irenaeus; there was no sufficient occasion for the formation of it until then. In view of the kind of regard the early church felt for the words and the story of Jesus and for the books which contained them, it is almost unthinkable that four of these books could be selected and published together as "the Gospel" except with the intention of securing recognition and acceptance of this document as the only valid and adequate account of the Lord's words and deeds and thus as genuine Scripture. But there is no evidence that this happened, or that there was enough pressure to make it happen, until the middle of the second century. If it had happened earlier, the New Testament would *ipso facto* have come into existence earlier; but it is clear that it did not. The same forces which produced the New Testament produced the fourfold Gospel, and produced it as a part of the New Testament. It may be argued that some of the same forces helped produce Luke-Acts a decade or so earlier; but Luke-Acts was the work of an individual, and the fourfold Gospel was the work of a community or of some official group in it. The author of Luke-Acts was not aware of himself as

producing Scripture; the compilers of the fourfold Gospel knew that they were.

For just as the necessity of canonizing the "Apostle" led to the making of the larger Pauline corpus, the "discovery" of Acts and the formation of the corpus of the "catholics," so the necessity of canonizing the "Gospel"—that is, both limiting it and exalting it, as Marcion had done—led to the making of the fourfold Gospel. We can believe, as I have said,<sup>37</sup> that progress toward canonization had gone further in the case of the "Gospel" than in the case of Paul and that it would eventually have been reached in any event. But shortly after the middle of the second century there was need that the process be accelerated and consummated by official action.<sup>38</sup> "The Gospel" must be formally canonized as the first part of the new twofold Scripture.

But what Gospel? Shall it be the Gospel of Matthew, which seems to have enjoyed by far the widest popularity in the churches? Will the canon-makers call this "the Gospel" and repudiate Mark, Luke, John, the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Egyptians, etc.? Or will they keep Matthew and Mark and repudiate all other Gospels as the Gospels of the heretics? Here is the same question which, in a different form, the creators of the canon faced in the case of Paul. And the answer was even more certain and immediate: all these other Gospels could not be surrendered. Particularly Luke and John (there is no certainty that they were known by these names) had too strong a hold in certain sections

<sup>37</sup> See above, pp. 26 f. and 114.

<sup>38</sup> See Harnack, *Origin*, p. 31: "The New Testament as it stands and the history of its development bear traces of the element of *compulsion*." This compulsion appears not least clearly in the "Gospel."

of the church. It is common to say that the Fourth Gospel was in general use at Ephesus. (Could it have been at Alexandria also, or instead?) We can be certain that it was used and highly valued somewhere besides in the so-called "heretical" churches, several of which held it in special esteem. It is more than probable that the substance of the Third Gospel was "the Gospel" in Pontus or elsewhere in Asia Minor, as well as for Marcion, who perhaps brought it to Rome.<sup>39</sup> Indeed, by this time (say, A.D. 165 or 170), this Gospel, probably in somewhat enlarged form, had become well established in Rome itself. But if neither John nor Luke could be surrendered, much less could Mark or Matthew, one of them perhaps the original Roman Gospel and the other used and honored there and in many other parts of the church.

The fact that Luke and John were established in certain communities which could not be declared heretical was not the only consideration that prevented the surrendering of them to the heretics; the churches would in any case have been unwilling to leave in the hands of the heretics *as sole and rightful possessors* such potent weapons as these two Gospels would have been. It was widely believed that the Third Gospel was the Gospel of Paul<sup>40</sup>—we cannot know whether the Marcionites were originally responsible for this belief (although it

<sup>39</sup> Harnack, in trying to explain why Marcion "chose" Luke, writes: "Für Lukas fiel der 'heidenchristliche' und der asketische Charakter schwer ins Gewicht; aber die Vorgeschichte war in Marcions Augen ein ungeheures Skandalon der Fälschung. Wenn er sich für dieses Evangelium entschied und nicht für Markus, so hat der Grund vielleicht nur in äusseren Umständen gelegen: das erste Evangelium, welches in den Pontus gekommen ist, war wahrscheinlich das Lukas-Evangelium" (*Marcion*, p. 39 [2d ed., p. 42]).

<sup>40</sup> Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* iii. 1. 1; Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 2.



will be remembered that Marcion himself spoke only of the "Gospel of Christ") or whether it goes back to some earlier tradition of Lukan authorship—and that the Fourth Gospel was the work of John, the apostle. The nonheretical churches could not have given over to their enemies such ancient, not to say such intrinsically impressive, witnesses.

But if these Gospel witnesses could not be declared false, they could at least be recognized as partial.<sup>41</sup> Only the churches which stood with Rome had the full Gospel. Marcion, his enemies claim later, has "mutilated" the Gospel not only by abridging Luke but by selecting Luke at all. He has torn away one part from an essentially four-part whole. And modern critics have too often taken the ancient critics' word for it.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>41</sup> This seems to be the point of Irenaeus in *Adv. Haer.* iii. 11. 7, where he tells us that the Ebionites use Matthew, the Marcionites Luke, the Docetae Mark, and the Valentinians John.

<sup>42</sup> Harnack (*Marcion*, pp. 72 f. [2d ed., pp. 78 f.]) bases his conclusion that Marcion knew the fourfold Gospel in part upon such testimony. But obviously Irenaeus and Tertullian will claim that their own Gospel is older than Marcion's. That Marcion knew other Gospels besides his own is altogether likely; that he knew *about* such Gospels is certain. But that he knew the fourfold Gospel is not established at all. Harnack makes much of Tertullian's statement (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 3) that Marcion sought to undermine the truth of the Gospels of the apostles (meaning, according to Harnack, Mark, Matthew, and John) in order to enhance the prestige of his own Gospel. But even if Marcion did in his *Antitheses* attack Matthew, Mark, and John, that fact does not prove the existence of the fourfold Gospel. The context of the passage in Tertullian, however, suggests that Peter, James, and John were the "apostles" whom Marcion attacked. It is likely that Tertullian draws the inference that, in attacking these apostolic authorities, Marcion is seeking to undermine the apostolic Gospels. Zahn holds that Marcion not only knew the other canonical Gospels but was influenced by them in the preparation of his own (*Geschichte*, I, 653 ff., 680). Marcion's text is undoubtedly nearer Matthew and Mark than is Luke's, but that may mean that it is more primitive, not less so. It may be more like Matthew and Mark because it bears less of the peculiarly Lukan literary stamp. Harnack held that Marcion found in Rome a text of Luke which had already been corrected to the text of Matthew and Mark (*Marcion*, pp. 224\* f. [2d ed., p. 243\*]).

Soon after the middle of the second century, then, there was the necessity for an authorized "Gospel," but there actually existed many Gospels, four of them in wide use and of obviously pre-eminent value. The answer was inevitable: "The Gospel [one Gospel] according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John." The two Gospels which might have become the "Gospels of the heretics" take their place after Matthew and Mark, as Paul took his place after Acts and, sometimes, the Catholic Epistles. The two Gospels which the heretics came close to making their own are claimed, but they are claimed not as "Gospels" but as parts of "the Gospel," which only the faithful possessed in its full richness and range.

## CHAPTER VII

### MARCION AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

**M**AY I conclude this book with a brief summary of the conclusions to which our study of Marcion's canon has led us? As far as we can find out, most, if not all, of the primitive Christian communities accepted the Jewish Scriptures, the Septuagint, as their Bible, and it does not appear to have occurred to them at first either to repudiate or to supplement it. To be sure, the "words of the Lord" from the beginning had authority; but the authority lay in them as spoken words of Jesus, not in any document as such to which they might by chance have been committed. There is no evidence that this situation changed basically up to the middle of the second century. It is clear that ten letters of Paul had been published well before that time and that some at least of the Gospels had been written, but there is no adequate ground for the view that either the letters or the Gospels were accepted as of equal authority with the Septuagint by any large section of the church. But soon after the middle of the century the situation is quite changed. There is a New Testament, regarded as having the full status and authority of Scripture. What accounts for this change?

In general, it may be answered that the canon was a part of the church's effort to combat what now begins to be sharply defined as "heresy." In particular, it is undoubtedly true to say that the tendency toward the

establishment of a distinct body of Christian Scripture, of equal and even of superior authority to the traditional canon, was a phase of the response to various forms of Gnosticism current in the second century, and especially to Marcionism. Two ways of reacting to Marcion's canon were open to the non-Marcionite churches. They might reject the canon as heretical, or they might appropriate it as a part (but only as a part) of their own Scriptures. One can hardly be surprised at the church's choice between these two alternative strategies. Indeed, the choice was so obvious that, as I have said earlier, it is probably false to refer to it as a choice at all. "Orthodox" churchmen would not let it appear that Marcion had a monopoly on reverence for the apostolic Christian documents. Without repudiating their own Scriptures, they added Marcion's. They broke the force of Marcion's authorities by absorbing them. They were able to say: "We have what Marcion has and more; we have both the Old Testament and the New Testament."

