

## THE ANTI-MARCIONITE PROLOGUES

ENGELBERT GUTWENGER, S.J.

*Heythrop College*

THE so-called anti-Marcionite prologues have met with considerable interest since Dom Donatien De Bruyne published his article "Les plus anciens prologues latins des Évangiles,"<sup>1</sup> in which he maintains that the old prologues to Mark, Luke, and John were written shortly after the Marcionite crisis and should, consequently, be of great historical interest, inasmuch as they show the tradition of the early Church concerning the authors of the Gospels. Harnack accepted De Bruyne's thesis and gave as the approximate date of the prologues the years between 160 and 180.<sup>2</sup> Other scholars, however, refused to conform to the new discovery. But recently, it has become more and more customary to use the anti-Marcionite prologues in discussions about the authorship of the Gospels. Reading through the articles by De Bruyne and Harnack, I was struck by the scantiness of the proofs given to establish the venerable age of the prologues. In the present article, therefore, I should like to submit De Bruyne's theory to a short criticism and to make some tentative suggestions about the date and origin of the prologues.

### CRITICISM OF DE BRUYNE'S PROOFS

To enable the reader to follow the argument more easily, I reproduce the prologues in the form established by De Bruyne.

#### *Anti-Marcionite prologue to Mark*

Marcus adseruit, qui colobodactylus est nominatus, ideo quod ad ceteram corporis proceritatem digitos minores habuisset. Iste interpretis fuit petri. Post excessionem ipsius petri descripsit idem hoc in partibus italiae euangelium (p. 196).

#### *Greek anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke*

Ἔστιν ὁ Δουκᾶς Ἀντιοχεὺς Σύρος, ἱατρὸς τῇ τέχνῃ. μαθητὴς ἀποστόλων γενόμενος, καὶ ὕστερον Παύλῳ παρακολουθήσας μέχρι τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ, δουλεύσας τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως, ἀγύβαιος, ἀπεκνος, ἐπὶ τῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων ἐκοιμήθη ἐν τῇ Βουιωτίᾳ, πλήρης Πνεύματος ἁγίου. οὗτος προῦπαρχόντων ἤδη εὐαγγελίων, τοῦ μὲν κατὰ Ματθαίου

<sup>1</sup> *Revue bénédictine*, XL (1928), 193-214.

<sup>2</sup> "Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologe und die Bildung des Neuen Testaments," *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse*, XXIV (1928), 322 ff.

ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀναγραφέντος, τοῦ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, οὗτος προτραπέει ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἀχαίαν τὸ πᾶν τοῦτο συνεγράψατο εὐαγγέλιον, δηλῶν διὰ τοῦ προοιμίου τοῦτο αὐτὸ ὅτι πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλλα ἐστὶ γεγραμμένα καὶ ὅτι ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνῶν πιστοῖς τὴν ἀκριβῆ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἐκθέσθαι διήγησιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ταῖς ἰουδαϊκαῖς μυθολογίαις περισπᾶσθαι αὐτοὺς, μήτε ταῖς αἰρετικαῖς καὶ κεναῖς φαντασίαις ἀπατωμένους ἀστοχῆσαι τῆς ἀληθείας. ὡς ἀναγκαιωτάτην οὖν οὖσαν εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ παρειλήφαμεν τὴν τοῦ Ἰωάννου γέννησιν, ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, πρόδρομος τοῦ Κυρίου γενόμενος καὶ κοινῶν ἐν τε τῷ καταρτισμῷ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ τῇ τοῦ βαπτίσματος διαγωγῇ καὶ τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος κοινωσίᾳ. ταύτης τῆς οἰκονομίας μέμνηται προφήτης ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα. καὶ δὴ μετέπειτα ἔγραψεν ὁ αὐτὸς Λουκᾶς πράξεις ἀποστόλων. ὕστερον δὲ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα ἔγραψεν τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ Πάτμῳ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (p. 197).

*Latin anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke*

Est quidem lucas antiochensis syrus, arte medicus, discipulus apostolorum: postea uero paulum secutus est usque ad confessionem eius, seruiens domino sine crimine. Uxorem numquam habuit, filios numquam procreauit, octoginta quattuor annorum obiit in boeotia, plenus spiritu sancto. Igitur cum iam descripta essent euangelia, per matthaeum quidem in iudaea, per marcum autem in italia, sancto instigatus spiritu, in aethiopia partibus hoc descripsit euangelium, significans per principium ante suum alia esse descripta, sed et sibi maximam necessitatem incumbere graecis fidelibus cum summa diligentia omnem dispositionem narratione sua exponere, propterea ne iudaicis fabulis desiderio tenerentur, neue haereticis fabulis et stultis sollicitationibus seducti excederent a veritate. Itaque perquam necessariam statim in principio sumpsit a iohannis natiuitate, quae est initium euangelii, praemissus domini nostri iesu christi, et fuit socius ad perfectionem populi, item inductionem baptismi atque passionis socius. Cuius profecto dispositionis exemplum meminit malachiel propheta, unus de duodecim. Et tamen postremo scripsit idem lucas actus apostolorum. Post-

