

## I. The Gospel Of The Lord.

The Gospel of the Lord, Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Κυρίου, was the banner under which the left of the Christian army marched, as the right advanced under that of the Gospel of the Hebrews.

The Gospel of the Lord was used by Marcion, and apparently before him by Cerdo.<sup>389</sup>

In opposition to Ebionitism, with its narrow restraints and its low Christology, stood an exclusive Hellenism. Ebionitism saw in Jesus the Son of David, come to re-edit the Law, to provide it with new sanction, after he had winnowed the chaff from the wheat in it. Marcionism looked to the Atonement, the salvation wrought by Christ for all mankind, to the revelation of the truth, the knowledge (γνῶσις) of the mysteries of the Godhead made plain to men, through God the good and merciful, who sent His Son to bring men out of ignorance into light, out of the bondage of the Law into the freedom of the Gospel.<sup>390</sup>

[236]

The Gospel, in the eyes of Marcion and the extreme followers of St. Paul, represented free grace, overflowing goodness, complete reconciliation with God.

But such goodness stood contrasted with the stern justice of the Creator, as revealed in the books of the Old Testament; infinite, unconditioned forgiveness was incompatible with the idea of God as a Lawgiver and a Judge. The restraint of the Law and the freedom of the Gospel could no more emanate from the same source than sweet water and bitter.

Therefore the advanced Pauline party were led on to regard the God who is revealed in the Old Testament as a different

<sup>389</sup> Tert. De praescr. haeretica, c. 51. "Cerdon solum Lucae Evangelium, nec tamen totum recipit."

<sup>390</sup> For an account of the doctrines of Marcion, the authorities are, The Apologies of Justin Martyr; Tertullian's treatise against Marcion, i.-v.; Irenaeus against Heresies, i. 28; Epiphanius on Heresies, xlii. 1-3; and a "Dialogus de recta in Deum fide," printed with Origen's Works, in the edition of De la Rue, Paris, 1733, though not earlier than the fourth century.

God from the God revealed by Christ. Cerdo first, and Marcion after him, represented the God of this world, the Demiurge, to be the author of evil; but the author of evil only in so far as that his nature being incomplete, his work was incomplete also. He created the world, but the world, partaking in his imperfection, contains evil mixed with good. He created the angel-world, and part of it, through defect in the divinity of their first cause, fell from heaven.

The germs of this doctrine, it was pretended, were to be found in St. Paul's Epistles. In the second to the Corinthians, after speaking of the Jews as blinded to the revelation of the Gospel by the veil which is on their faces, the apostle says: "The God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them."<sup>391</sup> St. Paul had no intention of representing the God of the Jews who veiled their eyes as opposed to Christ; but it is easy to see how readily those who followed his doctrine of antagonism between the Law and the Gospel would be led to suppose that he did identify the God of the Law with the principle of obstructiveness and of evil. [237]

So also St. Paul's teaching that sin was produced by the Law, that it had no positive existence, but was called into being by the imposition of the Commandments, lent itself with readiness to Marcion's system. "The Law entered, that the offence might abound."<sup>392</sup> "The motions of sins are by the Law."<sup>393</sup> "I had not known sin, but by the Law: for I had not known lust, except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet."<sup>394</sup>

This Law, imposed by the God of the Jews, is then the source of sin. It is imposed, not on the spirit, but on the flesh. In opposition to it stands the revelation of Jesus Christ, which repeals the

---

<sup>391</sup> 1 Cor. iv. 4.

<sup>392</sup> Rom. v. 20.

<sup>393</sup> Rom. vi. 5.

<sup>394</sup> Rom. vii. 7.

Law of the Jews. "The Law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."<sup>395</sup> "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified without the deeds of the Law."<sup>396</sup> "Before faith came, we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith; but after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster."<sup>397</sup>

[238]

We find in St. Paul's writings all the elements of Marcion's doctrine, but not compacted into a system, because St. Paul never had worked out such a theory, and would have shrunk from the conclusions which might be drawn from his words, used in the heat of argument, for the purpose of opposing an error, not of establishing a dogmatic theory.

The whole world lay, according to Marcion, under the dispensation of the Demiurge, and therefore under a mixed government of good and evil. To the Jewish nation this Demiurge revealed himself. His revelation was stern, uncompromising, imperfect. Then the highest God, the God of love and mercy, who stood opposed to the inferior God, the Creator, the God of justice and severity, sent Jesus Christ for the salvation of all (*ad salutem omnium gentium*) to overthrow and destroy (*arguere, redarguere, ἐλέγχειν, καταλύειν*) "the Law and the Prophets," the revelation of the world-God, the God of the Jews.

The highest God, whose realm and law were spiritual, had been an unknown God (*deus ignotus*) till Christ came to reveal Him. The God of this world and of the Jews had a carnal realm, and a law which was also carnal. They formed an antithesis, and true Christianity consisted in emancipation from the carnal law. The created world under the Demiurge was bad; matter was evil; spirit alone was pure. Thus the chain unrolled, and lapsed

---

<sup>395</sup> Rom. viii. 2.

<sup>396</sup> Rom. iii. 28.

<sup>397</sup> Gal. iii. 23-25.

into Manichaeism. Cerdo and Marcion stood in the same relation to Manes that Paul stood in to them. Manichaeism was not yet developed; it was developing.

Gnosticism, with easy impartiality, affected Ebionitism on one side and Marcionism on the other, intensifying their opposition. It was like oxygen combining here to form an alkali, there to generate an acid.

The God of love, according to Marcion, does not punish. His dealings with man are, all benevolence, communication of free grace, bestowal of ready forgiveness. For if sin be merely violation of the law of the God of this world, it is indifferent to the highest God, who is above the Demiurge, and regards not his vexatious restrictions on the liberty of man. [239]

Yet Marcion was not charged by his warmest antagonists with immorality. They could not deny that the Marcionites entirely differed from other Pauline Antinomians in their moral conduct—that, for example, in their abhorrence of heathen games and pastimes they came fully up to the standard of the most rigid Catholic Christians. While many of the disciples of St. Paul, who held that an accommodation with prevailing errors was allowable, that no importance was to be attached to externals, found no difficulty in evading the obligation to become martyrs, the Marcionites readily, fearlessly, underwent the interrogations of the judges and the tortures of the executioner.<sup>398</sup>

Marcion, there is no doubt, regarded St. Paul as the only genuine apostle, the only one who remained true to his high calling. He taught that Christ, after revealing himself in his divine power to the God of this world, and confounding him unto submission, manifested himself to St. Paul,<sup>399</sup> and commissioned him to preach the gospel.

He rejected all the Scriptures now accounted canonical, except the Epistles of St. Paul, which formed with him an “Apostoli-

<sup>398</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. iv. 15, vii. 12. De Martyr. Palaest. 10.

<sup>399</sup> Cf. 1 Col. ix. 1, xv. 8; 2 Cor. xii.



con,” in which they were arranged in the following order:—The Epistle to the Galatians, the First and Second to the Corinthians, the Epistles to the Romans, the Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and to the Philippians.<sup>400</sup>

[240]

Besides the Epistles of St. Paul, he made use of an original Gospel, which he asserted was the evangelical record cited and used by Paul himself. The other Canonical Gospels he rejected as corrupted by Judaizers.

This Gospel bore a close resemblance to that of St. Luke. “Marcion,” says Irenaeus, “has disfigured the entire Gospel, he has reconstructed it after his own fancy, and then boasts that he possesses the true Gospel.”<sup>401</sup>

Tertullian assures us that Marcion had cut out of St. Luke's Gospel whatever opposed his own doctrines, and retained only what was in favour of them.<sup>402</sup> This statement, as we shall see presently, was not strictly true.