This strategy—no less real because it was largely unconscious—of absorbing Marcion's canon and thus rendering it innocuous is revealed further in the way in which the non-Marcionite churches dealt with the contents of Marcion's Scriptures. For Marcion the "Apostle" was the ten epistles of Paul. The churches did not reject a single one of these ten epistles. Indeed, one of the most convincing reasons for finding in Marcion the original occasion of the New Testament lies in the predominating position of Paul in the New Testament canon, a position apparently out of proportion to his influence in the church of the early second century. The ten letters of Paul are kept—are the churches willing to

let Marcion claim Paul as his own?—but the “Apostle” is enlarged. It is enlarged in three ways: first, the Pastoral Epistles are added to the ten letters of Paul, thus making possible the claim that Marcion did not have all the letters even of that apostle; second, other presumably apostolic writings are sought out and assembled so that it can be said that, whereas Marcion had Paul (or a part of him), the orthodox had Peter, James, John, and Jude as well as Paul; and, third, Acts is canonized and made the beginning book of the “Apostle.” That book deals largely with Paul but represents him as being but one of the early apostles and by no means the most important one; as an apostle who does his work in closest collaboration with the churches in Jerusalem and Antioch and under their orders and who gladly acknowledges his dependence upon the Twelve. This book thus gave a radically different picture of Paul’s relation to the primitive Christian community (a point of crucial importance in the Marcionite controversy) from that which the ten letters of Paul on the whole present, and, when placed near the letters, had the effect of qualifying materially Paul’s portrait of himself. It is noteworthy that in the Muratorian canon of about A.D. 200 the book is called the “Acts of All the Apostles”—as though the author of that document would say: “Marcion claims Paul; we have all of the apostles, Paul among them.”

In a word, just as the non-Marcionite churches, instead of repudiating Marcion’s Christian Scriptures, appropriated them as the New Testament section of their own more inclusive Scriptures, so they made Marcion’s “Apostle” a part of a larger “Apostle.” They accepted

Paul's writings as Scripture but considerably qualified their effect by adding as much as possible of the alleged work of other apostles and by putting the letters in close relation to another work, the Acts of the Apostles, which interprets Paul as one—even though the greatest—of many co-operative workers who gladly acknowledged the authority of the Twelve at Jerusalem and labored under their direction.

This does not mean, I am concerned to repeat yet again, that opposition to Marcionism was the only factor contributing to the creation of a distinctive Christian canon of Scriptures. Many other factors were at work and would eventually have produced a New Testament of some kind. I am merely urging that Marcion's canon served as the decisive occasion of its creation, just as the addition of a single element to a highly complex chemical solution often produces the precipitate. This view is confirmed by the particular dual form which the precipitate in this case—the New Testament—assumed, and it is further confirmed by a comparison of the contents of the Apostle section of Marcion's Bible with the same section of the catholic canon.

But how about the "Gospel"? It would be natural to suppose that the same sort of thing happened in the case of the "Gospel" of Marcion as happened in the case of his "Apostle." The "Apostle" was undoubtedly enlarged; the presumption would be that the "Gospel" also was enlarged. This presumption is strengthened when we observe that the relation of Marcion's "Gospel" to the Gospel section of the catholic New Testament is exactly the same as the relation of the Marcionite "Apostle" to the catholic "Apostle." Just as the makers

of the New Testament had a larger Paul than Marcion, so they had a larger "Luke" than Marcion. Just as they had other apostles besides Paul, so they had other Gospels besides Luke. We have every reason to believe that it was the churches which added rather than Marcion who abridged in the case of the "Apostle"; is it not fair to assume that the churches enlarged Marcion's Gospel (or, rather, a Gospel roughly equivalent to it) rather than that Marcion abridged the catholic Gospel of Luke? Why should the process, ending with the same result in both cases, be supposed to have worked in one direction in the "Apostle" and in the other in the "Gospel"? An argument from analogy is always precarious, but in this instance it is surely not without some validity.

A second argument in support of this hypothesis can be stated as follows: While our New Testament as a whole is evidently built on a twofold arrangement—"Gospel" and "Apostle"—it is obvious that two of the books composing it, one in the Gospel section and the other in the Apostle section, were at one time the two parts of a single work. I refer, of course, to the work ordinarily known as Luke-Acts. Now it is a strange fact that when our New Testament took form as "Gospel and Apostle," there should lie at hand for use in it another two-part work and that this other two-part work should also have been in the form, "Gospel and Apostle." We have seen reasons for believing that the Gospel-Apostle pattern of the New Testament was derived from Marcion; is it not natural to account for the Gospel-Apostle pattern of Luke-Acts in the same way? The plausibility of that explanation of the occasion of Luke-

Acts as a single work is increased by the observation that the Luke-Acts Apostle is Paul—but a catholic Paul—and that the Gospel section of Luke-Acts is an enlarged form of Marcion's Gospel. This latter is really a quite remarkable fact and appears more remarkable the more one reflects on it. Here are two two-part works—Marcion's canon and Luke-Acts—making their appearance at approximately the same time. Both are organized as "Gospel and Apostle," and the *Gospel section is largely the same*. That there is no connection between these two sets of facts seems to me highly improbable. An explanation which appears at least possible is that Luke-Acts as a *single finished work* is a relatively early response to Marcion's use of Gospel and Paul. Marcion's Gospel is enlarged, and over against the letters of Paul is put the book we know as the Acts of the Apostles.

It is generally held that Marcion selected Luke from the four Gospels. But why should he have selected Luke? Why not Mark or John?<sup>2</sup> Why did he select a book from which he was forced to delete so large a portion—a book so steeped, especially in its opening chapters, in Jewish lore? The fact that the Gospel bore the name of Luke, mentioned in Paul's letters as one of his friends, does not make a convincing answer. There is no evidence that Marcion knew the Gospel as Luke's; cer-

<sup>2</sup> W. von Loewenich's explanation of why Marcion did not choose John (*Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* [Giessen, 1932], pp. 68 f.) is certainly not a very convincing explanation. To be sure, Marcion would not have liked everything in John; but, according to the usual view, he selected a Gospel a full one-fourth of which he did not like. See also in this connection nn. 31 and 39 on pp. 18 and 155, above. For a short statement of the usual explanation of Marcion's choice of Luke see E. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'église chrétienne* (Paris, 1911), pp. 154 f.



tainly he made no use of the name.<sup>2</sup> Besides, Mark<sup>3</sup> figures in Paul's letters as a companion of the apostle quite as prominently and as favorably as Luke. Mark and John, not Luke, came nearest to being Pauline Gospels; and Marcion was quite astute enough to recognize it. From Mark, Marcion would have had to delete comparatively little. And would not Luke's association with Acts (and we can be sure that Luke did not reach its final form apart from Acts) have had the effect of disqualifying that Gospel for Marcion? The hypothesis I have ventured to propose is that Marcion's Gospel, although some "omitting" and editing are not to be denied, was in large part identical with a primitive Gospel, known simply as "the Gospel" in the community of Asia Minor where Marcion had his origin; and that a later writer enlarged it (although not in its Marcionite form) and made it the first section of a two-volume work, the second section of which, also based in considerable part upon primitive materials, was concerned to give a more irenic picture of Paul's relations with the Jerusalem community than the Marcionites accepted or indeed than the letters of Paul alone would seem to justify.

And how can we better explain the fourfold Gospel? We have already seen how Marcion's canonization of Paul led to the canonization of Paul by the non-Mar-

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 2.