*Monarchian prologue to Luke*

Lucas syrus, natione antiochensis, arte medicus, discipulus apostolorum, postea paulum secutus usque ad confessionem eius, seruiens domino sine crimine. Nam neque uxorem unquam habens, neque filios, LXXXIII annorum obiit in bithynia, plenus spiritu sancto. Qui cum iam descripta essent euangelia, per matthaeum quidem in iudaea, per marcum autem in italia, sancto instigante spiritu; in aethiopia partibus hoc scripsit euangelium, significans etiam ipse in principio ante alia esse descripta. Cui extra ea quae ordo euangelicae dispositionis exposcit, ea maxime necessitas laboris fuit ut primum graecis fidelibus, omni perfectione uenturi in carnem dei manifestata, ne iudaicis fabulis intenti in solo legis desiderio tenerentur, neue haereticis fabulis et stultis sollicitationibus seducti excederent a ueritate elaboraret, dehinc ut in principio euangelii, iohannis natiuitate praesumpta. [Cui euangelium scriberet, et in quo electus scriberet, indicare, contestificans in se completa esse quae essent ab aliis inchoata. Cui ideo, post baptismum filii dei, a perfectione generationis in christo impletae et repetendae a natiuitatis humanae pote-

modum iohannes apostolus scripsit apocalypsin in insula pathmos, deinde euangelium in asia.

stas permissa est, ut requirentibus demonstraret in quo apprehendens erat, per nathan filium introitu recurrentis in deum generationis admissio, indispartibilis deus ut praedicans in hominibus christum suum, perfecti opus hominis redire in se per filium faceret, qui per dauid patrem uenientibus iter praebebat in christo.] Cui lucae non immerito etiam scribendorum apostolicorum actuum potestas in ministerio datur. [Ut deo in deum pleno, ac filio perditionis extincto, oratione apostolis facta, sorte domini electionis numerus compleretur, sicque paulus consummationem apostolicis actibus daret, quem diu contra stimulos recalcitrantem dominus elegisset. Quod legentibus ac requirentibus deum, etsi per singula expediri a nobis utile fuerat, scientes tamen quod operantem agricolam oporteat de fructibus suis edere, uitamus publicam curiositatem, ne non tam demonstrare uolentibus deum uideremur quam fastidientibus prodidisse (pp. 197-8).]<sup>3</sup>

*Anti-Marcionite Prologue to John*

Euangelium iohannis manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis ab iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut papias nomine hierapolitanus, discipulus iohannis carus, in exotericis,<sup>4</sup> id est in extremis quinque libris retulit. Descripsit uero euangelium, dictante iohanne recte. Uerum marcion haereticus, cum ab eo fuisset inprobatus eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus est ab iohanne. Is uero scripta uel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in ponto fuerunt (p. 198).

De Bruyne argues as follows. The Latin prologues to Luke and Mark depend on a Greek original. This is easily established for the

<sup>3</sup> I have bracketed those passages which are omitted by De Bruyne but indicated by points (. . .).

In the middle of the Monarchian prologue to John, and well connected with the previous sentence, occurs the following: "Hoc autem euangelium (iohannes) scripsit in asia, posteaquam in pathmos insula apocalypsin scripserat . . ." Compare the last sentence of the anti-Marcionite prologue to Luke.

<sup>4</sup> *Exotericis*: FNS.

former prologue, since the Greek text is clearer and more exact. The latter contains the word "colobodactylus," which proves that it had originally been written in Greek. We may let this pass for the moment. In the following, we are faced with the crux of the matter. De Bruyne maintains that the prologue to John also is based on a Greek original, since the three prologues form a unit and are by the same author. How does he prove the last assertion? Thus:

1) The three prologues are united in the Spanish branch of bible MSS—TXE—and in the more important one, FNS.

2) The same phraseology occurs in Mark and Luke: "Descripsit idem hoc in partibus italiae evangelium," and "in aethiopiae partibus hoc descripsit evangelium."

3) Mark and Luke served as a basis for the Monarchian prologues in the fourth century.

4) Anti-Marcionite tendencies can be seen implicitly in Luke and explicitly in John (pp. 199–201).

Having thus proved the unity of the three prologues to his satisfaction, De Bruyne proceeds to assign their date to the second half of the second century. To do it successfully, he starts off by showing that they are of Roman origin. If they were not, how could one account for the reference to Mark's nickname "colobodactylus," which was known to Romans only? Moreover, the references to Marcion in the last prologue clearly point to Roman origin. Instead of naming Cerinthus or Ebion in connexion with St. John, the last prologue mentions Marcion, the only man who caused an acute crisis in the Church of Rome. Thus, for the dating of the prologues the following facts need to be taken into account:

1) They were written when Greek was the language of the Church of Rome.

2) They were written when detailed information about Mark and Luke was still available. Some points of the information are of a unique but not improbable sort.