Epiphanius is more precise. He goes most carefully over the Gospel used by Marcion, and discusses every text which, he says, was modified by the heretic.<sup>403</sup>

The charge of mutilating the Canonical Gospels was brought by the orthodox Fathers against both the Ebionites on one side, and the Marcionites and Valentinians on the other, because the Gospels they used did not exactly agree with those employed by the middle party in the Church which ultimately prevailed. But the extreme parties on their side made the same charge against the Catholics.<sup>404</sup> It is not necessary to believe these charges in every case.

<sup>400</sup> Epiphan. Haeres. xlii. 11.

<sup>401</sup> Iren. adv. Haeres. iii. 11.

<sup>402</sup> “Contraria quaeque sententiae emit, competentia autem sententiae reservavit.”—Tertul. adv. Marcion, iv. 6.

<sup>403</sup> Epiphan. Haeres. xlvii. 9-12.

<sup>404</sup> “Ego meum, (Evangelium) dico verum, Marcion suum. Ego Marcionis affirmo adulteratum, Marcion meum. Quis inter nos disceptabit?”—Tert. adv. Marcion, iv. 4.

If the Gospels<sup>405</sup> were compiled as in the manner I have contended they were, such discrepancies must have occurred. Every Church had its own collection of the “Logia” and of the “Practhenta” of Christ. The more voluminous of these collections, those better strung together, thrust the earlier, less complete, collections into the back-ground. And these collections were continually being augmented by the acquisition of fresh material; and this new material was squeezed into the existing text, often without much consideration for the chain of story or teaching which it broke and dislocated. [241]

Marcion was too conscientious and earnest a man wilfully to corrupt a Gospel. He probably brought with him to Rome the Gospel in use at Sinope in Pontus, of which city, according to one account, his father was bishop. The Church in Sinope had for its first bishop, Philologus, the friend of St. Paul, if we may trust the pseudo-Hippolytus and Dorotheus. It is probable that the Church of Sinope, when founded, was furnished by St. Paul with a collection of the records of Christ's life and teaching such as he supplied to other “Asiatic” churches. And this collection was, no doubt, made by his constant companion Luke.

Thus the Gospel of Marcion may be Luke's original Gospel. But there is every reason to believe that Luke's Gospel went through considerable alteration, probably passed through a second edition with considerable additions to it made by the evangelist's own hand, before it became what it now is, the Canonical Luke.

He may have found reason to alter the arrangement of certain incidents; to insert whole paragraphs which had come to him since he had composed his first rough sketch; to change certain expressions where he found a difference in accounts of the same sayings, or to combine several.

---

<sup>405</sup> Not St. John's Gospel; that is unique; a biography by an eye-witness, not a composition of distinct notices.

[242]

Moreover, the first edition was published in the full heat of the Pauline controversy. Its strong Paulinianism lies on the surface. But afterwards, when this excitement had passed away, and the popular misconception of Pauline sola-fidianism had become a general offence to morals and religion, then Luke came under the influence of St. John, and tempered his Gospel by adding to it incidents Paul did not care to have inserted in the Gospel he wished his converts to receive, or the accuracy of which, as disagreeing with his own views, he was disposed to question.

Of this I shall have more to say presently. It is necessary, in the first place, briefly to show that Marcion's Gospel contained a different arrangement of the narrative from the Canonical Luke, and was without many passages which it is not possible to believe he wilfully excluded. For instance, in Marcion's Gospel: "And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: and they lifted up their voices, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. And when he saw them, he said unto them, Go, show yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that as they went, they were cleansed. And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed saving Naaman the Syrian. And one of them, when he saw that he was healed," &c. Here the order is Luke xvii. 12, 13, 14, iv. 27, xvii. 15. Such a disturbance of the text in the Canonical Gospel could serve no purpose, would not support any peculiar view of Marcion, and cannot therefore have been a wilful alteration. And in the first chapter of Marcion's Gospel this is the sequence of verses whose parallels in St. Luke are: iii. 1, iv. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44.

[243]

Thus the order of events is different in the two Gospels. Christ goes first to Capernaum in the "Gospel of the Lord," and afterwards to Nazareth, an inversion of the order as given in the Gospel of St. Luke. Again, in this instance, no purpose was served by this transposition. It is unaccountable on the theory

that Marcion corrupted the Gospel of Luke; but if we suppose that Luke revised the arrangement of his Gospel after its first publication, the explanation is simple enough.

But what is far more conclusive of the originality of Marcion's Gospel is, that his Gospel was without several passages which occur in St. Luke, and which do apparently favour his views. Such are Luke xi. 51, xiii. 30 and 34, xx. 9-16. These contain strong denunciations of the Jews by Jesus Christ, and a positive declaration that they had fallen from their place as the elect people. Marcion insisted on the abrogation of the Old Covenant; it was a fundamental point in his system; he would consequently have found in these passages powerful arguments in favour of his thesis. He certainly would not have excluded them from his Gospel, had he tampered with the text, as Irenaeus and Tertullian declare.

Yet Marcion would not scruple to use the knife upon a Gospel that came into his hands, if he found in it passages that wholly upset his doctrine of the Demiurge and of asceticism. For when the Church was full of Gospels, and none were as yet settled authoritatively as canonical, private opinion might, unrebuked, choose one Gospel and reject the others, or subject any Gospel to critical supervision. The manner in which the Gospels were composed laid them open to criticism. Any Church might hesitate to accept a saying of our Lord, and incorporate it with the Gospel with which it was acquainted, till satisfied that the saying was a genuine, apostolic tradition. And how was a Church to be satisfied? By internal evidence of genuineness, when the apostles themselves had passed away. Consequently, each Church was obliged to exert its critical faculty in the composition of its Gospel. And that the churches did exert their judgment freely is evidenced by the mass of apocryphal matter which remains, the dross after the refining, piled up in the Gospels of Nicodemus, of the Infancy of Thomas, and of Joseph the Carpenter. All of which was deliberately rejected as resting on no apostolic authority, as [244]

not found in any Church to be read at the sacred mysteries, but as mere folk-tales buzzed about, nowhere producing credentials of authenticity.

Marcion, following St. Paul, declared that the Judaizing Church had “corrupted the word of God,”<sup>406</sup> meaning such “logia” as, “I am not come to destroy the Law or the Prophets.” “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all is fulfilled.”<sup>407</sup> These texts would naturally find no place in the original Pauline Gospels used by the Churches he had founded. In St. Luke's Gospel, accordingly, the Law and the Prophets are said to have been until John, and since then the Gospel, “the kingdom of God.”<sup>408</sup> But the following verse in St. Luke's Gospel is, “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the Law to fail”—a contradiction of the immediately preceding verse, which declares that the Law has ceased with the proclamation of the Gospel. This verse, therefore, cannot have existed in its present form in the original Gospel of St. Luke, and must have been modified when a reconciliation had been effected between Petrine and Pauline Christianity.

[245]

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the verse should read differently in Marcion's Gospel, which contains the uncorrupted original passage, and runs thus “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of my words to fail;” or perhaps, “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the words of the Lord to fail;” for in this instance we have not the exact words.<sup>409</sup>

But though Marcion certainly endured the presence of texts in his Gospel which militated against his system, he may have cut

<sup>406</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 17, and iv. 2.

<sup>407</sup> Matt. v. 17, 18.

<sup>408</sup> Luke xvi. 16.