<sup>3</sup> One can disregard the contention of H. Raschke, *Die Werkstatt des Markusevangelisten* (Jena, 1924), pp. 31 ff., that Mark was Marcion's Gospel, although the statement of Hippolytus in *Ref. Haer.* vii. 18 apparently identifying Marcion's Gospel with Mark is curious. Zahn makes the rather far-fetched suggestion that Hippolytus is attempting a witticism (*Geschichte*, I, 621). Harnack says only that Hippolytus "was asleep" (*Marcion*, p. 222\* [2d ed., p. 240\*]).

cionites, but that this canonization was not of Paul merely as such but of Paul as included in a larger Apostle corpus. What more natural to suppose than that this same thing happened in the case of Marcion's "Gospel"? Marcion has called Luke (or, I am inclined to believe, its principal source) the "Gospel"; other heretics were claiming John. May not one phase of the catholic response to these heretical movements have been the publication of the fourfold Gospel, in which each of the separate books is validated but is subordinated to the whole, just as Paul is validated by being subordinated to a more inclusive "Apostle"? This would explain the name under which the fourfold Gospel was apparently published: it was not the "four Gospels"—that comes later—but "the Gospel." The position of Luke and John at the end of the collection may be accounted for by the fact that these two Gospels had been most used by the heretics.

May I sum up the conclusion of this book by saying that although various apostolic and pseudo-apostolic writings were known generally among the churches of the early second century and were held in high esteem in the several communities, they were not, except by the "heretics," at first regarded as having the value of Scripture; that the impulse toward a distinctively Christian canon was given largely by Marcion; that the organization of the new canon followed the general pattern of the Marcionite Scriptures with its twofold organization as "Gospel and Apostle"; that the method of the anti-Marcionite churches was in general to accept Marcion's Scriptures and to enlarge them; that this

method was followed in the case both of the "Apostle" and of the "Gospel"; that Luke-Acts, itself a "Gospel and Apostle," stands somewhere between the "Gospel and Apostle" of Marcion and the "Gospel and Apostle" of the catholic New Testament; and that the fourfold Gospel is in part to be explained by Marcion's use of a single Gospel.

This is the conclusion to which this study of Marcion's canon has brought us. Parts of it are more obviously true and are held with greater conviction than other parts, but the whole, I submit, has a rational consistency which gives it a certain a priori probability. Unfortunately, the evidence is too meager either to disprove or to prove. Among the objections to the hypothesis as a whole, two are particularly serious. The first of these has to do with relative dates: the thesis apparently demands a later date for the composition of Luke-Acts than is generally ascribed to that work. The second and even more serious objection is based upon the all but universally accepted conclusion that the text of Marcion's Gospel, as it is recovered in the quotations of the Fathers, reveals unmistakably that it was simply an abridgment of the canonical Gospel of Luke.

I have sought to meet the former of these objections by showing, first, that the date when Luke-Acts is known to have assumed its final form cannot be placed earlier than the middle of the second century, however much more primitive many elements in both the "Gospel" and the "Apostle" sections undoubtedly were, and, second, that Marcion's activities and conservative reactions to his influence may well have begun earlier than

has been commonly supposed. In answer to the second objection I have tried to demonstrate that, although the textual evidence prevents our saying, as the more radical German critics said, that Luke simply added to Marcion, it does not establish the opposite view that Marcion simply abridged our Luke. There is no decisive ground for denying that the source of Marcion's Gospel was a document considerably more primitive than the third canonical Gospel—a "proto-Luke" upon which both Marcion and Luke relied.

## APPENDIX I

### THE MARCIONITE PROLOGUES TO THE LETTERS OF PAUL,

Below is the text of the prologues as presented in Harnack's *Marcion* (pp. 136\* f. [2d ed., pp. 127\* ff.]), followed by the English translation published by Burkitt in his *Gospel History and Its Transmission* (pp. 355 f.) and used by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

#### AD GALATAS

Galatae sunt Graeci. hi verbum veritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt; sed post discessum eius temptati sunt a falsis apostolis, ut in legem et circumcisionem verterentur. hos apostolus revocat ad fidem veritatis scribens eis ab Epheso.

#### AD CORINTHIOS

Corinthi sunt Achaei. et hi similiter ab apostolo audierunt verbum veritatis et subversi multifarie a falsis apostolis, quidam a [ad] philosophiae verbosa [-am] eloquentia [-am], alii a [ad] secta [-am] legis Judaicae inducti. hos revocat apostolus ad veram evangelicam sapientiam scribens eis ab Epheso per Timotheum.

#### AD ROMANOS

Romani sunt in partibus Italiae. hi praeventi sunt a falsis apostolis et sub nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi in legem et prophetas erant inducti. hos revocat apostolus ad veram evangelicam fidem scribens eis a Corintho [some manuscripts read "ab Athenis"].

#### AD THESSALONICENSES

Thessalonicenses sunt Machedones, qui accepto verbo veritatis perstiterunt in fide etiam in persecutione civium suorum; praeterea nec receperunt ea quae a falsis apostolis dicebantur. hos conlaudat apostolus scribens eis ab Athenis.

## AD LAUDICENSES

[Laudiceni sunt Asiani. hi praeventi erant a pseudo-apostolis . . . . ad hos non accessit ipse apostolus . . . . hos per epistolam recorigit. . . . ]<sup>1</sup>

## AD COLOSSENSIS

Colossenses et hi sicut Laudicenses sunt Asiani, et ipsi praeventi erant a pseudapostolis nec ad hos accessit ipse apostolus, sed et hos per epistolam recorigit—audierant enim verbum ab Archippo qui et ministerium in eos accepit—, ergo apostolus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso.

## AD PHILIPPENSES

Philippenses sunt Machedones. hi accepto verbo veritatis perstiterunt in fide nec receperunt falsos apostolos. hos apostolus conlaudat scribens eis a Roma de carcere per Epaphroditum.

## AD PHILEMONEM

Philemoni familiares litteras facit pro Onesimo servo eius. scribit autem ei a Roma de carcere.

## TO THE GALATIANS

Galatians are Greeks. These accepted the word of truth first from the Apostle, but after his departure were tempted by false Apostles to turn to the law and circumcision. These the Apostle recalls to the faith of the truth, writing to them from Ephesus.

## TO THE CORINTHIANS

Corinthians are of Achaia. And these similarly heard the word of truth from the Apostle and were perverted variously by false Apostles, some by the wordy eloquence of philosophy, others brought in by the sect of the Jewish Law. These the Apostle recalls to true Evangelical wisdom, writing to them from Ephesus by Timothy.

<sup>1</sup> This prologue is missing in the manuscripts, although there is one to the Epistle to the Ephesians. The reconstruction is based on the next.

## TO THE ROMANS

Romans are in the parts of Italy. These were reached beforehand by false Apostles, and under the name of our Lord Jesus Christ had been brought in to the Law and the Prophets. These the Apostle recalls to the true Evangelical faith, writing to them from Corinth.

## TO THE THESSALONIANS

*Thessalonians* are Macedonians, who having accepted the word of truth persevered in the faith even in persecution from their fellow-citizens. Moreover, also, they received not the things said by false Apostles. These the Apostle praises, writing to them from Athens.

## TO THE LAODICEANS

[Missing.]

## TO THE COLOSSIANS

*Colossians*—these also like the *Laodiceans* are of Asia, and they had been reached beforehand by Pseudo-Apostles, nor did the Apostle himself come to them. But these also by an epistle he corrects, for they had heard the word from Archippus, who also accepted a ministry unto them. Therefore the Apostle already in custody writes to them from Ephesus.

## TO THE PHILIPPIANS

*Philippians* are Macedonians. These having accepted the word of truth persevered in the faith, nor did they receive false Apostles. These the Apostle praises, writing to them from Rome out of prison by Epaphroditus.

## TO PHILEMON

To Philemon he sends a private letter for Onesimus his slave, and writes to him from Rome out of prison.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> These prologues have called forth an extensive literature. In addition to the works referred to at the beginning of this appendix and those of De Bruyne, Harnack, Mundle, and La Grange cited on p. 37, mention may be made of Peter Corsen, "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, X (1909), 1 ff.

## APPENDIX II

### A NOTE ON THE COLLECTION OF THE PAULINE LETTERS

Walter Bauer affirms that he finds no sufficient indication of the existence of a collection of Pauline letters until the time of Marcion and that he is disposed to see in Marcion himself "the first systematic collector of Paul's literary remains."<sup>1</sup> He asks if it is not to Marcion's zealous search that we are indebted for the short letter to Philemon, whose preservation otherwise is not easily explained since it could hardly have served any useful purpose in the early churches. Referring to Harnack's expression of wonder that "the epistle to the Galatians was preserved at all," Bauer shows that Marcion would not only have had every reason to preserve it but also that in Pontus (lying next to Galatia) he would very naturally have known it. As he traveled through Asia Minor and Greece on a pilgrimage which brought him eventually to Rome, he would have had opportunity (as he alone would have had, as far as we know, adequate motive) to collect the other epistles. According to Bauer, then, the first formal collection of the Pauline letters was made and published by Marcion in Rome near the middle of the second century.