3) They cannot be much later than the Marcionite crisis.

4) They are much earlier than the Monarchian prologues, as we have to allow a considerable length of time for their translation into Latin and their subsequent journey to Spain, where they were used for the Monarchian prologues (pp. 209–10).

On this basis, De Bruyne feels entitled to claim the years between the Marcionite crisis and the publication of Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses* for the birth of the anti-Marcionite prologues. According to him, Irenaeus is dependent on the anti-Marcionite Mark (p. 210). It is easy to see that De Bruyne's whole argument revolves on the unity of the three prologues as on its pivot. The prologue to Luke does not give any indication as to the whereabouts of its origin. The prologue to Mark may point to Rome and to a Greek original but does not betray any anti-Marcionite tendency. The prologue to John shows anti-Marcionite tendency but no clear trace of dependence on a Greek original—and, we may add, neither does it actually point to Roman origin. It is, therefore, of paramount importance to examine the reasons given by De Bruyne for the unity of the three prologues. Should our inquiry lead to the result that De Bruyne's proofs are unsatisfactory or that they are outweighed by reasons pointing to the non-unity of the prologues, we should have to investigate each prologue separately and to try in that way to find its date and origin.

I return now to the proofs for the unity of the prologues and propose to deal first with the evidence of the Bible MSS. De Bruyne examined thirty-seven MSS. The picture they furnish can be summarized briefly as follows. The prologue to Luke alone is found in twenty-one MSS<sup>6</sup>; to Mark in five; to John in three; to Luke and John in one; to Mark and Luke in one; to Mark, Luke, and John in six. Moreover, Luke is already contained in ff Paris of the fifth century; in D Paris 17226 of the seventh century; and in Kremsmünster Schatz 1 and Vienna 1224, both of the eighth century. The following names indicate the MSS in which all three prologues can be found:

- F Vat. Barberini 637, ninth century;
- N Munich 6212, tenth century;
- S Stuttgart fol 44; tenth century;
- T Toletanus, eighth century;
- X Madrid Univ. 32, tenth century;
- E Leon S. Isidro, tenth century (pp. 193-6).

<sup>6</sup> The prologue to Luke is also contained in a MS of Würzburg, as Harnack mentions, *art. cit.*, p. 323, footnote 2. The Greek Luke is found in 'Εδρ. Βιβλ. 91 (Athens), of the twelfth century (tenth century: Scrivener), and in Bodl. Misc. Gr. 141, of the eleventh century.

Of importance for De Bruyne are the last six codices. For it is they that are said to furnish the proof for the unity of the prologues. But do they really do so?

It is easy to show for FNS that either NS are dependent upon F, or all three on one other single codex. For in the prologue to St. John's Gospel there occurs in FNS the same faulty reading "exotoricis," whereas all the other MSS have "exotericis." "Exotoricis" does not make sense at all, and must have been copied from one single MS. Hence, the testimony for the unity of the prologues of the better branch of MSS, as De Bruyne likes to call FNS, has thus been reduced to one codex. From what century it dates, we do not know; but there is no reason to go much further back than the seventh.

This assertion, however, would seem to be invalidated by what we read in F 40: "Incipit secundum Lucam. Precipiente sanctissimo ac beatissimo Ecclesio preposito meo, ego Patricius, licet indignus, Christi famulus, emendaui atque distinxī. Est quidem Lucas. . . ." De Bruyne affirms that the scribe of F copied this sentence from his model. R. Eisler calls attention to a suggestion made by Bernhard Bischof and Dom Germain Morin that the Ecclesius of F is identical with a certain bishop who headed the Church of Ravenna from 521 to 532. An old account<sup>6</sup> tells us of a dissension among the clergy and of the bishop's subsequent journey to Pope Felix. It then continues: "Nomina presbiterorum, diaconorum vel clericorum Ravennatis ecclesiae, qui Roma venerunt cum episcopo: Patricius presbiter. . . ." Since the name Ecclesius is rare and is found here in connexion with that of Patricius, the above mentioned scholars would like to assume that these Ravennese are identical with the Ecclesius and Patricius of F.

However, the name Ecclesius does not seem to have been unique in Italy, and Patricius was very common. Further, the expression "prepositus" is not simply synonymous with bishop but can very well designate the superior of a monastery. It therefore would appear that Dr. Bischof's and Dom Morin's suggestion is an interesting conjecture, but hardly sufficient to establish the date of the model for F as lying between 521 and 532.

<sup>6</sup> *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel* (London, 1938), pp. 157-8.

<sup>7</sup> *Agnelli qui et Andreas liber pontificalis ecclesiae ravennatis, (Scriptores rerum langobardarum et italicarum [MGH])* p. 321.