<sup>409</sup> Tert.: “Transeat coelum et terra citius quam unus apex verborum Domini;” but Tertullian is not quoting directly, so that the words may have been, and probably were, τῶν λόγων μου, not τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ.

out other passages. Passages, or words only, which he thought had crept into the text without authority. This can scarcely be denied when the texts are examined which are wanting in his Gospel. No strong conservative attachment to any particular Gospels had grown up in the Church as yet; no texts had been authoritatively sanctioned. As late as the end of the second century (A.D. 190), the Church of Rhossus was using its own Gospel attributed to Peter, till Serapion, bishop of Antioch, thinking that it contained Docetic errors, probably because of omissions, suppressed it,<sup>410</sup> and substituted for it, in all probability, one of the more generally approved Gospels.

The Church of Rhossus was neither heretical nor schismatical; it formed part of the Catholic Church, and, no objection was raised against its use of a Gospel of its own, till it was suggested that this Gospel contained errors of doctrine. No question was raised whether it was an authentic Gospel by Peter or not; the standard by which it was measured was the traditional faith of the Church. It did not agree with this standard, and was therefore displaced. St. Epiphanius and St. Jerome assert, probably unjustifiably, that the orthodox did not hesitate to amend their Gospels, if they thought there were passages in them objectionable or doubtful. Thus they altered the passage in which Jesus is said to have wept over Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41). St. Epiphanius [246] frankly tells us so. "The orthodox," says he, "have eliminated these words, urged to it by fear, and not feeling either their purpose or force."<sup>411</sup> But it is more likely that the weeping of Jesus over Jerusalem was inserted by Luke in his Gospel at the time of reconciliation under St. John, so as to make the Pauline Gospel exhibit Jesus moved with sympathy for the holy city, the head-quarters of the Law. The passage is not in Marcion's Gospel; and though it is possible he may have removed it, it is also possible that he did not find it in the Pauline Gospel of the

<sup>410</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi. 12; Theod. Fabul. haeret. ii. 2.

<sup>411</sup> Epiphan. Ancor. 31.

Church at Sinope.

St. Jerome says that Luke xxii. 43, 44, were also eliminated from some copies of the Canonical Gospel. "The Greeks have taken the liberty of extracting from their texts these two verses, for the same reason that they removed the passage in which it is said he wept.... This can only come from superstitious persons, who think that Jesus Christ could not have become as weak as is represented."<sup>412</sup> St. Hilary says that these verses were not found in many Greek texts, or in some Latin ones.<sup>413</sup>

But here, also, the assertion of St. Jerome and St. Hilary cannot be taken as a statement of fact, but rather as a conclusion drawn by them from the fact that all copies of the Gospel of St. Luke did not contain these two verses. They are wanting in the Gospel of our Lord, and may be an addition made to the Gospel of St. Luke, after it had been first circulated. There is reason to suppose that after St. Luke had written his Gospel, additional matter may have been provided him, and that he published a second, and enlarged, edition of his Gospel. Thus some Churches would be in possession of the first edition, and others of the second, and Jerome and Epiphanius, not knowing this, would conclude that those in possession of the first had tampered with their text.

[247]

The Gospel of Marcion has been preserved to us almost in its entirety. Tertullian regarded Marcionism as the most dangerous heresy of his day. He wrote against it, and carefully went through the Marcionite Gospel to show that it maintained the Catholic faith, though it differed somewhat from the Gospel acknowledged by Tertullian, and that therefore Marcion's doctrine was untenable.<sup>414</sup> He does not charge Marcion with having interpolated or curtailed a Canonical Gospel, for Marcion was ready to retort the charge against the Gospel used by Tertullian.<sup>415</sup>

<sup>412</sup> Hieron. adv. Pelag. ii.

<sup>413</sup> Hilar. De Trinit. x.

<sup>414</sup> "Christus Jesus in evangelio tuo meus est."

<sup>415</sup> See note 4 on p. 240.

It is not probable that Tertullian passed over any passage in the “Gospel of the Lord” which could by any means be made to serve against Marcion's system. This is the more probable, because Tertullian twists the texts to serve his purpose which in the smallest degree lend themselves to being so treated.<sup>416</sup>

St. Epiphanius has gone over much the same ground as Tertullian, but in a different manner. He attempts to show how wickedly Marcion had corrupted the Word of God, and how ineffectual his attempt had been, inasmuch as passages in his corrupted Gospel served to destroy his system.

With these two purposes he went through the whole of the “Gospel of the Lord,” and accompanied it with a string of notes, indicating all the alterations and omissions he found in it. Each text from Marcion's Gospel, or Scholion, is accompanied by a refutation. Epiphanius is very particular. He professes to disclose “the fraud of Marcion from beginning to end.” And the pains he took to do this thoroughly appear from the minute differences between the Gospels which he notices.<sup>417</sup> At the same time, he does not extract long passages entire from the Gospel, but indicates their subject, where they agreed exactly with the received text. It is possible, therefore, that other slight differences may have existed which escaped his eye, but the differences can only have been slight. [248]

The following table gives the contents of the Gospel of Marcion. It contains nothing that is not found in St. Luke's Gospel. But some of the passages do not agree exactly with the parallel passages in the Canonical Gospel.

THE GOSPEL (Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον).<sup>418</sup>

<sup>416</sup> As xix. 10 “Filius hominis venit, saluum facere quod perfit ... elisa est sententia haereticorum negantium *carnis* salutem;—pollicebatur (Jesus) *totius* hominis salutem.”

<sup>417</sup> Sch. 4. ἐν αὐτοῖς for μετ’ αὐπῶν. Sch. 1, ὑμῖν for αὐτοῖς. Sch. 26, κλησιν for κρίσιν. Sch. 34, πάτερ for πάτερ ὑμῶν, &c.

<sup>418</sup> Marcion called his Gospel “The Gospel,” as the only one he knew and



Chap. i.<sup>419</sup>

1. Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate ruling in Judea, Jesus came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and straightway on the Sabbath days, going into the synagogue, he taught.<sup>420</sup>

[249]

2. And they were astonished at his doctrine: for his word was with power.

3. And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice,

4. Saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, Jesus?<sup>421</sup> Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God.

5. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not.

6. And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out.

7. And he arose out of the synagogue,<sup>422</sup> and entered into Simon's house. And Simon's wife's mother was taken with a great fever; and they besought him for her.

8. And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever, and it left her: and immediately she arose and ministered unto them.

9. And the fame of him went out into every place of the country round about.

---

recognized, or "The Gospel of the Lord."

<sup>419</sup> The division into chapters is, of course, arbitrary.

<sup>420</sup> Ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, ἡγεμονεύοντος (St. Luke, ἐπιτροπεύοντος), Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, κατῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Καπερναοὺμ, πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ εὐθέως τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκε (St. Luke, καὶ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν).

<sup>421</sup> Ναζαρηνέ omitted.

<sup>422</sup> St. Luke iv. 37 omitted here, and inserted after iv. 39.

10. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.<sup>423</sup>

11. And he came to Nazareth;<sup>424</sup> and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day,<sup>425</sup> and he began to preach to them.<sup>426</sup>

12. And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth.<sup>427</sup>

13. And he said unto them, Ye will surely say unto me this [250] proverb, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here.<sup>428</sup>

14. But I tell you of a truth, many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout the land;

15. But unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow.

16. And many lepers were in the time of Eliseus the prophet in Israel,<sup>429</sup> and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian.