Although this argument is in line with several of the results of this study—namely, the importance of Marcion and the importance of Rome in the early history of the canon—nevertheless I cannot agree either that the first Pauline collection was so late or that it was Marcionite. As I have said, the textual data indicate that the ecclesiastical corpus was not based on the Marcionite corpus; there must have been a pre-Marcionite collection of the letters which circulated outside Marcionite groups. Besides, I cannot agree with Bauer that the references to Paul's letters and the reminiscences of their language in Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Ignatius are not such as to indicate the existence of a published corpus. Certainly the assembling of the letters of Ignatius, referred to in Polycarp,

<sup>1</sup> *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), p. 224.



chapter xiii, comes more naturally after Paul's letters had been collected than before; and the same thing can be said of the seven letters to churches with which Revelation begins. And if, as Dr. Goodspeed has shown, Ephesians is based on the other letters (and I do not believe that one can successfully deny that it does depend on more than a few of them), then the first clear indication of the existence of Ephesians is also an indication of the existence of the collection. I believe that some of the data which I have presented in my work on Philemon, already cited, strikingly confirm the view that the collection was made before the end of the century. If Onesimus, bishop of Ephesus, was Onesimus, the former slave, a motive for the preservation of Philemon far more adequate than the one Bauer appeals to stands disclosed.

That this was the time of the collection both Zahn and Harnack agree. Zahn places it "around the year 80 or 85,"<sup>2</sup> and Harnack "in the last quarter of the first century."<sup>3</sup> The *terminus ad quem* for Harnack is determined by the use of the letters by the Apostolic Fathers; the *terminus a quo* by the fact that "in the Acts of the Apostles the use of no Pauline letter can be established."<sup>4</sup> Dr. Goodspeed<sup>5</sup> sees in the publication of Luke-Acts the cause of the making of the Pauline letter collection. Although, as chapter iii of this book and my essay on Philemon will show,<sup>6</sup> I find myself in general agreement with and greatly indebted to Dr. Goodspeed's work, I have never found this particular part of his hypothesis persuasive. I believe that a more adequate motive for the collection and publication of Paul's letters can be found in the continuing loyalty of certain communities to Paul (see chap. i of this book in this connection) and that the publication of Luke-Acts is too purely "literary" an event to serve as the occasion, much less the cause, of the publication of the letters. Besides, I am of the opinion that Luke-Acts appeared after the letters were published (see chap. v).

Since Acts, in my judgment, was not published (at least in its present form) until close to the middle of the second century, there is no external evidence of a *terminus a quo* later than the death of

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen, 1888), I, 837.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen Christlichen Briefsammlungen* (Leipzig, 1926), p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 1 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* (Chicago, 1935).

Paul. I believe it will be generally agreed, however, that Ephesians, which certainly was a part of the collection from the first,<sup>7</sup> falls more naturally in the last decade of the first century than earlier.

As the place of the publication, both Zahn and Harnack favor Corinth.<sup>8</sup> Harrison sums up Harnack's argument for Corinth as follows:

(a) The Epistles to the Corinthians head our earliest lists of Pauline Epistles—in the Muratorian Canon and in Tertullian—while Marcion, who puts them second only to Galatians, is really a witness to the same original sequence; because Galatians, being for him the chief source of the Pauline Gospel, was bound to be given first place in his Apostolicon, and is thus the exception that proves the rule that in the collection as Marcion found it, Corinthians came first. (b) The unique, paradoxical, ecumenical address in I Cor. 1:2, "unto the Church of God at Corinth . . . with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their (Lord) and ours," seems incapable of any satisfactory explanation in a letter so definitely local in very many of its applications, and can only be regarded as an addition made on the publication of the whole collection, of course at Corinth itself, to introduce it to wider circles of readers than the apostle had in mind for it. . . . (c) The fusion of two different Epistles in our II Corinthians can only have taken place at Corinth, and at the time when the collection was made. (d) The central position of Corinth, and the activity and vitality of the great community there, support the same hypothesis.<sup>9</sup>

None of these arguments will bear close inspection: (a) It is likely, for reasons which I have presented, that not Corinthians but Ephesians headed the first collection; but if Corinthians *was* in first place, it was there simply because it was the longest of the letters. Harnack himself recognizes that this was true of the place of Corinthians in Marcion's collection<sup>10</sup> and therefore really has no right to take Marcion as a witness to his point here; (b) the ecumenical address of I Corinthians may just as well belong to the time when the Corinthian letters *did* head the corpus;<sup>11</sup> (c) it is altogether gra-

<sup>7</sup> See J. Weiss, *History of Primitive Christianity*, II, 682 (this is an English trans. [New York, 1937] by F. C. Grant and others of Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* [Göttingen, 1917]).

<sup>8</sup> Zahn, *op. cit.*, I, 837, and Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 8 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Polycarp's *Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 236 f. (quoted by permission of the Cambridge University Press and the Macmillan Co., publishers).

<sup>10</sup> Marcion, p. 148\* (2d ed., pp. 168\* f.).

<sup>11</sup> See note on this subject above, pp. 67 f.

tuitous to say that the fusion of letters in II Corinthians could have taken place only at Corinth: it could have taken place just as naturally wherever the collection was made; (d) Corinth was no more active and vital a community than Ephesus and scarcely more central.

In support of the view that the collection was made in Ephesus, Dr. Goodspeed has marshaled many strong arguments, for which the reader is referred to the books of his which have already been cited and also to a chapter on the early literary importance of Ephesus in his *New Chapters in New Testament Study*.<sup>12</sup> Attention may also be called to the fact that Ephesus seems to have been Paul's principal headquarters and might have been expected to serve as the base for the collection of his literary remains. The fact that the Marcionite Prologues describe three (or four) of the letters as written from Ephesus may be cited as evidence of an early tradition associating Paul's letters as a whole with that city. Such a tradition would explain the absence of an "Ephesians" from the earliest corpus, as well as Ignatius' phrase, "in every letter he remembers you." Also the strange and pre-eminent importance of Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon for the collector (see my *Philemon among the Letters of Paul*) suggests Ephesus. Harrison tries to work out a theory in which the claims of both Corinth and Ephesus are taken account of; the job of collecting was begun in Corinth and finished in Ephesus. But he does not make, in my judgment, a convincing case.<sup>13</sup>

Zahn sees no reason to doubt that the original collection contained the Pastoral Epistles;<sup>14</sup> and he supposes that, when Marcion formed his corpus of ten letters, he rejected these notes. Harnack believes, as I do, that there were two steps in the publication process—a publication of the ten letters (which Marcion appropriated) and a later publication of the thirteen; but Harnack places both before A.D. 100. He does this in spite of his denial (as against Zahn) that Marcion rejected or *even knew* the Pastoral Epistles. But how could Marcion have failed to know about the Pastoral Letters if they had already been published as a part of the Pauline Corpus even before he began his career?

<sup>12</sup> (New York, 1937), pp. 22 ff.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 238 ff. See also K. Lake's argument that there were several independent collections of Pauline Epistles in the early second century (*The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* [London, 1911], pp. 356 ff.).

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 837.

As to the signs of connection between Polycarp and the Pastorals (which provide the chief ground for both Harnack's and Zahn's view that these letters had appeared by the end of the first century or shortly afterward), several remarks may be made: (1) One may take either of the two positions indicated by Bauer,<sup>15</sup> namely, that the similarities grow out of the dependence of both authors upon a common speech or that they are to be explained by the dependence of the Pastoral Epistles upon Polycarp. (2) One may point to the fact that Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, chapters 1-12, is probably as late as A.D. 130 and that even if it be acknowledged that these chapters show dependence upon the Pastorals, one needs only to assume that the letters had been *written* at that time (or parts of them had),<sup>16</sup> not that they had been published as a part of the corpus. These letters (or fragments of them) may thus have been known to Polycarp but not to Marcion or to the Roman church.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 226; see also Dibelius, *Die Pastoralbriefe* ("Handbuch zum Neuen Testament" [Tübingen, 1931]), pp. 6 and 54.

<sup>16</sup> The view that the Pastoral Letters are not the work of a single author but embody genuine Pauline fragments is argued persuasively by P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (London, 1921).

## APPENDIX III

### LUKAN TERMS AND MARCION'S GOSPEL

Below are the data upon which the generalizations of chapter iv (pp. 93-99) are based. Superior numbers following words in Lists 1 and 4 indicate actual appearances in Harnack's reconstruction.