The testimony of the Spanish branch of MSS—TXE—becomes equally valueless after a short investigation into the real state of affairs. In TXE, the prologues do not appear in their primitive form but are enlarged by additional matter. Thus, the anti-Marcionite prologue to Mark is continued in the following way:

... quem secutus sicut ipsum audierat referentem, rogatus romae a fratribus, hoc breue euangelium in italiae partibus scripsit. Quod cum petrus audisset, probauit ecclesiaeque legendum sua auctoritate firmavit. Uerum post discessum petri, adsumpto hoc euangelio quod ipse confecerat, perrexit aegyptum et primus alexandriae episcopus ordinatus, christum adnuntians, constituit illic ecclesiam. Tantae doctrinae et uitae continentiae fuit ut omnes sectatores christi ad sum cogeret imitari exemplum.

The prologue to John begins with an excerpt from St. Jerome,<sup>8</sup> which is followed up by the anti-Marcionite prologue: "Hoc igitur euangelium post apocalypsin scriptum manifestatum et datum est. . ."

These enlarged prologues of the Spanish Bibles are clearly the work of one redactor. Who is this redactor? Perhaps Bishop Peregrinus, who almost certainly is the editor of the Spanish recension of the Bible.<sup>9</sup> However, in the Spanish bishop-lists we meet no Peregrinus. Is Peregrinus therefore a pseudonym? Very likely. But to discover who is hidden under it, seems quite impossible. Some think it is Bacharius.<sup>10</sup> But all suggestions remain in the sphere of mere conjecture and are, therefore, quite useless for clearing up the problem of the prologues in the Spanish Bibles. The only thing we can say is that the Spanish form of the prologues comes from an unknown redactor. The fact that the Spanish Bibles also contain the Monarchian prologues—T has the Monarchian Mark and John—makes it even questionable whether the Spanish tradition adopted the anti-Marcionite prologues right from the beginning. Perhaps only later did they slip into the Bibles, as the Monarchian prologues were so obscure and difficult to understand.

The evidence of FNSTXE is thus reduced to two MSS. Hence, by contrast, the early and frequent appearance of isolated Luke makes it at least probable that Luke existed originally as an isolated unit

<sup>8</sup> *De uiris illustribus*, IX (*ML*, XXIII, 654-5): "Joannes apostolus . . . qui quattuor euangeliorum volumina legerint diligenter."

<sup>9</sup> S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate* (Paris, 1893), p. 28.

<sup>10</sup> G. Schepss, *Priscilliani quae supersunt* (*CSEL*, XVIII, 179: *Index nominum*, s.v., "Peregrinus").

and that only later some scribe added Mark and John. This probability will be strengthened by subsequent considerations.

The identity of phraseology on which De Bruyne bases his second argument is irrelevant. In late Latin such conjunctions as "in partibus Italiae" are not infrequent. We find one, for instance, in the so-called Marcionite prologues: "Romani sunt in partibus Italiae."<sup>11</sup> Cassian uses the same phraseology at least twenty times.<sup>12</sup> Further, St. Jerome would not have used "Achaiae Boeotiaeque partibus,"<sup>13</sup> if it had not been in accordance with the accepted usage of speech.

The statement that the old prologues to Mark and Luke were used by the author of the Monarchian prologues must be denied so far as Mark is concerned. The Monarchian prologue, nearly ten times as long as its anti-Marcionite counterpart, neither calls Mark, Peter's interpreter nor says that he wrote after Peter's death. It contains the statement: "Euangelium in italia scripsit." But surely, that bit of information need not have been borrowed from the anti-Marcionite prologue. The story of the mutilation of Mark's thumb positively excludes a literary dependence upon the anti-Marcionite prologue. For the Monarchian prologue gives us the following report: "Denique amputasse sibi post fidem pollicem dicitur, ut sacerdotio reprobis haberetur."

De Bruyne speaks of an anti-Marcionite tendency to be found implicitly in the prologue to Luke, and explicitly in that to John. The anti-Marcionite tendency in John is beyond doubt. But as regards Luke it is a different matter. Here the aim of St. Luke's Gospel is described in the following manner: "Ne iudaicis fabulis desiderio tenerentur, neue hereticis fabulis et stultis sollicitationibus seducti excederent a veritate." De Bruyne stresses the expression "hereticis fabulis" and asks: To which "hereticae fabulae" does the author of the prologue refer? I give his answer in his own words: "Luc commence son Évangile en racontant l'histoire de la naissance de Jean-Baptiste. Cette histoire est appelée *perquam necessaria*. . . .

<sup>11</sup> Cf. A. Harnack, *Marcion* (Leipzig, 1924), p. 128\*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *De Institutis coenobiorum*, II, 1 (*CSEL*, XVII, 18); II, 5, 5, (*ibid.* 22); III, Cap. 1 (*ibid.*, 32); IV, Cap. 31 (*ibid.*, 48); V, 38, 1 (*ibid.*, 109): "e partibus Italiae"; *Conlatio*, II, 2, 1 (*ibid.*, XIII, 40).

<sup>13</sup> Prologue to Luke. Cf. J. Wordsworth-H. J. White, *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, Latine* (Oxford, 1898), p. 12.