17. And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath,

18. And rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong.

19. But he passing through the midst of them, went his way to Capernaum.<sup>430</sup>

<sup>423</sup> Luke iv. 15 inserted here.

<sup>424</sup> οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος omitted.

<sup>425</sup> ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶσαι omitted, and Luke iv. 17-20.

<sup>426</sup> καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν αὐτοῖς. St. Luke has, Ἦρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτούς, ὅτι σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὡσὶν ὑμῶν.

<sup>427</sup> The rest of the verse (22) omitted.

<sup>428</sup> ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου omitted.

<sup>429</sup> ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ after ἐπὶ Ἑλισσαίου τοῦ προφήτου.

<sup>430</sup> ἐπορεύετο εἰς Καπερναοῦμ. St. Luke has, ἐπορεύετο καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ.

20. And when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him, &c. (as St. Luke iv. 40-44).

Chap. ii.

Same as St. Luke v.

Verse 14 differed slightly. For εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, Marcion's Gospel had ἵνα τοῦτο ᾗ μαρτύριον ὑμῖν, "that this may be a testimony to you."

Chap. iii.

Same as St. Luke vi.

Verse 17, for μετ' αὐτῶν, Marcion read ἐν αὐτοῖς; "among them" for "with them."

Chap. iv.

Same as St. Luke vii.

Verses 29-35 omitted.

Chap. v.

Same as St. Luke viii.

But verse 19 was omitted by Marcion.

And verse 21 read: "And he answering, said unto them, Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?<sup>431</sup> My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it."

Chap. vi.

Same as St. Luke ix.

But verse 31 was omitted.

Chap. vii.

Same as St. Luke x.

But verse 21 read: "In that hour he rejoiced in the Spirit, and said, I praise and thank thee, Lord of Heaven, that those things

[251]

<sup>431</sup> τίς μου ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί.

which were hidden from the wise and prudent thou hast revealed to babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.”<sup>432</sup>

And verse 22 ran: “All things are delivered to me of my Father, and no man hath known the Father save the Son, nor the Son save the Father, and he to whom the Son hath revealed;”<sup>433</sup> in place of, “All things are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.”

And verse 25: “Doing what shall I obtain life?” “eternal,” αἰώνιον, being omitted.

Chap. viii.

Same as St. Luke xi.

[252]

But verse 2: “When ye pray, say, Father, may thy Holy Spirit come to us, thy kingdom come,” &c., in place of “Hallowed be thy name.”<sup>434</sup>

Verse 29: in Marcion's Gospel it ended, “This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it.” What follows in St. Luke's Gospel, “but the sign of Jonas the prophet,” and verses 30-32, were omitted.

Verse 42: “Woe unto you, Pharisees! ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over the calling<sup>435</sup> and the love of God,” &c.

Verses 49-51 were omitted by Marcion.

Chap. ix.

Same as St. Luke xii.

But verses 6, 7, and “τῶν ἀγγέλων” in 8 and 9 omitted.

<sup>432</sup> Εὐχαριστῶ καὶ ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅτι ἅτινα ἦν κρυπτά σοφοῖς καὶ συνετοῖς ἀπεκάλυψας, &c. St. Luke has, ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας, &c.

<sup>433</sup> οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱόν τις γινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ ὃ ἂν ὁ υἱός ἀποκαλύψῃ.

<sup>434</sup> In some of the most ancient codices of St. Luke, “which art in heaven” is not found. Πάτερ, ἐλθέτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου.

<sup>435</sup> κλῆσιν instead of κρίσιν.

Verse 32 read: "Fear not, little flock; for it is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."<sup>436</sup>

And verse 38 ran thus: "And if he shall come in the evening watch, and find thus, blessed are those servants."<sup>437</sup>

Chap. x.

Same as St. Luke xiii. 11-28.

Marcion's Gospel was without verses 1-10.

Verse 28: for "Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets," Marcion read, "all the righteous,"<sup>438</sup> and added "held back" after "cast."<sup>439</sup>

[253] Verses 29-35 of St. Luke's chapter were not in Marcion's Gospel.

Chap. xi.

Same as St. Luke xiv.

Verses 7-11 omitted.

Chap. xii.

Same as St. Luke xv. 1-10.

Verses 11-32 omitted.

Chap. xiii.

Same as St. Luke xvi.

But verse 12: "If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who will give you that which is mine?"<sup>440</sup>

And verse 17: for "One tittle of the Law shall not fall," Marcion read, "One tittle of my words shall not fall."<sup>441</sup>

Chap. xiv.

Same as St. Luke xvii.

---

<sup>436</sup> ὑμῶν omitted.

<sup>437</sup> τῇ ἐσπερινῇ φυλακῇ, for ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ.

<sup>438</sup> πάντας τοὺς δικαίους.

<sup>439</sup> ἐκβαλλομένους καὶ κρατουμένους ἔξω.

<sup>440</sup> ἐμόν for ὑμέτερον.

<sup>441</sup> ἢ τῶν λόγων μου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν.

But verse 2: εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ μύλος ὀνικός,<sup>442</sup> “if he had not been born, or if a mill-stone,” &c.

Verses 9, 10: Marcion's Gospel had, “Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. So likewise do ye, when ye shall have done all those things that are commanded you.” Omitting, “Say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.”

Verse 14: “And he sent them away, saying, Go show yourselves unto the priests,” &c., in place of, “And when he saw them, he said unto them,” &c.<sup>443</sup>

Verse 18 ran: “These are not found returning to give glory to God. And there were many lepers in the time of Eliseus the prophet in Israel; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian.”<sup>444</sup> [254]

Chap. xv.

Same as St. Luke xviii. 1-30, 35-43.

Verse 19: “Jesus said to him, Do not call me good; one is good, the Father.”<sup>445</sup>

Verses 31-34 were absent from Marcion's Gospel.

Chap. xvi.

Same as St. Luke xix. 1-28.

Verses 29-48 absent.

Verse 9: “For that he also is a son of Abraham,” was not in Marcion's text.

Chap. xvii.

Same as St. Luke xx. 1-8, 19-36, 39-47.

Verses 9-18 not in Marcion's Gospel.

Verse 19: “They perceived that he had spoken this parable against them,” not in Marcion's text.

<sup>442</sup> Some codices of St. Luke have, λίθος μυλικός; others, μύλος ὀνικός.

<sup>443</sup> Ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς λέγων.

<sup>444</sup> μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος omitted; the previous question, Οὐχ εὐρέθησαν κ.τ.λ., made positive; and Luke iv. 27 inserted.

<sup>445</sup> Μὴ με λέγε ἀγαθόν, εἷς ἐστὶν ἀγαθός, ὁ πατήρ.

Verse 35: "But they which shall be accounted worthy of God to obtain that world," &c.<sup>446</sup>

Verses 37, 38, omitted.

Chap. xviii.

Same as St. Luke xxi. 1-17, 19, 20, 23-38.

Verses 18, 21, 22, were not in Marcion's Gospel.

Chap. xix.

Same as St. Luke xxii. 1-15, 19-27, 31-34, 39-48, 52-71.

Verses absent were therefore 16-18, 28-30, 35-38, 45-51.

Chap. xx.

[255]

Same as St. Luke xxiii.

Verse 2: "And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this one perverting the nation, and destroying the Law and the Prophets, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and leading away the women and children."<sup>447</sup>

Verse 43: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me."<sup>448</sup>

Chap. xxi.

Same as St. Luke xxiv. 1-26, 28-51.