#### 1. WORDS APPEARING ONLY IN THE "A"<sup>1</sup> SECTIONS OF LUKE (OR IN "A" AND "C")

ἀγαθοποιεῖν,<sup>1</sup> ἄγρα, ἀθετεῖν,<sup>2</sup> ἀθροΐζειν, αἰσθάνεσθαι, ἀλλογενής, ἀναιδεία,<sup>1</sup> ἀνάθεμα, ἀνάληψις, ἀνάπειρος, ἀνένδεκτον, ἀντιβάλλειν, ἀντικαλεῖν, ἀντιπέραν, ἀπαιτεῖν,<sup>1</sup> ἀπελπίζειν, ἀποδεκατεύειν, ἀποθλίβειν, ἀποκλείειν,<sup>1</sup> ἀπολείχειν (οἱ λείχειν, οἱ ἐπιλείχειν),<sup>1</sup> ἀπομάσσειν,<sup>1</sup> ἀποπλύνειν (οἱ πλύνειν), ἀπορία,<sup>1</sup> ἀποψύχειν, ἀρήν, ἄροτρον, ἀρχιτελώνης, ἀστράπτειν,<sup>1</sup> ἄτεκνος, αὐστηρός,<sup>1</sup> ἄφαντος, ἀφρός, ἀφυπνοῦν, βαθέως,<sup>1</sup> βλητέον, βολή,<sup>1</sup> βρώσιμος,<sup>1</sup> βύσσος,<sup>1</sup> γαμίσκεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> γείτων, γελᾶν,<sup>2</sup> δανείζειν,<sup>1</sup> δανειστής, δεσμεῖν, δευτερόπρωτος, διαβάλλειν, διαγογγύζειν, διαγρηγορεῖν, διαλείπειν, διαμερίζειν,<sup>1</sup> διαμερισμός,<sup>1</sup> διανόημα, διανυκτερεύειν,<sup>1</sup> διαπραγματεύεσθαι, διαχωρίζεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> δοχή, δραχμή, ἐγκάθετος, ἐκκομίζειν, ἐκμυκτηρίζειν,<sup>1</sup> ἔλκοῦν,<sup>1</sup> ἐμβάλλειν, ἐνεῖναι, ἐξαιτεῖσθαι ἐξαστράπτειν,<sup>1</sup> ἐπαθροΐζεσθαι, ἐπαιτεῖν,<sup>1</sup> ἐπανέρχεσθαι, ἐπεισέρχεσθαι, ἐπικρίνειν, ἐπιμελῶς, ἐπιπορεύεσθαι, ἐπισιτισμός, ἐπιστάτης, ἔσθσις,<sup>1</sup> εὐγε, εὐθετος, εὐφορεῖν,<sup>1</sup> ἔχθρα, ἦχος,<sup>1</sup> ἰκμάς, ἰσάγγελος,<sup>1</sup> καθοπλίζεσθαι, κατακλίνειν,<sup>1</sup> κατακρημνίζειν, καταλιθάζειν,<sup>1</sup> κατανεύειν, καταπλέειν, κατασύρειν,<sup>1</sup> καταψύχειν,<sup>1</sup> κέραμος, κλίνειν, κλινίδιον, κλισία, κόραξ,<sup>1</sup> κόρος, κρεπάλη,<sup>1</sup> κρύπτῃ,<sup>1</sup> λαμπρῶς,<sup>1</sup> λαξευτός,<sup>1</sup> λῆρος, λίμνη, λυσιτελεῖ, λύχνος,<sup>3</sup> μενοῦν,<sup>1</sup> μεριστής, μετεωρίζεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> μνᾶ,<sup>1</sup> μυλικός,<sup>1</sup> νομικός,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For meaning of the term "A," "B," etc., see above, pp. 93 ff. My principal tools in this analysis were Bruder's *Concordance* (checked at certain doubtful points with that of Moulton and Geden) and the apparatus of Harnack's *Marcion*. The best text of Tertullian is that of A. Kroymann (Vienna and Leipzig, 1906), and, of Epiphanius, that of K. Holl (Leipzig, 1922).

οικονομῆν, ὄμβρος, ὀπότε, ὀπτός, ὀρθρίζειν,<sup>1</sup> ὀρθρῶς, ὀφρύς,<sup>1</sup> παμπληθεί, παράδοξον, παρακαλύπτειν, παράλιος,<sup>1</sup> παρατήρησις,<sup>1</sup> πεδινός, περιζώννυσθαι,<sup>1</sup> πήγανον, πιέζειν,<sup>1</sup> πλούσιος,<sup>5</sup> πραγματεύεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> πράκτωρ,<sup>2</sup> πρεσβεία, προμελετᾶν,<sup>1</sup> προσαναλίσκειν, προσεργάζεσθαι, προσψαύειν, προφέρειν, πτοεῖσθαι, πτύσσειν, σάλος, σιτομέτριον, σκύλον, σορός, στρατόπεδον,<sup>1</sup> συγκαλύπτειν,<sup>1</sup> συγκατατίθεσθαι,<sup>2</sup> συγκύπτειν, συκομορέα, συλλογίζεσθαι, συμπορεύεσθαι, συμφύεσθαι, συνιέναι (συνείμι), συσπράττειν, τελεσφορεῖν, τετραπλοῦς,<sup>1</sup> τρυγᾶν, ὑπερεκχύνεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> ὑποκρίνεσθαι, ὑποχορεῖν, ὑπωπιάζειν, φόβητρον,<sup>1</sup> φρονίμως, φύειν, χάσμα,<sup>1</sup> χρᾶν, χρεωφειλέτης, ψωχεῖν,<sup>1</sup> ὠόν.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. WORDS APPEARING ONLY IN "B" SECTIONS OF LUKE (OR IN "B" AND "C")

ἀγκάλη, ἀγραιλεῖν, ἀμπελουργός, ἀμφιάζειν, ἀνάδειξις, ἀναζετεῖν, ἀνατάσσεσθαι, ἀναφωνεῖν, ἀνευρίσκειν, ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι, ἀπογραφῆ, ἀσφάλεια, ἀσώτως, ἄτοπος, αὐτόπτης, βουνός, γῆρας, γνωστός, δακτύλιος, διαγνωρίζειν (οἱ γνωρίζειν), διακαθαίρειν, διανεύειν, διασειεῖν, διαταράττεσθαι, διατάσσειν, διατηρεῖν, διαφυλάσσειν, διήγησις, δόγμα, δούλη, ἔγκυος, ἑδαφίζειν, ἐθίζειν, ἐκφέρειν, ἐκχώρειν, ἔναντι, ἐνδέχεσθαι, ἐννεύειν, ἐξαποστέλλειν, ἐπειδήπερ, ἐπέχειν, ἐπιβιβάζειν, ἐπιδεῖν, ἐπιχειρεῖν, εὐλαβῆς, ἐφημερία, ἡγεμονεύειν, ἡγεμονία, θυμῖν, ἴασις, ἱερατεύειν, ἴσως, καθότι, κατάβασις, κατακλείειν, κεράτιον, κοπρία, κόπριον, κράτιστος, λείος, λύτρωσις, μεγαλείος, μίσθιος, νοσσιά, νοσσός (οἱ νεοσσός), ὄνειδος, ὀπτασία, ὀρενός, ὀσιότης, οὐσία, παρεμβάλλειν, παρθενία, περικρύπτειν, περικυκλοῦν, περιλάμπειν, περιοικεῖν, περίοικος, περιτέμνειν, πινακίδιον, προβαίνειν, πρεσβύτης, προπορεύεσθαι, σίκερα, σιτευτός, σπαργανοῦν, σπλάγχχνον, στείρος, στιγμή, στρατιά, συγγένεια, συμβάλλειν, συμφωνία, συνοδία, συντυγχάνειν, σωτήριον, ταπείνωσις, τετρααρχεῖν, τραχύς, τραυματίζειν, τρυγῶν, ὑποστρωννύειν, φάραγξ, χόραξ, χορός, ὤφθην(ὄπτεσθαι).