Marcion avait adopté l'Évangile de Luc, mais il avait supprimé le récit 'absolument nécessaire' de la naissance de Jean."<sup>14</sup> Thus De Bruyne proves the anti-Marcionite tendency in the prologue to St. Luke's Gospel. However, there is a more obvious explanation of the words "perquam necessaria." When dealing with the aim of the third Gospel, the prologue-writer quite clearly refers to its opening verses: "[Lucas] significans per principium. Now, St. Luke tells us in the beginning of his Gospel: (1) that other Gospels had been written before; (2) that it seemed good to him to write a Gospel himself; (3) that having followed up all things from the beginning he would try to set them out in an orderly account, with (4) the purpose of strengthening the faith of the reader. The prologue, in fact, repeats each point. "Ne iudaicis fabulis desiderio tenerentur, neue hereticis fabulis. . . a veritate excederent" is clearly an enlargement upon point (4), the phrasing probably having been taken from Titus 1:14 and II Timothy 2:18. The designation of the story of John's birth as "perquam necessaria" introduces the answer to the following question raised by point (3): If St. Luke intended to describe the story of our Lord, why does he begin with the birth of John the Baptist, and not with that of Christ? The answer is that John is the beginning of the Gospel—the Precursor of the Lord, His companion in teaching the people, in the introduction of baptism, and in suffering. The different elements of the answer seem to have been taken from St. Mark's Gospel. To call John the Baptist the beginning of the Gospel, reminds us of C. H. Turner's interpretation of Mark 1:1-4. He declares verses 2-3 to be parenthetical and connects thus: "The beginning of the Gospel about Jesus Christ, Son of God, was John the baptizer." Verses 2-3 speak of the Precursor, verse 4 of baptizing and preaching.<sup>15</sup>

It belonged to the technique of the prologue-writers to state the reason why an evangelist began his story just where he did. Marcion rejected the first two chapters of Luke because his doctrine was that Christ had possessed no real body, had not been born, and had no relatives. The author of an anti-Marcionite prologue would, therefore, have pointed out that St. Luke considered the description of the

<sup>14</sup> *Art. cit.*, p. 206.

<sup>15</sup> "Marcian Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel," *JTS*, XXVI (1925), 146; "A Textual Commentary on Mark I," *ibid.*, XXVIII (1927), 150.

birth of Christ as "perquam necessaria." Marcion would hardly have objected to the fact that John the Baptist had a mother by whom he was born. If the prologue to Luke were truly anti-Marcionite, it also would remain unintelligible why so much stress is laid on Luke's unmarried and virginal state. It was Marcion who had condemned marriage and the begetting of children. Why support Marcionite propaganda in an anti-Marcionite prologue?

I do not think that De Bruyne has proved the identity of authorship for the three prologues. Harnack himself confessed that it was difficult to believe the prologues to have come from the same pen. Indeed, a cursory glance at them reveals such disproportions of length and content, such difference of coloring and atmosphere that this alone should suffice to dispel any doubt about their difference in origin.

#### THE PROLOGUE TO MARK

The material of the prologue to Mark is probably taken from one of the lost works of Hippolytus.<sup>16</sup> "Colobodactylus" as nickname for St. Mark is found once more in Hippolytus.<sup>17</sup> The explanation of the nickname need not have been drawn from old tradition, as De Bruyne asserts; the explanation is obvious if *κολοβός* is translated "short," and not "maimed." The latter meaning seems to be at the basis of the Monarchian prologue. The rest of the prologue coincides with Irenaeus: *Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος . . . ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου. . .*<sup>18</sup> Since Hippolytus was a disciple of Irenaeus, or, at least, an industrious student of his works, one suspects that he would have utilized *Adversus Haereses* in writing about the evangelists.

It may be useful to emphasize that in the anti-Marcionite prologue to Mark, Irenaeus' *μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον* is copied in a mechanical way and without due regard to the general tenor of the passage, which does not deal with the chronology of the Gospels. The context of *Adversus Haereses* shows that St. Irenaeus had meant to say that the Gospel preached by St. Peter did not perish with his death, but was handed down after his death in the Gospel according to St. Mark.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Ὦδαί εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γραφάς?

<sup>17</sup> *Philosophomena*, VII, 30 (CSEG, *Hippolytus Werke*, III [Leipzig, 1916], p. 215).

<sup>18</sup> *Adv. Haereses*, III, 1, 2 (ed. W. W. Harvey, Cambridge, 1857, pp. 4-5).

<sup>19</sup> J. Chapman, "St. Irenaeus and the Dates of the Gospels," *JTS*, VI (1905), 563-9; Harnack, *Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels* (London, 1911), p. 130.