Verse 25: "O fools and sluggish-hearted in believing all those things which he said to you," in place of, "in believing all those things which the prophets spake."<sup>449</sup>

Verse 27 was omitted.

Verse 32: "And while he opened to us the Scriptures," omitted.

Verse 44: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you." What follows in St. Luke, "that all things

<sup>446</sup> ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ inserted.

<sup>447</sup> Καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας after διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος, and καὶ ἀναστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα after φόρους μὴ δοῦναι.

<sup>448</sup> ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ omitted. Possibly the whole verse was omitted.

<sup>449</sup> οἷς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν, instead of ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται. Volckmar thinks that in v. 19, "of Nazareth" was omitted, but neither St. Epiphanius nor Tertullian say so.

must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms, concerning me,” was omitted.

Verse 45 was omitted.

Verse 46 ran: “That thus it behoved Christ to suffer,” &c.; so that the whole sentence read, “These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, That thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.”

Verses 52 and 53 were omitted.

[256]

I shall now make a few remarks on some of the passages absent from Marcion's Gospel, or which, in it, differ from the Canonical Gospel of St. Luke.

1. It was not attributed to St. Luke. It was Τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, not κατὰ Λουκᾶν. Tertullian explicitly says, “Marcion inscribes no name on his Gospel,”<sup>450</sup> and in the “Dialogue on the Right Faith” it is asserted that he protested his Gospel was *the* Gospel, the only one; and that the multiplicity of Gospels used by Catholics, and their discrepancies, were a proof that none of these other Gospels were genuine. He even went so far as to assert that his Gospel was written by Christ,<sup>451</sup> and when closely pressed on this point, and asked whether Christ wrote the account of his own passion and resurrection, he said it was so, but afterwards hesitated, and asserted that it was probably added by St. Paul.

This shows plainly enough that Marcion had received the Gospel, probably from the Church of Sinope, where it was the only one known, and that he had heard nothing about St. Luke as its author; indeed, knew nothing of its origin. He treated it with the utmost veneration, and in his veneration for it attributed its authorship to the Lord himself; supposing the words of St. Paul, “the Gospel of Christ,”<sup>452</sup> “the Gospel of his Son,”<sup>453</sup> “the

<sup>450</sup> Tert. adv. Marcion, iv. 2. “Marcion evangelio scilicet suo nullum adscribit nomen.”

<sup>451</sup> “Ἐν ἔστι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ ὁ Χριστὸς ἔγραψεν.

<sup>452</sup> Rom. i. 16, xv. 19, 29; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4, ix. 13; Gal. i. 7.

<sup>453</sup> Rom. i. 9.



Gospel of God,”<sup>454</sup> to mean that Jesus Christ was the actual author of the book.

[257] Marcion, it may be remarked, would have had no objection to acknowledging St. Luke as the compiler of the Gospel, as that evangelist was a devoted follower of St. Paul. If he did not do so, it was because at Sinope the Gospel read in the Church was not known by his name.

2. Marcion's Gospel was without the Preface, Luke i. 1-4.

This Preface is certainly by St. Luke, but was added, we may conjecture, after the final revision of his Gospel, when he issued the second edition. Its absence from Marcion's Gospel shows that it did not accompany the first edition.

3. The narrative of the nativity, Luke i. ii., is not in Marcion's Gospel.

It has been supposed by critics that he omitted this narrative purposely, because his Christ was descended from the highest God, had no part with the world of the Demiurge, and had therefore no earthly mother.<sup>455</sup> But if so, why did Marcion suffer the words, “Thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to see thee” (Luke viii. 20), to remain in his Gospel?

And it does not appear that Marcion denied the incarnation *in toto*, and went to the full extreme of Docetic doctrine. On the contrary, he taught that Christ deceived the God of this World, by coming into it as a man. The Demiurge trusted he would be his Messiah, to confirm the Law for ever. But when he saw that Christ was destroying the Law, he inflicted on him death. And this was only possible, because Christ was, through his human nature, subject to his power.

It is a less violent supposition that in the Church of Sinope the Gospel was, like that of St. Mark, without a narrative of the nativity and childhood of Jesus. It is probable, moreover, that the first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel were added at a

<sup>454</sup> Rom. i. 1, xv. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 2, 9; 1 Tim. i. 11.

<sup>455</sup> Volckmar: Das Evangelium Marcions; Leipzig, 1852, p. 54.

later period. The account of the nativity and childhood is taken [258] from the mouths of the blessed Virgin Mary, of eye-witnesses, or contemporaries. "Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart," and "His mother kept all these sayings in her heart."<sup>456</sup> This is our guaranty that the story is true. Mary kept them in memory, and the evangelist appeals to her memory for them. So with regard to the account of the nativity of the Baptist, "All they that heard these things laid them up in their hearts."<sup>457</sup> To their recollections also the evangelist appeals as his authority.

Now it is not probable that St. Luke or St. Paul were brought in contact with the Virgin and the people about Hebron, relatives of the Baptist. Their lives were spent in Asia Minor. But St. John, we know, became the guardian of the blessed Virgin after the death of Christ.<sup>458</sup> Greek ecclesiastical tradition declares that she accompanied him to Ephesus. But be that as it may, St. John almost certainly would have tenderly and reverently collected the "memorabilia" of the blessed Mother concerning her Divine Son's birth and infancy.

St. John had the organizing and disciplining of the "Asiatic" churches founded by St. Paul after the removal of the Apostle of the Gentiles. When he came to Ephesus, and went through the Churches of Asia Minor, he found a Gospel compiled by St. Luke in general use. To this he added such particulars as were expedient to complete it, amongst others the "recollections" of St. Mary, and the relatives of the Baptist. It is most probable that he gave them to St. Luke to work into his narrative, and thus to form a second edition of his Gospel.<sup>459</sup> That the Gospel

---

<sup>456</sup> Luke ii. 19, 51.

<sup>457</sup> Luke i. 66.

<sup>458</sup> John xix. 26.

<sup>459</sup> This was some time prior to the composition of St. John's Gospel. The first two chapters of St. Luke's Gospel were written apparently by the same hand which wrote the rest. Similarities, identity of expression, almost prove this. Compare i. 10 and ii. 13 with viii. 37, ix. 37, xxiii. 1; also i. 10 with xiv. 17, xxii. 14; i. 20 with xxii. 27, and i. 20 with xii. 3, xix. 44; i. 22 with xxiv. 23; i.

[259]

of St. Luke was retouched after the abatement of the anti-legal excitement can hardly be doubted. We shall see instances as we proceed.

4. The section relating to the Baptist (Luke iii. 2-19), with which the most ancient Judaizing Gospels opened, was absent from that of Marcion.

John belonged to the Old Covenant; he could not therefore be regarded as revealing the Gospel of the unknown God. This is thought by Baur, Hilgenfeld and Volckmar, to be the reason of the omission. But the explanation is strained. I think it probable, as stated above, that St. Luke when with St. Paul had not got the narrative of those who had heard and seen the birth of the Baptist and his preaching beyond Jordan. Had Marcion, moreover, objected to the Baptist as belonging to the Old Covenant, he would not have suffered the presence in his Gospel of the passage, Luke vii. 24-28, containing the high commendation of John, "This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare the way before thee."

[260]

5. There is no mention in Marcion's Gospel of the baptism of our Lord (Luke iii. 21, 22). This is given very briefly in St. Luke's Gospel. To the Nazarene Church this event was of the utmost importance; it was regarded as the beginning of the mission of Jesus, the ratification by God of his Messiahship, and therefore the Gospels of Mark and of the Hebrews opened with it. But the significance was not so deeply felt by the Gentile converts, and therefore the circumstance is despatched in a few words.

