

Let us return to the list of twelve. There appear to be two cases of paralysis. One is distinctly so described—the case of the man who was let down through the roof. The withered hand that was healed on the Sabbath was probably another. These cases would be confidently claimed for the Neurotic Theory. For there is no form of disease that is found more readily curable by a strong mental impression than motor paralysis, the inability to move the limbs by voluntary effort. But there are two kinds of paralysis. There is the hysterical kind, and there is the kind that is due to structural disease of the spinal cord or some other part of the motor nerve system. To which of these kinds of paralysis do the two cases before us belong?

There is little to go upon in either. Yet what little there is cannot be said to lead in the direction of hysterical paralysis. For, in the first place, hysterical paralysis is comparatively rare; while genuine paralysis from structural disease or injury is a common disorder. In the next place, hysterical paralysis is almost always found in women and

girls; the cases before us are those of men. Once more, the word 'withered' which is applied to one of the cases is a word which aptly applies only to a case of genuine paralysis.

Five cases remain. Dr. Ryle examines them one by one particularly. One is of fever, two of blindness, one of 'hæmorrhoids' or some disease peculiar to women, and one of leprosy. In not one instance is the ailment of a kind that lends itself readily to psychological treatment.

What is it that has led the critics of the miracles to ascribe these cures to faith-healing? Dr. Ryle believes that the consideration which has weighed most with them has been the fact that in connexion with acts of healing mention is so often made of faith. It is very kind of Dr. Ryle to make that suggestion, but it is not very complimentary to the critics. For even a medical man has little difficulty in seeing that the faith which the faith-healer demands is a very different thing from the faith which was demanded by Christ.

Marcion and the Canon.

BY PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.

THE *Revue Bénédictine* for January has a remarkable article by de Bruyne, entitled 'Biblical Prologues of Marcionite Origin,' in which the writer succeeds in showing that a very widely spread series of prefaces to the Pauline Epistles which occur in certain Latin Bibles must have been taken from a Marcionite Bible; and this discovery naturally suggests that we owe the Canon of the New Testament, in the first instance, to Marcion, and that the prefaces in question may go back to Marcion himself, for, in any case, the Marcionite hand from which they come antedates the Latin tradition in which we find the prologues embedded. And such a discovery as this of de Bruyne, taken with the suggestions to which it naturally gives

rise, forms an event in criticism, so far as the history of the Canon is concerned.

Now we all know that the Marcionite New Testament was a Canon: it defined inclusively and exclusively the books to be read in the Marcionite Church—one Gospel, viz. that of Luke; ten Pauline Epistles, forming the 'Apostle' to complete the 'Evangel'; and these ten Epistles occurred in a known order, which has left its mark on the literature of the subject. Hebrews was not included, but that required no deliberate exclusion, for it was clearly recognized as non-Pauline, and so self-excluded, rather than decanonized. But the case of the Pastoral Epistles is not so easy to explain. The orthodox, indeed, affirmed, and still

affirm, that Marcion deliberately excised them, and use the said Epistles to break Marcion's head with ; but, on the other hand, the modern critics maintain that these Epistles are not Paul's, and that it is more probable they were produced, wholly or in part, to discredit Marcion than that they were deliberately rejected by him. In any case, however, Marcion had a Canon, and the Pastoral Epistles and the Hebrews were not in it.

Westcott, in writing on the Canon (p. 312), admits that 'the Canon thus published is the first of which there is any record ; and, like the first Commentary [Heracleon], and the first express recognition of the Old and New Testament Scriptures [Basilides], it comes from without the Catholic Church, and not from within it' ; but he is reluctant to concede priority to the Marcionite Canon over the Canon of the Catholic Church, remarking that 'it is impossible to suppose that in these respects they [the heretical authors] suggested the Catholic view of the whole Bible instead of following it.' 'Impossible' is a strong word to use in face of such evidence ! The first harmony of the Gospels known to us also comes from heretical hands, though here there is at least a suspicion that something of the kind had already been attempted. It is not, however, impossible that Tatian may be the first Harmonist. But now let us come to de Bruyne and his discovery. Let us see how our knowledge of the facts can be extended without resorting to *à priori* impossibilities.

It is clear, from Tertullian's polemic against Marcion, that the Pauline Epistles stood in the following order in the Marcionite Canon :—

Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, then Ephesians (which Marcion calls by the name of the Epistle to the Laodiceans), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon.

The chief points to fix attention on are (a) the priority of Galatians, and the equivalence of the Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Laodiceans, for which equivalence there is much to be said in view of the omission of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ from early copies, and from the fact that it explains the similarity of the Ephesian and Colossian letters, and the reference in the latter to an Epistle to the Laodiceans which was despatched along with it. We may say, if we like, that Marcion has made a false identification between the (in his

day anonymous) Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to the Laodiceans, to which allusion is made at the end of Colossians ; in any case, he means what we call Ephesians by Laodiceans, and if he made a mistake it was a very innocent one compared with the forgery of an Epistle to the Laodiceans which took place in later times, and has found a place in many Latin Bibles.