The other two texts which deal with St. Mark, those of Papias and Clement of Alexandria,<sup>20</sup> seem to be capable of reconciliation. Papias explains that Mark did not write an orderly account because he had to write from memory: Peter was indifferent to a written account of the Gospel which he preached.<sup>21</sup> I do not agree with T. W. Manson that the translation of *ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος* in the opening sentence of Papias has been settled as that given by Lawlor and Oulton, viz., "*Having been the interpreter of Peter.*"<sup>22</sup>

#### THE PROLOGUE TO LUKE

De Bruyne affirms that the Greek prologue to Luke represents the original text. Here is his proof: "Plusieurs détails ne sont clairs ou exacts que dans le grec."<sup>23</sup> This statement is rather sweeping than convincing. It is based on the bold assumption that original texts must be clearer than their translations. But such an assumption goes against facts. I have just read Chapman's translation of the Monarchian prologues.<sup>24</sup> Everyone will agree with me that his English translation is much clearer than the Latin original.

Quite contrary to De Bruyne's theory, there are several indications that the anti-Marcionite prologue is based on the Monarchian one.

1) In the Monarchian prologue the sentences "Lucas . . . seruiens domino sine crimine. Nam neque uxorem umquam habens. . ." are well connected. Priscillian had condemned marriage. In the anti-Marcionite prologue no such connection is found.<sup>25</sup>

2) The Monarchian prologue forms a perfect unit and is from beginning to end written in Priscillian's (Instantius') style.<sup>26</sup> It is easier to strip the Monarchian prologue of its obscurities than to turn a simple prologue into one which, though complicated, is not disjointed.

<sup>20</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI, 14 (*MG*, XX, 532).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. P. Gächter, "Zur Abfassungszeit des Markusevangelium," *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie*, LIV (1930), 425 ff.

<sup>22</sup> T. W. Manson, "The Life of Jesus," *Bull. of the John Rylands Libr.*, XXVIII (1944), p. 125, note 3.

<sup>23</sup> De Bruyne, *art. cit.*, p. 200.

<sup>24</sup> Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels* (Oxford, 1908), pp. 225-36.

<sup>25</sup> In the Monarchian prologue to the Fourth Gospel the virginity of St. John is likewise stressed. Nothing of that kind happens in the anti-Marcionite prologue to John.

<sup>26</sup> Chapman, *op. cit.*, pp. 217-249.

3) The mention of Matthew and Mark in the Monarchian prologue is well motivated. It explains Luke's *ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν*. The anti-Marcionite prologue appends references to the Apocalypse and St. John's Gospel. This would appear to be an extraneous addition. In fact, the references coincide with a sentence in the middle of the Monarchian prologue to John and are there well connected with the previous sentence.

4) In the Monarchian prologue the phrase "ne iudaicis fabulis intenti [cf. Titus 1:14] in solo legis desiderio tenerentur" makes good sense, whereas the same cannot be said of the anti-Marcionite "ne iudaicis fabulis desiderio tenerentur." The Greek prologue misses the Pauline terminology altogether: *ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ταῖς ἰουδαϊκαῖς μυθολογίαις περισπᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς*. . . . It is not easy to see how a translator should have given that Greek phrase in the words of the anti-Marcionite prologue. But, vice versa, it is quite intelligible why the writer of the Greek prologue should have omitted the "desiderio tenerentur" which did not make sense to him.

5) The structure of the Monarchian prologue to Luke is equally well discernible in the other three Monarchian prologues: biographical notes, aim of the evangelist and reason for the opening verses of his Gospel, theological notes, further biographical notes (missing in Matthew), and theological notes. Hence, the Monarchian Luke is an original work just as well as the other Monarchian prologues.

Unfortunately, there is no external evidence to show the priority of the Monarchian Luke. Chapman's attempt at arguing from the introductory sentences to the Greek prologue which is contained in Athens *Ἐθν. βιβλ.* 91, must be regarded as a failure. The introductory sentences run as follows: *τοῦτο ἐξ ἰδιοχειρῶν τοῦ ἁγίου πατριάρχου Μεθοδίου. Ἀναπαυσις τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Λουκᾶ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ εἰκαδὶ τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου μηνός*. Chapman thinks it likely that St. Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople, made an autograph version, when he visited Rome in the time of Paschal I (817-24). He is puzzled by the reference to the twentieth of September and writes: "The Greek feast (of St. Luke), Oct. 18, has been universal in the West since Bede, Ado, Usuard and their followers. But the Hieronymian Martyrology gives Sept. 21, and I presume that St. Methodius found his ancient

Western date given in the Latin MS from which he was translating."<sup>27</sup> But *ιδιοχειρον* means only *autograph*. And the date, the twentieth of September, is accounted for by the *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum* under the same date: *καὶ ἡ εἶρησις καὶ μετᾶθεσις τῶν χιτώνων καὶ περιβολοίων τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν Ἰωάννου καὶ Λουκᾶ, . . . ἅτινα κατατέθησαν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καὶ μεγάλων.*<sup>28</sup>

As a probable date for the anti-Marcionite prologue to St. Luke's Gospel, I would propose the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth, i.e., the time between the writing of the Monarchian prologues and that of ff.