6. The genealogy of Joseph is not given (Luke iii. 23-38). This is not to be wondered at. It is an evidently late interpolation, clumsily foisted into the sacred text, rudely interrupting the

---

44 with vii. 1, ix. 44; also i. 45 with x. 23, xi. 27, 28; also i. 48 with ix. 38; i. 66 with ix. 44; i. 80 with ix. 51; ii. 6 with iv. 2; ii. 9 with xxiv. 4; ii. 10 with v. 10; ii. 14 with xix. 18; ii. 20 with xix. 37; ii. 25 with xxiii. 50; ii. 26. with ix. 20.

narrative.

(21): “Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven opened, (22) and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased. (iv. 1): And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness.” Such is the natural order. But it is interrupted by the generation of Joseph, the supposed father of Jesus, from Adam. This generation does not concern Jesus at all, but it came through some Jewish Christians into the hands of the Church in Asia Minor, and was forced between the joints of the sacred text, to the interruption of the narrative and the succession of ideas.<sup>460</sup> Marcion had it not in the Gospel brought from Pontus.

7. The narrative of the Temptation is not in Marcion's Gospel. It can have been no omission of his, for it would have tallied admirably with his doctrine. He held that the God of this world believed Christ at first to be the Messiah, but finally was undeceived. In the narrative of the Temptation the devil offers Christ all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. He takes the position which in Marcion's scheme was occupied by the Demiurge. Had he possessed the record of the Temptation, it would have mightily strengthened his position. [261]

8. The “Gospel of our Lord” opens with the words, “In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate ruling in Judaea (ἡγεμονεύοντος in place of ἐπιτροπεύοντος, an unimportant difference), Jesus came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and straightway on the Sabbath days, going into the synagogue, he taught” (εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκε in place of

<sup>460</sup> The descent of the Holy Ghost in bodily shape explains why in iv. 1 he is said to have been full of the Holy Ghost. I suspect the narrative of the unction occurred here. This was removed to cut off occasion to Docetic error, and the gap was clumsily filled with an useless genealogy.

καὶ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν), again an unimportant variation.

9. The words “Jesus of Nazareth”<sup>461</sup> are in Marcion's Gospel simply “Jesus.” This may have been done by Marcion on purpose. But there is no evidence that it was omitted in xxiv. 19.

10. The order of events, as given in Luke iv., is changed. Jesus, in Marcion's Gospel, goes first to Capernaum, and then to Nazareth, reversing the order in St. Luke.

THE GOSPEL OF THE  
LORD.

9. Christ goes to Capernaum, and enters the synagogue to teach.

10. All are astonished at his doctrine and power.

11. He heals the demoniac.

12. All are amazed at his power.

14. He enters Simon's house, and heals his wife's mother.

13. His fame spreads.

THE GOSPEL OF ST.  
LUKE, iv. 14-40.

1. Christ comes into Galilee, and the fame of him goes round about (14).

2. He teaches in the synagogues of Galilee, being glorified of all (15).

3. He comes to Nazareth, and goes into the synagogue (16).

4. He opens Esaias, and interprets his prophecy (17-21).

<sup>461</sup> Ναζωραῖος for Ναζαρηνός omitted.

2. He teaches in the synagogues, being glorified of all.
3. He comes to Nazareth, and goes into the synagogue.
5. All bare him witness, and wonder at his gracious words.
6. Christ quotes a proverb, and combats it.
7. The Nazarenes seek to throw him down a precipice.
8. He escapes, and goes to Capernaum.
15. At sunset he heals the sick.
5. All bare him witness, and wonder at his gracious words, but ask if he is not Joseph's son (22).
6. Christ quotes a proverb, and combats it (23-27).
7. The Nazarenes seek to throw him down a precipice (28, 29).
8. He escapes, and goes to Capernaum (30, 31).
9. He teaches in the synagogue at Capernaum (31).
10. All are astonished at his doctrine and power (32).
11. He heals the demoniac (33-35).
12. All are amazed at his power (36).
13. His fame spreads (37).

14. He enters Simon's house, and heals his wife's mother (38, 39).  
 15. At sunset he heals the sick (40).

By placing the subject-matter of the two narratives side by side, and numbering that of St. Luke consecutively, and giving the corresponding paragraphs, with their numbers as in Luke's order, arranged in the Marcionite succession, the reader is able at once to see the difference. No doctrinal question was touched by this transposition. The only explanation of it which is satisfactory is that each Gospel contained fragments which were pieced together differently. One block consisted of paragraphs 2-8; another, of paragraphs 9-14; another 15. Besides these blocks, there were chips, splinters, the paragraphs 1, 13, 15. Marcion's Gospel was without 1 and 4.

Par. 2, verse 15: "He taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all," was common to both Gospels. In Marcion's, most appropriately, it came after Christ has performed miracles; less judiciously in Luke's does it come before the performance of miracles.

[263]

Par. 13: "And the fame of him went out into every place of the country round about." St. Luke put this after Christ had taught in Nazareth and Capernaum; in Marcion's Gospel it was before he had been to Nazareth, but immediately after the healing of Simon's wife's mother. It ought probably to occupy the place assigned it in Marcion's text. The fame of Christ spreads. They in Nazareth hear of it, and say, "What we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here."

Par. 15: "Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him," &c., as in St. Luke iv. 40, 41. This Marcion's Gospel has immediately after

the healing of the sick wife of Simon, as though the rumour of the miracle attracted all who had sick relations to bring them to Christ. No doubt the paragraph should rightly stand in connection with this miracle of healing the fevered woman.

But there are omissions supposed to have been made purposely by Marcion. In verse 16 of St. Luke's Gospel, c. iv.: "He came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up," in the "Gospel of the Lord" ran, "He came to Nazareth" only. But it is not improbable that "where he had been brought up" was a gloss which crept into the text after the addition of the narrative of the early years of Christ had been added to the Canonical Gospel.

All the reading from the prophet Esaias, and the exposition of the prophecy (Luke iv. 17-21) was omitted, there can be small question, by Marcion, because it mutilated against his views touching the prophets as ministers, not of the God of Christ, but of the God of this world.

Luke iv. 23: "Do also here in thy country," changed into, "Do also here." It is possible that "in thy country" may be a gloss which has crept into a later text of St. Luke's Gospel, or was inserted by Luke in his second edition.

11. Luke vii. 29-35 are wanting in Marcion's Gospel. [264] That verses 29-32 should have been purposely excluded, it is impossible to suppose, as they favoured Marcion's tenets. It has been argued that the rest of the verses, 33-35, were cut out by Marcion because in verse 34 it is said, "The Son of Man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a winebibber." But the "Gospel of the Lord" contained Luke v. 33: "Why do the disciples of John fast often, and make long prayers, and likewise the disciples of the Pharisees; but thine eat and drink;" and the example of Christ going to the feast prepared by Levi is retained (v. 29).

12. Luke viii. 19: "Then came to him his mother and his brethren," &c., omitted; but the next verse, "And it was told him by certain which said, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without,



desiring to see thee.” This cannot be admitted as a mutilation by Marcion. Had he cut out verse 19, he would also have removed verse 20. Rather is verse 19 an amplification of the original text. The “saying” of Jesus was known in the “Asiatic” churches; and when Luke wove it into the text of his Gospel, he introduced it with the words, “Then came to him his mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press,” words not necessary, but deducible from the preserved text, and useful as introducing it.