In passing, we notice that the priority of Galatians is supported from other quarters. As an example, we may take the commentary of Ephrem Syrus on the Pauline Epistles, in which we find suggestions of a different order from that which Ephrem actually follows ; for example, although he begins with Romans, yet in the very first verse he makes St. Paul speak of imparting to you some spiritual grace, as I have done to *your companions the Galatians and Corinthians* ; and that this is not an accidental conjunction may be seen from the opening passages of the Commentary on the Hebrews ; there he discusses the question why, if the Epistle were St. Paul's, he had concealed his name, seeing that he made no such concealment in writing to the *Galatians, or the Corinthians, . . . or to the Romans*. Here, again, we see that Ephrem has in his mind an epistolary order—

Galatians, Corinthians, Romans.

Now this is the Marcionite order, and it is quite possible that Ephrem may have been under the influence of Marcionite texts and arrangements, for the Marcionite movement was strong in Edessa, and lasted late. It is at any rate noteworthy that the Canon of Marcion seems to be reflected in the writings of Ephrem. Whether Marcion meant the order in the Canon to be the historical order of production is an interesting question ; it does not, however, immediately concern us here. It is sufficient to remark that we know, with considerable accuracy, the order of the Pauline Epistles in the Canon of Marcion.

Now de Bruyne draws our attention to a series of Latin prologues to the Pauline Epistles, which go back as far as the Codex Fuldensis of the Vulgate ; that is, they have an attestation as early as the sixth century, which means that they are, in all probability, a good deal earlier ; and he proceeds to criticize the language and the statements made in these prologues. For example, suppose we place side by side the prologue to the Corinthians and the prologue to the Galatians.

'Ad Cor.

'Corinthi sunt Achaici: et hi similiter ab apostolo audierunt verbum veritatis et subversi multifarie a falsis apostolis,' etc.

Here the eye is at once struck by the fact that the prologue to Corinthians assumes the pre-existence of the prologue to the Galatians: each Church has been led astray by false apostles—the Galatians first, and then the Corinthians (*hi similiter*). So it looks as if the prologue formed a series in which Galatians had the front place, and Corinthians followed. This suggests the Marcionite order; and the matter of the prologues, with its sharp contrast between Paul and the false apostles, is also as Marcionite as the order. These false apostles are brought in everywhere, or almost everywhere, through the series; they try to lead the Christian believers to accept Judaism, circumcision, and the sect of the Law. Notice, in passing, that the Galatians are said to be Greeks, which looks like a very early testimony to the South Galatian theory. Since Marcion came from Pontus, he (and to some extent his followers) might be supposed to have some knowledge on the point.

Now let us turn to the prologues that are current in Vulgate and other MSS for Ephesians and Colossians: the Ephesian prologue runs as follows:—

'Ephesii sunt Asiani. Hi accepto verbo veritatis perstiterunt in fide. Hos conlaudat apostolus scribens eis a Roma de carcere.'

When, however, we turn to the Colossian prologue, we find that it opens as follows:—

'Colossenses et hi sicut Laodicensis sunt Asiani. Et ipsi praeveni erunt a pseud-apostolis nec ad hos accessit ipse apostolus sed et hos per epistulam recorrigit,' etc.

From this it is clear that originally the prologue to Laodiceans preceded the prologue to Colossians, and that the Ephesian prologue is a substitute for the Laodicean prologue, which can be partly reconstructed from the references to it in the Colossian prologue. We can see that it had a statement that the Laodiceans belonged to Asia Minor, that they had been under the influence of false apostles, and had never been visited by St. Paul, who corrects their errors by an Epistle.

'Ad Gal.

'Galatæ sunt Græci. Hi verbum veritatis primum ab apostolo acceperunt sed post discessum eius temptati sunt a falsis apostolis,' etc.

We have thus, in certain Vulgate MSS, a Catholic prologue for Ephesians which has displaced a Marcionite prologue. Notice, in passing, that the prologues have a Greek origin. When the translator of them came to deal with the false apostles, he first translated the word *ψευδαπόστολος* by *falsi apostoli*; but when he comes to Colossians he simply transliterates the Greek word. The variety of the forms *falsi apostoli* and *pseudapostoli* shows that he is translating with varying freedom. A little lower in the Colossian prologue we are told that the Apostle writes the letter *iam ligatus*: (ergo Apostolus iam ligatus [*v.l.* legatus] scribit eis ab Epheso). I am not quite sure whether we should not read *legatus*, and regard it as a reference to *πρεσβύτης νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δέσμιος* in Philem⁹, on the supposition that the composer of the prologues only took the words *πρεσβύτης νυνὶ* from the text; if, however, we read *ligatus*, the reference is still to the expression in Philemon; but we cannot argue for a translation from the Greek. We have now shown that the original Canon had

Laodiceans, Colossians.

It is interesting to observe how some Latin MSS naïvely admit this: 'You must know that the Epistle which we have as that written to the Ephesians, the heretics, and especially the Marcionites, entitle the Epistle to the Laodiceans.' The addition of these words to the prologue tell the tale of what happened when the Catholic prologue was substituted for the Marcionite.

We have only to state further that internal evidence shows that the Marcionite Canon to which the prologues belonged had single prologues for 1 and 2 Corinthians and for 1 and 2 Thessalonians; but that, when the prologues were taken over by the Catholic Church, Catholic prologues were written for 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, as well as for Ephesians, and that a series of three prologues were written for the non-Marcionite Epistles, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus.

This, then, is de Bruyne's discovery; and its importance in the history of the Canon is evident. I have little doubt that the prologues of the Marcionite 'Apostle' were originally written in Greek; possibly they may be found presently. As to their antiquity there can hardly be a doubt. It will be surprising if they do not go back very nearly, if not quite, to the time of Marcion himself.