#### THE PROLOGUE TO JOHN

After the learned discussions of Lightfoot, Zahn, Harnack, Corssen, Bacon, and Donovan, it must seem presumptuous if I embark on a new interpretation of the last of the anti-Marcionite prologues. But I must do so, if only to make a tentative suggestion as to its date.

The prologue, it seems to me, must be considered as a complete unit. Its background might be this: Marcion had rejected the Gospels, except that of St. Luke. The Marcionites denied that the Apostles themselves had ever written any Gospel account.<sup>29</sup> The Gospels of Matthew and John were considered as forged documents. In the ensuing controversy the Marcionites may have laid stress on John 21:24 which suggests an editor different from St. John. They may have argued that the editorial gloss of John 21:24 amounted to a pretence of posthumous publication so that the forgery might more easily pass for a genuine work.

Against these statements put out by the Marcionite sect, the prologue asserts both the authorship of, and the publication by, St. John. Papias is introduced as chief witness. The phrase "adhuc in corpore constituto" need not necessarily have stood in the *Dominical Oracles* of Papias, as Lightfoot conjectured.<sup>30</sup> There are perhaps some indications that Papias was commenting upon the Fourth Gospel.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 237.

<sup>28</sup> *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum* (ed. H. Delehaye, Bruxelles, 1902, col. 759).

<sup>29</sup> Adamantius, *Dial.*, II, 12 (CSEG, p. 83).

<sup>30</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion* (London, 1889), p. 213.

The note by Wardan Wardabet<sup>31</sup> seems to point to it. There is also in the *Kitab al-'Unwan* by Agapius of Manbig, an interesting passage treating of the twelfth year of Hadrian's reign: "About that time an eminent teacher lived at Manbig,<sup>32</sup> author of several treatises. He wrote five treatises about the gospel. *In one treatise about the gospel of John* he narrates. . . ."<sup>33</sup> I am not prepared to defend the historical reliability of Agapius. But there is the possibility that Papias had been commenting on the Fourth Gospel. He might even have quoted words of John the Elder in that connection. The prologue-writer, to whom John the Apostle and John the Elder were identical, would have easily concluded that the Fourth Gospel was published during John's lifetime.

The anti-Marcionite prologue then stresses the value of Papias' testimony. Papias was bound to know about the authorship and publication of the Fourth Gospel. For he had given an exegetical description (*ἀνεγράψεν*) of the Gospel and that (partly) at John's dictation. Eusebius speaks to the same effect.<sup>34</sup> There is no sufficient ground for thinking that the prologue-writer meant to depict Papias as John's secretary in the writing of the Fourth Gospel. The appeal to the *Catena* of Corderius lacks conviction when we read the whole passage of the *ἀνεπίγραφος*. He clearly indicates Irenaeus and Eusebius as his sources:

Ἵστατος γὰρ τούτων [εὐαγγελιστῶν] Ἰωάννης ὁ τῆς βροντῆς Ὑἱὸς μετακληθεῖς, πᾶν γηραλέου γενομένου, ὡς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν ὅτε Εἰρηναῖος. καὶ Εὐσέβειος, καὶ ἄλλοι πιστοὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν γεγονότες ἱστορικοὶ, κατ' ἐκείνου καιροῦ αἰρέσεων δεινῶν ὑπαγόρευσε [sic!] τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τῷ ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῇ Παπῆτι Εὐρώτῳ τῷ Ἱεραπολίτῃ πρὸς ἀναπλήρωσιν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ κηρυξάντων τὸν λόγον τοῖς ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἔθνεσιν . . . .

Papias the secretary of John is, therefore, nothing but a peculiar conjecture of an unknown writer.

The next sentence introduces Marcion. B. W. Bacon rightly postulates that the "recte" at the end of the previous sentence should be joined with the present one which then would run as follows: "Recte vero Marcion. . . ."<sup>35</sup> De Bruyne sharply criticized Bacon's

<sup>31</sup> *Patres Apostolici*, I (ed. Funk, Tübingen, 1901), 375.

<sup>32</sup> Agapius mistakes Hierapolis in Phrygia for Manbig, Hierapolis in Syria.

<sup>33</sup> *Patrologia Orientalis*, VII, 504-5.

<sup>34</sup> *H. E.*, III, 39, 14-17 (*MG*, XX, 296-7).

<sup>35</sup> "Marcion, Papias, and the 'Elders,'" *JTS*, XXIII (1921-22), 151 ff.; "The Anti-Marcionite Prologue to John," *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, XLVIII (1930), 43 ff.

suggestion as made "en dépit des manuscrits, de la grammaire et du bon sens."<sup>36</sup> But the testimony of the MSS is too vague, as many centuries lie between the composition of the prologue and the first MS that contains it. Bacon's grammar is better than that of De Bruyne. And good sense is admirably preserved in Bacon's correction, just as in *Pseudo-Tertullian*, III, 301: "Abiectus [Marcion] *merito* tam saevi criminis auctor. . ."