## 3. WORDS APPEARING ONLY IN "C" SECTIONS OF LUKE

ἀγωνία, ἀνασπᾶν, ἀνέκλειπτος, ἀντιπαρέρχεσθαι, ἀπαρτισμός, ἀποστοματίζειν, ἀροτριᾶν, βαθύνειν, βελόνη, δαπάνη, διῆσταναι, διῆσχυρίζειν, ἐκκρέμασθαι, ἐκτελεῖν, ἐνεδρεύειν, ἐνέχειν, ἐνισχύειν,

ἐξηγείσθαι, ἐπισχύειν, ἐπιχέειν, ἐσπέρα, εὐεργέτης ζωογονεῖν, ἡμιθανής, θεωρία, θηρεύειν, θορυβάζειν, θρόμβος, ἰδρῶς, καταδέειν, κατασφάττειν, κλάσις, μερίς, ὀδεύειν, ὀρθρινος (ὁ ὀρθριος), πανδοχείον, πανδοχεύς, παραβιάζεσθαι, παρακαθέζεσθαι, πενιχρός, περιπίπτειν, περιάπτειν, περισπᾶσθαι, πλήμμουρα, προσαναβαίνειν, προσδαπανᾶν, προσποιεῖσθαι, προσρήγνυμι, ῥήγμα, σινιάζειν, συγκυρία, συκάμινος, συμπίπτειν, συνπαραγίνεσθαι, τραῦμα, τρήμα, ὑγρός, ὑδρωπικός, φιλονεικία.

#### 4. WORDS APPEARING IN BOTH "A" AND "B" OR IN BOTH "A" AND ACTS

ἀδικία,<sup>1</sup> ἄδικος,<sup>1</sup> αἴτιον, ἀναδεικνύναι, ἀνακαθίζειν, ἀναφαίνεσθαι, ἀνὴρ,<sup>5</sup> ἀντειπεῖν, ἅπας, ἀποδέχεσθαι, ἀπολαμβάνειν,<sup>2</sup> ἀπόστολος,<sup>2</sup> ἀποτινάσσειν, ἄστρον,<sup>1</sup> ἀτενίζειν, ἄτερ, ἀφαιρεῖν, ἀφιστάναι,<sup>1</sup> ἄχρι, βαλλάντιον, βάτος, βίος, βουλή, βρέφος, γονεῖς, δεῖσθαι,<sup>1</sup> δεκτός, διαγγέλλειν,<sup>1</sup> διαλαλεῖν, διαλογισμός,<sup>2</sup> διαμαρτύρεσθαι,<sup>2</sup> διανοίγειν, διαπορεῖν, διαπορεύεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> διέρχεσθαι,<sup>2</sup> δικαιοῦν,<sup>2</sup> δικαστής, διοδοεῖν, ἐᾶν,<sup>1</sup> ἔθος, εἰσάγειν, εἰσφέρειν,<sup>1</sup> ἔμφοβος, ἐναντίον, ἐνώπιον,<sup>4</sup> ἐξῆς, ἐπαίρειν,<sup>3</sup> ἐπέρχεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> ἐπιδιδόναι,<sup>2</sup> ἐπιθυμεῖν,<sup>3</sup> ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, ἐπιφωνεῖν, ἐργασία, ἐρωτᾶν,<sup>2</sup> ἐσθής, ἕτερος,<sup>4</sup> ἔτος,<sup>1</sup> εὐαγγελίζεσθαι,<sup>3</sup> εὐγενής, εὐτόνως, εὐφραίνειν,<sup>1</sup> ἐφιστάναι,<sup>2</sup> ζεύγας, ἡσυχάζειν,<sup>1</sup> θάμβος, ἰᾶσθαι,<sup>1</sup> ἱκανός, καθεξῆς, καθιέναι, κατάγειν, κατακολουθεῖν, κατανοεῖν, καταξιοῦν,<sup>2</sup> κατέρχεσθαι,<sup>2</sup> καταπίπτειν, κινδυνεύειν, κλαίειν,<sup>1</sup> κοιλία,<sup>1</sup> κριτής,<sup>2</sup> κρούειν,<sup>1</sup> λαός,<sup>2</sup> λοιμός,<sup>1</sup> μήν, μόλις, νῦν,<sup>3</sup> ὀδυνᾶσθαι,<sup>1</sup> ὀμιλεῖν, ὀρθρος,<sup>1</sup> ὀρίζειν, παραγίνεσθαι, παραλθεσθαι,<sup>2</sup> παραχρῆμα,<sup>2</sup> παρέχειν, πατεῖν,<sup>1</sup> παύειν,<sup>1</sup> πειρασμός,<sup>1</sup> περιέχειν, πλεῖν,<sup>1</sup> πλήθειν (πίμπλημι), πλήθος,<sup>1</sup> πλήν,<sup>1</sup> πνεῦμα,<sup>5</sup> ποιμνιον, πολίτης, πράσσειν, πρεσβυτέριον, προβάλλειν,<sup>1</sup> προδότης,<sup>1</sup> προσάγειν, προσδέχεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> προσδοκᾶν,<sup>2</sup> προσδοκία,<sup>1</sup> προστιθέναι,<sup>1</sup> προσφώνειν, προϋπάρχειν, πύκνα,<sup>1</sup> ῥῆμα, σιγᾶν, σκάπτειν, σκιρτᾶν, στάσις, στρατηγός,<sup>1</sup> συγγενής, συγκαλεῖν,<sup>1</sup> συκοφαντεῖν,<sup>1</sup> συλλαμβάνειν, συμπληροῦν, σύν,<sup>1</sup> συναθροίζειν, συναντᾶν, συναρπάζειν, συνεῖναι, συνεσθιέναι, συνευδοκεῖν,<sup>1</sup> συνέχειν,<sup>1</sup> συντιθέναι, σωτηρία,<sup>1</sup> τάσσειν, τάχος, τε,<sup>2</sup> τετραάρχης, τυγχάνειν,<sup>1</sup> τύπτειν,<sup>1</sup> ὑπάρχειν,<sup>2</sup> ὑποδεικνύναι,<sup>1</sup> ὑποδέχεσθαι,<sup>1</sup> ὑπολαμβάνειν, ὑποστρέφειν,<sup>2</sup> ὑψιστος, ὑψοῦν, φάτνη,<sup>1</sup> φίλος,<sup>4</sup> φόβος, φυλάσσειν,<sup>1</sup> χαλᾶν, χαρίζεσθαι, χαρά,<sup>1</sup> χάρις,<sup>1</sup> χήρα, χρόνος, ψαλμός, ψηλαφᾶν.

## 5. "A-B" (LIST 4 ABOVE) TERMS IN MARCION'S TEXT WHICH HAVE SYNOPTIC PARALLELS

εἰσφέρειν, ἐπιδιδόναι,<sup>2</sup> λοιμός (according to many MSS of Matthew) πειρασμός, πλῆθος, προσδοκᾶν,<sup>2</sup> προστιθέναι, and φυλάσσειν. Likewise three appearances of πνεῦμα and one appearance each of ἀνὴρ, ἀπόστολος, διέρχεσθαι, and κριτής.

## 6. "A-B" (LIST 4 ABOVE) TERMS THE PRESENCE OF WHICH IN MARCION'S GOSPEL IS BASED ON GREEK EVIDENCE (UNDERLINED WORDS DEPEND UPON ADAMANTIUS ONLY)

ἀνὴρ, ἀπολαμβάνειν, ἀπόστολος, δεῖσθαι, διαμαρτύρεσθαι, διέρχεσθαι, διαπορεύεσθαι, ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἐρωτᾶν, ἔτος, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, εὐφραίνειν, ἡσυχάζειν, ἰᾶσθαι, κατέρχεσθαι, λαός, νῦν, ὀδυνᾶσθαι, παραχρηῆμα, πλεῖν, πνεῦμα, προδότης, στρατηγός, συγκαλεῖν, σύν, συνέχειν, τύπτειν, ὑπάρχειν, ὑποστρέφειν, φίλος.