[265]

13. Luke x. 21: “In that hour he rejoiced in the spirit, and said, I praise and thank thee, Lord of heaven, that those things which are hidden from the wise and prudent thou hast revealed to babes.” The version in Luke's Gospel may have been tampered with by Marcion, lest God should appear harsh in hiding “those things from the wise and prudent.” But it is more likely that Marcion's text is the correct one. Why should Christ thank God that he has hidden the truth from the wise and prudent? The reading in Marcion's Gospel is not only a better one, but it also appears to be an independent one. He has, “I praise and thank thee.” The received text differs in different codices; in some, Jesus rejoices “in the Spirit;” in others, “in the Holy Spirit.”

14. Luke x. 22: “All things are delivered to me of my Father, and no man hath known the Father save the Son, nor the Son save the Father, and he to whom the Son hath revealed him.” No doctrinal purpose was effected by the change. It is therefore probable that the Sinope Gospel ran as in Marcion's text.

15. Luke x. 25: “Doing what shall I obtain life?” “eternal” being omitted, it is thought, lest Jesus should seem to teach that eternal life was to be obtained by fulfilling the Law.<sup>462</sup> But Marcion did not alter the same question when asked by the ruler, in Luke xviii. 18; for then Christ, after he has referred him to the

<sup>462</sup> Tertul. adv. Marcion, iv. c. 25, “ut doctor de ea vita videatur consuluisse quae in lege promittitur longaeva.”

Law, goes on to impose on him a higher law—that of love. But “eternal” may be an addition to Luke's text in the second edition.

16. The first petition in the Lord's Prayer differs in Marcion's Gospel from that in St. Luke. Marcion has, “Father! may thy Holy Spirit come to us, Thy kingdom come,” &c., instead of, “Father! (which art in heaven—not in the most ancient copies of St. Luke) Hallowed be thy name,” &c. No purpose was served by this difference; and we must not attribute to Marcion in this instance wilful alteration of the sacred text. It is apparent that several versions of the Lord's Prayer existed in the first age of the Church, and that this was the form in which it was accepted and used in Pontus, perhaps throughout Asia Minor.

[266]

That the Lord's Prayer in St. Luke's Gospel stood originally as in Marcion's Gospel is made almost certain by verse 13. After giving the form of prayer, xi. 2-4, Christ instructs his disciples on the readiness of God to answer prayer. “And,” he continues, “if ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?” How ready will He be to give that which you have learned to ask in the first petition of the prayer I have just taught you! The petition was altered in the received text later, to accommodate it to the form given in St. Matthew's Gospel.

17. Luke xi. 29: “There shall no sign be given.” What follows in St. Luke's Gospel, “but the sign of the prophet Jonas,” and verses 30-32, were not found in Marcion's Gospel. Perhaps all this was inserted in the second edition of St. Luke's Gospel. But also perhaps the allusions to the Ninevites and the Queen of the South were omitted, because of the condemnation pronounced on the generation which received not Christ through them; and Jesus was not the manifestation of the God of judgment, but of the God of mercy.

18. So also “judgment” was turned into “calling,” in verse 42; and also the verses 49-51, in which the blood of the prophets is

said to be “required of this generation.”

19. Luke xii. 38: “The evening watch” is perhaps an earlier reading than the received one: “If he shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch;” which has the appearance of an expansion of the simpler text.

[267] The evening watch was the first watch. The Christians in the first age thought that our Lord would come again immediately. But as he did not return again in glory in the first watch, they altered the text to “the second watch or the third watch.” Consequently Marcion's text is the original unaltered one.

20. Luke xii. 6, 7: “Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows.” Perhaps Marcion omitted this because he did not hold that the Supreme God concerned Himself with the fate of men's bodies.

But more probably the passage did not occur in the original Pauline Gospel, but was grafted into it afterwards when St. Matthew's Gospel came into the hands of the Asiatic Christians, when it was transferred from it (x. 29-31) verbatim to Luke's Gospel.

21. Marcion's Gospel was without Luke xiii. 1-10.

The absence of the account of the Galilaeans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and of those on whom the tower in Siloam fell, which occurs in the received text, removes a difficulty. St. Luke says, “There were present at that season some that told him of the Galilaeans, whose blood,” &c., as though it were a circumstance which had just taken place, whereas this act of barbarity was committed when Quirinus, not Pilate, was governor, twenty-four years before the appearance of Jesus. And no tower in Siloam is mentioned in any account of Jerusalem. The mention of the Galilaeans in the canonical text has the appearance of an anachronism, and probably did not exist

in the Gospel which Marcion received, and was a late addition to the Gospel of Luke.

The parable of the fig-tree which follows may, however, have been removed by Marcion lest the Supreme God should appear as a God of judgment against those who produced no fruit, *i.e.* did no works. But it is more probable that this parable, which has an anti-Pauline moral, was not in the original edition of Luke's Gospel. [268]

22. Luke xii. i 28: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out," altered into, "when ye shall see all the righteous in the kingdom of God, and ye yourselves cast and held back without."<sup>463</sup>

The change of "the righteous" into "Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," in the deuterio-Luke, clearly disturbs the train of thought. Ye Jews shall weep when ye see the δίκαιοι, those made righteous through faith, by the righteousness which is *not* of the Law, Gentiles from East and West, in the kingdom, and ye yourselves cast out.

Hilgenfeld thinks that the account of the Judgment by St. Matthew and St. Luke is couched in terms coloured by the respective parties to which the evangelists belonged, and that the sentences on the lost are sharpened to pierce the antagonistic party. Thus, in the Gospel of St. Luke, Christ dooms to woe those who are workers of unrighteousness, ἐργάται ἀδικίας,<sup>464</sup> using the Pauline favourite expression to designate those who are cast out to weeping and gnashing of teeth, as men who have not received the righteousness which is of faith; whereas, in St. Matthew it is the workers of anomia, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν

<sup>463</sup> ὅταν ὀψήσθῃ πάντας τοὺς δικαίους ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους καὶ κρατουμένους ἔξω.—Epiph. Schol. 40; Tertul. c. 30.

<sup>464</sup> Luke xiii. 25-30.

[269] ἀνομίαν,<sup>465</sup> by which Hilgenfeld thinks the Pauline anti-legalists are not obscurely hinted at, who are hurled into outer darkness. In St. Luke it is curious to notice how the lost are described as Jews: “We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets;” whereas the elect who “sit down in the kingdom of God” come “from the east and from the west, and from the north and from the south,” that is to say, are Gentiles.

In Marcion's text we have therefore the ἀδίκαιοι shut and cast out, and the δίκαιοι sitting overthroned in the kingdom of God. It can scarcely be doubted that this is the correct reading, and that “Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,” was substituted for δίκαιοι at a later period with a conciliatory purpose.

The rest of the chapter, 31-35, is not to be found in Marcion's Gospel. The first who are to be last, and the last first, not obscurely means that the Gentiles shall precede the Jews. This was in the “Gospel of the Lord,” which was, however, without the warning given to Christ, “Get thee out, and depart hence; for Herod will kill thee,” and the lamentation of the Saviour over the holy city, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets,” &c. Why Marcion should omit this is not clear. It was probably not in the Gospel of Sinope.

23. Luke xiv. 7-11. The same may be said of the parable put forth to those bidden to a feast, when Christ marked how they chose out the chief rooms. It has been supposed by critics that Marcion omitted it, lest Jesus should seem to sanction feasting; but this reason is far-fetched, and it must be remembered that he did retain Luke v. 29 and 33.