The interpretation of the present sentence offers some difficulty. The source from which the information about Marcion ultimately came must have contained some other name than that of John. Would the following suggestion be acceptable? Marcion's break with the Church took place in the year 144 at Rome. The bishop of Rome was Pius. We know further that Irenaeus, in his epistle to Victor, referred to the bishops of Rome as *πρεσβύτεροι*, and this kind of designation may have been common at his time. Borrowing from Donovan's translation,<sup>37</sup> I would read a line such as this in the source of the prologue: *Εικότως δὲ ὁ Μαρκίων αἰρετικὸς ἐλεγχεῖς ὅτι ἡτεροδόξει ἐξεβλήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου Πίου*. Hence, the Latin prologue would originally have read "a presbytero pio," instead of, "a Joanne." Very early some scribe changed "a presbytero pio," thinking that it referred to John the Presbyter, who to him was identical with the Apostle John.

For the last sentence of the prologue it is difficult to give any satisfactory explanation. Perhaps it refers to Marcion's Bible. "Scripta vel epistulas" might go back to *γράφαι*. Apart from other heretical views, Marcion had been condemned because of his heretical Bible. That seems to follow from many references in the works of the early Fathers. The final sentence would then imply that Marcion was already in possession of his Bible when he left his fellow Christians—or followers—in Pontus<sup>38</sup> and that he proposed his Bible to Pius in Rome at the famous gathering which pronounced his condemnation.

The whole prologue would then appear to state the following facts: Contrary to the teaching of Marcion, John the Apostle wrote and published the Gospel which is named after him. For this we have the testimony of Papias, the writer of exegetical Gospel-explanations some of which were dictated to him by John himself. Therefore,

<sup>36</sup> De Bruyne, *art. cit.*, p. 207.

<sup>37</sup> J. Donovan, S. J., *The Authorship of St. John's Gospel*, (London, 1935), p. 52.

<sup>38</sup> "ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν . . ."; ἀπό indicates the place from which Marcion came.

Marcion, denying the Johannine authorship, was justly condemned by Pius to whom he had shown his own abbreviated Bible which he had brought from Pontus.

Greek sources certainly lie at the bottom of the prologue, which, in its original form, may have been in Greek; the Latin is clumsy and its content can only be explained when retranslated into Greek. The two decades 160-180 are too early a date for the prologue, which supposes that Marcion himself had rejected the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. The evidence of the early Fathers, however, is to the contrary. From them it would appear that Marcion did not accept what he believed to have been written by John. The great excitement about the Alogoi at the close of the second century would be unintelligible if previously to their own denial of the genuinity of the Fourth Gospel, Marcion had spoken to the same effect. Harnack committed a serious error when he concluded from Adamantius that Marcion himself had denied the Johannine authorship.<sup>39</sup> From Adamantius<sup>40</sup> it follows only that the Marcionites of his time rejected John as the author of the Fourth Gospel. They may have appealed quite arbitrarily to the authority of their master. Hence, there is neither an internal nor an external reason for dating the prologue earlier than 300. And just as Adamantius wrote, not at Rome, but in Syria, so the prologue can have originated somewhere else than in Rome.

If the Latin is a translation, it must have been made at the beginning of the fourth century, before the Marcionite sect was suppressed by imperial edict. Later on, the Marcionite views hardly commanded so much interest as to warrant the translation of an anti-Marcionite prologue. The Latin of the prologue is that of the fourth century. The phrase "adhuc in corpore constituto" was regarded by Lightfoot and Harnack as a clumsy translation of *ἔτι ἐν σώματι καθεστῶτος*. In fact it is a phrase commonly used by Latin writers of the fourth century.<sup>41</sup> The participle of the present tense of *esse* did not

<sup>39</sup> Harnack, *Marcion* (Leipzig, 1924), p. 40.

<sup>40</sup> Wrote ca. 300.

<sup>41</sup> P. C. Juret, "Étude grammaticale sur le latin de s. Filastrius," *Romanische Forschungen*, XIX (1905), 175. For "in corpore constitutus," see Philastrius, *Diversarum haereseon lib.*, 79, 7 (CSEL, XXXVIII, 41); 128, 3 (*ibid.*, 94); Priscillian, *Canon* 84 (CSEL, XVIII, 144); Cassaiianus, *Conlatio*, I, 14, 1 (CSEL, XIII, 21).



exist and was supplied by *constitutus*. "Contraria sentiebat" does not hint at the *Antitheses* of Marcion—as Harnack suggests<sup>42</sup>—but is again a phrase of the fourth century.<sup>43</sup>

From what has been said, it would follow that the authority of the so-called anti-Marcionite prologues is at least questionable. Hence, it is uncritical to use them in the same manner as the documents of well-known writers of the early patristic literature.

<sup>42</sup> "Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologue," p. 334, note 2.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Philastrius, *Div. haer. lib.*, 116, 2; (*CSEL*, XXXVIII, 81), 131, 1: (*ibid.*, 99): "Sunt haeretici contraria sentientes."



Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.