## 7. "A-B" (LIST 4 ABOVE) TERMS THE PRESENCE OF WHICH IN MARCION'S GOSPEL IS BASED ON LATIN EVIDENCE

ἀδικία.....	"iniustitiae" (16:9)
ἄδικος.....	"iniusto" (16:11)
ἀνὴρ.....	"hominum" (9:14) and "viro" (16:18)
ἀπολαμβάνειν.....	"recepturos" (6:34)
ἄστρον.....	"siderum prodigia" (21:25)
ἀφιστάναι.....	"recedite" (13:27)
διαγγέλειν.....	"adnuntia" (9:60)
διαλογισμός.....	"cogitationes" (24:38)
διαπορεύεσθαι.....	"praetereuntem" (18:36)
δικαιούν.....	"justificantes" (16:15) and "justificatum" (18:14)
ἐνώπιον.....	"coram" (12:9; 13:26; 16:15)
ἐπαίρειν.....	"adlevasset" (16:23) and "levabitur" (21:28)
ἐπέρχεσθαι.....	"imminentium" (21:26)
ἐρωτᾶν.....	"interroganti" (23:3)
ἕτερος.....	"alios" (10:1), "aliam" (16:18), "alterum" (18:10)
εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.....	"adnuntiare" (4:43)
ἐφιστάναι.....	"insistat" (21:34)
καταξιοῦν.....	"dignatus est" (20:35)



κατέρχεσθαι . . . . .	"descendisse" (4:31)
κλαίειν . . . . .	"plorantes" (6:21)
κοιλία . . . . .	"uterum" (11:27)
κριτής . . . . .	"iudicem" (12:14)
κρούειν . . . . .	"pulsantibus" (13:25)
λαός . . . . .	"populum" (7:16), "populus" (18:43)
νῦν . . . . .	"nunc" (6:25), "abhinc" (22:69)
παραλύεσθαι . . . . .	"paralyticus" (5:18)
πατεῖν . . . . .	"calcandi" (10:19)
πλήν . . . . .	"tamen" (10:11)
πνεῦμα . . . . .	"spiritum" (11:2 and 13)
προβάλλειν . . . . .	"protulerint" (21:30)
προσδέχεσθαι . . . . .	"expectare" (12:36)
προσδοκία . . . . .	"expectatione" (21:26)
πίκνα . . . . .	"adsidue" (5:33)
συκοφαντεῖν . . . . .	"per calumniam eripui" (19:8)
συνευδοκεῖν . . . . .	"consentire" (11:48)
σωτηρία . . . . .	"salus" (19:9)
τε . . . . .	"-que" (21:11), "et" (21:11)
τυγχάνειν . . . . .	"possessione" (20:35)
ὑποδεικνύναι . . . . .	"demonstrabo" (12:5)
ὑποδέχεσθαι . . . . .	"exceptum" (19:6)
ὑποστρέφειν . . . . .	"revertentes" (24:9)
φάτνη . . . . .	"praesepi" (13:15)
φίλος . . . . .	"amico" (11:8), "amicos" (16:9)
χάρις . . . . .	"gratia" (6:34)

## 8. THE STYLE OF MARCION'S GOSPEL: AN ANALYSIS OF THE APPEARANCES OF 32 CHARACTERISTIC LUKAN USAGES IN MARCION'S RECOVERED TEXT

1. καὶ αὐτός	11. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις
2. ἐγένετο and infinitive	12. διὰ στόματος
3. ἐγένετο and finite verb	13. τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν
4. ἐγένετο and καί	14. ἰδοὺ γάρ
5. ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ	15. εἰς ἕκαστος
6. λέγειν (or εἰπεῖν) παραβολήν	16. φωνή μεγάλη
7. διδάξειν τὸν θεόν	17. παῖς αὐτοῦ
8. Genitive absolutes	18. Infinitive after ἐν τῷ
9. Double vocatives (such as Σιμών, Σιμών)	19. Infinitive with τοῦ to express purpose
10. καθ' ἡμέραν	20. εἰπεῖν (or λέγειν) πρὸς
	21. δὲ καί

- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| 22. εἰπεῖν (or λέγειν) δέ                                      | 27. ἄρχοντες (of the Jews)   |
| 23. εἰ δὲ μήγε   | 28. τὸ γέγονος               |
| 24. Combination of cognate words (such as φυλάσσαντες φυλακάς) | 29. ἔχω with infinitive      |
| 25. ἐν μέσῳ  | 30. ὄνομα ("whose name was") |
| 26. ἄν with optative   | 31. τις with nouns           |
|  | 32. πλήρης with genitive     |

Of these thirty-two usages, those numbered 3, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, and 32 I do not find at all in Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's recovered text. The remaining eighteen usages appear as follows: *καὶ αὐτός* (1) occurs only twice (16:24, 28) and in both cases its presence is attested only by Adamantius; *ἐγένετο* with infinitive (2) occurs only once (16:22) and (4) only once (18:35) and both are attested only by Adamantius (but cf. Epiphanius at 18:35); *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ* (5) appears only once (11:28) and is attested by Tertullian's "sermonem dei," but this expression belongs only to "A" and therefore has no significance here; *λέγειν παραβολήν* (6) appears once only (12:41) and then it is witnessed to by Tertullian's "dicerit parabolam"; the appearance of *δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν* (7) depends entirely upon Tertullian's "creatorem orantes" (7:16) and "reddens gloriam" (17:18); the two genitive absolutes (8) have the dubious foundation of Adamantius in one case (18:40) and Tertullian's "cum autem haec fiet" (21:28) in the other; *καθ' ἡμέραν* (10) is attested only by Adamantius (16:19) and Tertullian's "cottidianum" (11:3); *τις ἐξ ὑμῶν* (13) is once attested by Epiphanius (11:5), but the expression occurs only in "A" and "C"; *ἰδοὺ γάρ* (14) occurs only once (17:21) in Tertullian's "ecce enim"; *φωνῆ μεγάλη* (16) occurs once (23:46) and is attested by Epiphanius; there are four cases (8:42; 9:33; 18:35; 24:4) of infinitives following *ἐν τῷ* (18), three of which rest on doubtful Latin evidence and one on Epiphanius; *εἰπεῖν* (and *λέγειν*) *πρός* (20) occurs four times (12:1; 12:3; 12:41; 24:25), only twice with even reasonably adequate Latin support; *δὲ καὶ* (21) appears once (23:32) but is well attested by both Epiphanius and Tertullian; *εἰπεῖν δέ* (22) is found once (9:20) and is attested only by Adamantius; the same is true of (26) in 18:36; *ἔχω* with infinitive (29) occurs once (14:14) according to somewhat equivocal Latin evidence; *τις* with nouns (31) occurs seven times (9:19; 11:11; 14:16; 16:19; 16:20; 18:35; 24:41) with fair support in three of the cases; not only does (32) not appear, but Marcion's text of 5:12 apparently read *ἀνὴρ λεπρός*, rather than *πλήρης λέπρας*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN WORKS CITED

- ANDREWS, MARY. "Tendenz versus Interpretation: F. C. Baur's Criticisms of Luke," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1939).
- BACON, B. W. "The Latin Prologues of John," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1913).
- . "Marcion, Papias and the 'Elders,'" *Journal of Theological Studies* (1922).
- . "The Anti-Marcionite Prologue to John," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1930).
- BAKHUYZEN, W. H. VAN DE SANDE. *Der Dialog des Adamantius*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901.
- BARNETT, A. E. *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- BARNIKOL, E. *Philipp 2, der Marcionitische Ursprung des Mythosatzes Phil. 2:6-7*. Kiel: W. G. Mühlenau, 1932.
- . *Die Entstehung der Kirche in zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions*. Kiel: W. G. Mühlenau, 1933.
- BAUER, W. *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934.
- BAUR, F. C. *Paulus*. Stuttgart: Becher & Müller, 1845.
- . *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältniss zueinander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung*. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1847.
- . *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter, nebst einem Anhang über das Evangelium Marcion's*. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1851.
- . *Das Christentum und die Christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1853. Eng. trans., *Church History in the First Three Centuries*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1878.
- BELL, H. I. *Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937.
- BELL, H. I., and SKEAT, T. C. (eds.). *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1935.

- BLUDAU, A. *Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker*. Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1925.
- BOUSSET, W. *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891.
- BRUYNE, D. DE. "Prologues bibliques d'origine Marcionite," *Revue bénédictine* (1907).
- BUCKLEY, E. R. "Justin Martyr's Quotations from the Synoptic Tradition," *Journal of Theological Studies* (1935).
- BUONAIUTI, E. "Marcione e il nuovo testamento latino," *Ricerche religiose* (1926).
- BURKITT, F. C. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- CADBURY, H. J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- . "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface," *Expositor* (1921).
- . *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927.
- CASSELS, W. R. *Supernatural Religion*. London: Watts & Co., 1877-1902.
- CHARTERIS, A. H. *Canonicity*. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons, 1880.
- COLWELL, E. C., *The Study of the Bible*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- CORSSEN, P. "Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Römerbriefes," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1909).
- COUCHOUD, P. L. "La première édition de St. Paul," *Revue d'histoire des religions* (1926).
- . "Is Marcion's Gospel One of the Synoptics?" *Hibbert Journal* (1936).
- D'ALÈS, A. *Novatien: Etude sur la théologie romaine au milieu du III<sup>e</sup> siècle*. Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1924.
- DEISSMANN, G. A. *Licht vom Osten*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1908. Eng. trans., *Light from the Ancient East*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927.
- DIBELIUS, M. *Die Pastoralbriefe*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1931.
- . "The Text of Acts: An Urgent Critical Task," *Journal of Religion* (1941).

- DODD, C. H. *Epistle to the Romans*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1932.
- DUNCAN, G. S. *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929.
- EASTON, B. S. *The Purpose of Acts*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1936.
- EICHHORN, J. G. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804.
- ENSLIN, M. S. *Christian Beginnings*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1938.
- . "‘Luke’ and Paul," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (1938).
- FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J., and LAKE, K. (eds.). *The Beginnings of Christianity*. London and New York: Macmillan Co., 1920-33.
- GOODSPEED, E. J. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.
- . *The Formation of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- . *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- . *The Meaning of Ephesians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.
- . *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- . *New Chapters in New Testament Study*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1937.
- . *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- GRANT, F. C. "Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1937).
- GRANT, ROBERT. "The Oldest Gospel Prologues," *Anglican Theological Review* (1941).
- GREGORY, C. R. *The Canon and Text of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- HAHN, A. *Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt*. Königsberg: Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1823.
- HARNACK, A. VON. *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893-1904.

- HARNACK, A. VON. *Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200*. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1889.
- . *Die Apokryphen Briefe des Paulus an die Laodicener und Korinther*. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1905.
- . *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1908. Eng. trans., *The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Putnam, 1909.
- . *Bible Reading in the Early Church*. New York: Putnam, 1912.
- . *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914. Eng. trans., *The Origin of the New Testament*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1925.
- . *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1921 and 1924.
- . "Der Apokryphe Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Laodicener, eine Marcionitische Fälschung aus der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1923).
- . *Neue Studien zu Marcion*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1923.
- . "Der Marcionitische Ursprung der ältesten Vulgata-Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1925).
- . *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus und die anderen vorkonstantinischen Christlichen Briefsammlungen*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1926.
- . "Das Alte Testament in den Paulinischen Briefen und in den Paulinischen Gemeinden," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1928).
- HARRIS, J. R. *Four Lectures on the Western Text*. London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1894.
- . *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: University Press, 1891.
- . "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," *Expositor* (1914).
- . *Testimonies*. Cambridge: University Press, 1916-20.
- . "On the Trail of Marcion," in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.
- HARRISON, P. N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.

- . *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge: University Press, 1936.
- HAWKINS, J. C. *Horae synopticae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.
- HILGENFELD, ADOLF. *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's*. Halle: Schwetschke & Sohn, 1850.
- . "Das Marcionitische Evangelium und seine neueste Bearbeitung," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (1853).
- . *Der Kanon and die Kritik des Neuen Testaments*. Halle: C. E. M. Pfeffer, 1863.
- HOLL, K. *Epiphanius* (in Die Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften edition of the Greek Fathers). Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915-33.
- HOLTZMANN, H. "Lucas und Josephus," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche theologie* (1873).
- HUG, T. L. *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Stuttgart and Tübingen: J. G. Cotta, 1821.
- JACQUIER, E. *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'église chrétienne*. Paris: Gabaldi & Cie., 1911.
- JÜLICHER, A. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Tübingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1931.
- KNOX, J. *Philemon among the Letters of Paul*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- . "A Conjecture as to the Original Status of II Thessalonians and II Corinthians in the Pauline Corpus," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1936).
- . "'Fourteen Years Later'—a Note on the Pauline Chronology," *Journal of Religion* (1936).
- . "The Pauline Chronology," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1939).
- . "The Vocabulary of Marcion's Gospel," *ibid.*
- KRENKEL, M. "Ein Nachtrag zu dem Aufsatz: Josephus u. Lucas," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1873).
- . *Josephus und Lukas*. Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1894.
- KROYMANN, A. *Tertulliani opera*, Vol. III. ("Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum."). Vienna: F. Tempsky; Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1906.

- LA GRANGE, M. J. "Les Prologues prétendus Marcionites," *Revue biblique* (1926).
- LAKE, K. *The Earlier Epistles of Paul*. London: Rivingtons, 1911 and 1914.
- . "The Apostles' Creed," *Harvard Theological Review* (1924).
- . *The Text of the New Testament*. London: Rivingtons, 1901–28.
- . *Paul: His Heritage and Legacy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- LA PIANA, G. "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century," *Harvard Theological Review* (1925).
- LEIPOLDT, J. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1907.
- LIETZMANN, H. *An die Römer*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919 and 1928.
- . *Das Muratorische Fragment*. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1908.
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion"*. London and New York: Macmillan Co., 1889.
- . *Colossians*. London and New York: Macmillan Co., 1886.
- LOEWENICH, W. VON. *Das Johannes-Verständnis in zweiten Jahrhundert*. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1932.
- LOISY, A. "Marcion's Gospel," *Hibbert Journal* (1936).
- MCGIFFERT, A. C. *The Apostles' Creed: Its Origin, Its Purpose and Its Historical Interpretation*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.
- . *The God of the Early Christians*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- MOORE, L. V. "The Use of Gospel Material in Pre-Catholic Christian Literature." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1929.
- MUNDLE, W. "Der Herkunft der 'Marcionitischen' Prologue zu den Paulinischen Briefen," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1925).
- NEANDER, A. *Genetische Entwicklung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme*. Berlin: F. Dümmler, 1818.
- . *General History of the Christian Religion*. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1848.
- New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. (Oxford Society of Historical Theology.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.



- OVERBECK, F. "Über das Verhältniss Justins des Märtyrers zur Apostelgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1872).
- PETTY, O. A. *Did the Christian Use of the Term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Originate with Paul?* New Haven, Conn.: Norwood Press, 1925.
- PLUMMER, A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.
- RASCHKE, H. *Die Werkstatt des Markusevangelisten.* Jena: E. Diederichs, 1924.
- REUSS, E. *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments.* Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1860. Eng. trans., *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1884.
- RIDDLE, D. W. "The Occasion of Luke-Acts," *Journal of Religion* (1930).
- . *Paul: Man of Conflict.* Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940.
- RIST, M. "Pseudepigraphical Refutations of Marcionism," *Journal of Religion* (1942).
- RITSCHL, A. *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas.* Tübingen: Osiander, 1846.
- . "Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (1851).
- ROBERTS, C. H. *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel.* Manchester: University Press, 1935.
- SANDAY, W. "Marcion's Gospel," *Fortnightly Review* (1875).
- . *The Gospels in the Second Century.* London: Macmillan & Co., 1876.
- SCHÄFER, J. *Eine Altsyrische Antimarkionitische Erklärung von Parabeln des Herrn.* Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1917.
- SCHLEIERMACHER, F. E. D. *Einleitung ins Neue Testament.* Berlin: G. Reimer, 1845.
- SCHMIDT, J. E. C. "Über das echte Evangelium des Lukas," *Magazin für Religionphilosophie und Kirchengeschichte* (1796).
- . *Historisch-kritische Einleitung ins Neue Testament.* Giessen: Müller, 1804.
- SCHWEGLER, A. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung.* Tübingen: L. F. Fues, 1846.

- SEMLER, J. S. *Vorrede zu Townson's Abhandlung über die vier Evangelien*. Leipzig: Weygand, 1783.
- SODEN, H. VON. "Der Lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian," in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.
- SOUTER, A. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.
- STORR, G. C. *Über den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und die Briefe Johannis*. Tübingen: J. F. Heerbrandt, 1786.
- STREETER, B. H. *The Four Gospels*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1925.
- TITUS, ERIC L. "The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942.
- VOLKMAR, G. "Über das Lukas-evangelium nach seinem Verhältniss zu Marcion und seinem dogmatischen Charakter," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (1850).
- WEISS, J. *Das Urchristentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917. Eng. trans., *The History of Primitive Christianity*. New York: Wilson-Erickson, Inc., 1937.
- WESTCOTT, B. F. *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1855-70.
- WILSON, R. S. *Marcion: A Study of a Second Century Heretic*. London: Clarke, 1933.
- WORDSWORTH, J., and WHITE, H. J. *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889-1913.
- ZAHN, T. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888.
- . *Einige Bemerkungen zu Adolf Harnack's Prüfung der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Erlangen and Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1889.
- . *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1901.