24. Luke xv. 11-32. The parable of the Prodigal Son is omitted. That it is left out, as is suggested by some critics, because the elder son signifies mystically the Jewish Church, and the prodigal son represents the Heathen world, is to transfer such allegorical interpretations back to an earlier age than we

---

<sup>465</sup> Matt. vii. 13.

are justified in doing. Marcion was not bound to admit such an interpretation of the parable, if received in his day. Marcion, moreover, opposed allegorizing the sayings of Scripture, and insisted on their literal interpretation. Neander says, "The other Gnostics united with their theosophical idealism a mystical, allegorizing interpretation of the Scriptures. Marcion, simple in heart, was decidedly opposed to this artificial method of interpretation. He was a zealous advocate of the literal interpretation which prevailed among the antagonists of Gnosticism."<sup>466</sup> It is therefore most improbable that a popular interpretation of this parable, if such an interpretation existed at that time, should have induced Marcion to omit the parable. [270]

25. Luke xvi. 12: "If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who will give you that which is mine?" Surely a reading far preferable to that in the Canonical Gospel, "who will give you that which is your own?"

26. Luke, xvi. 17: "One tittle of my words shall not fall," in place of, "One tittle of the Law shall not fall." As has been already remarked, the reading in St. Luke is evidently corrupt, altered deliberately by the party of conciliation. Marcion's is the genuine text.

27. Luke xvii. 9, 10. The saying, "We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do," was perhaps omitted by Marcion, lest the Gospel should seem to sanction the idea that any obligation whatever rested on the believer. The received text is thoroughly Pauline, inculcating the worthlessness of man's righteousness. Hahn and Ritschl argue that the whole of the parable, 7-10, was not in Marcion's Gospel; and this is probable, though St. Epiphanius only says that Marcion cut out, "We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do."<sup>467</sup> The whole Parable has such a Pauline ring, that [271]

<sup>466</sup> Hist. of the Christian Religion, tr. Bohn, ii. p. 131.

<sup>467</sup> παρέκοψε τό: λέγετε, ἀχρεῖοι δοῦλοί ἐσμεν: ὁ ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι πεποιθήκαμεν, Sch. 47.

it would probably have been accepted in its entirety by Marcion, if his Gospel had contained it; and the parable is divested of its point and meaning if only the few words are omitted which St. Epiphanius mentions as deficient.

28. Luke xvii. 18: "There are not found returning to give glory to God. And there were many lepers in the time of Eliseus the prophet in Israel; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian." In the Gospel of the Lord, this passage concerning the lepers in the time of Eliseus occurs *twice*; once in chap. i. v. 15, as already given, and again here. It has been preserved in St. Luke's Gospel in only one place, in that corresponding with Marcion i. 15, viz. Luke iv. 27.

It is clear that this was a fragmentary saying of our Lord drifting about, which the compiler of the Sinope Gospel inserted in two places where it thought it would fit in with other passages. When St. Luke's Gospel was revised, it was found that this passage occurred twice, and that it was without appropriateness in chap. xvii. after verse 18, and was therefore cut out. But in Marcion's Gospel it remained, a monument of the manner in which the Gospels were originally constructed.

29. Luke xviii. 19. Marcion had: "Jesus said to him, Do not call me good; one is good, the Father;" another version of the text, not a deliberate alteration.

30. Luke xviii. 31-34. The prophecies of the passion omitted by Marcion.

31. Luke xix. 29-46. The ride into Jerusalem on an ass, and the expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the Temple, are omitted.

[272]

Why the Palm-Sunday triumphal entry should have been excluded does not appear. In St. Luke's Gospel Jesus is not hailed as "King of the Jews" and "Son of David." Had this been the case, these two titles, we may conclude, would have been eliminated from the narrative; but we see no reason why the

whole account should be swept away. It probably did not exist in the original Gospel Marcion obtained in Pontus.

Did Marcion cut out the narrative of the expulsion of the buyers and sellers from the Temple? I think not. St. John, in his Gospel, gives that event in his second chapter as occurring, not at the close of the ministry of Christ, but at its opening.

St. John is the only evangelist who can be safely relied upon for giving the chronological order of events. St. Matthew, as has been already shown, did not write the acts of our Lord, but his sayings only; and St. Mark was no eye-witness.

A Pauline Gospel would not contain the account of the purifying of the Temple, and the saying, "My house is the house of prayer." But when St. Matthew's Gospel, or St. Mark's, found its way into Asia Minor, this passage was extracted from one of them, and interpolated in the Lucan text, in the same place where it occurred in those Gospels—at the end of the ministry, and therefore in the wrong place.

32. Luke xx. 9-18. The parable of the vineyard and the husbandmen. This Marcion probably omitted because it made the Lord of the vineyard, who sent forth the prophets, the same as the Lord who sent his son. The lord of the vineyard to Marcion was the Demiurge, but the Supreme Lord sent Christ.

33. Luke xx. 37, 38, omitted by Marcion, because a reference to Moses, and God, as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

34. Luke xxi. 18: "There shall not an hair of your head [273] perish," omitted, perhaps, lest the God of heaven, whom Christ revealed, should appear to concern himself about the vile bodies of men, under the dominion of the God of this world; but more probably this verse did not exist in the original text. The awkwardness of its position has led many critics to reject it as an interpolation,<sup>468</sup> and the fact of Marcion's Gospel being without it goes far to prove that the original Luke Gospel was without it.

<sup>468</sup> Baur calls it an "ungeschickte Zusatz."



35. Luke xxi. 21, 22. The warning given by our Lord to his disciples to flee from Jerusalem when they see it encompassed with armies. Verse 21 was omitted no doubt because of the words, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." This jarred with Marcion's conception of the Supreme God as one of mercy, and of Jesus as proclaiming blessings and forgiveness, in place of the vengeance and justice of the World-God.

36. Luke xxii. 16-18. The distribution of the paschal cup among the disciples is omitted.

37. Luke xxii. 28-30. The promise that the apostles should eat and drink in Christ's kingdom and judge the twelve tribes, was omitted by Marcion, as inconsistent with his views of the spiritual nature of the heavenly kingdom; and that judgment should be committed by the God of free forgiveness to the apostles, was in his sight impossible. Why Luke xxiii. 43, 47-49, were not in Marcion's Gospel does not appear; they can hardly have been omitted purposely.

38. Luke xxiii. 2. In Marcion's Gospel it ran: "And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this one perverting the nation, and destroying the Law and the Prophets, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and leading away the women and children."

[274]

It is not possible that Marcion should have forced the words "destroying the Law and the Prophets" into the text, for these are the accusations of *false* witnesses. And this is precisely what Marcion taught that Christ had come to do. Both this accusation and that other, that he drew away after him the women and children from their homes and domestic duties and responsibilities, most probably did exist in the original text. It is not improbable that they were both made to disappear from the authorized text later, when the conciliatory movement began.

39. Luke xxiv. 43. In Marcion's Gospel, either the whole of the verse, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," was omitted, or more probably only the

words “in Paradise.” Marcion would not have purposely cut out such an instance of free acceptance of one who had all his life transgressed the Law, but he may have cancelled the words “in Paradise.”

40. Luke xxiv. 25 stood in Marcion's Gospel, “O fools, and in heart slow to believe all that he spake unto you;” and 27 and 45, which relate that Jesus explained to the two disciples out of Moses and the Prophets how he must suffer, and that he opened their understanding to understand the Scriptures, were both absent.

41. Luke xxiv. 46. Instead of Christ appealing to the Prophets, Marcion made him say, “These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.” This was possibly Marcion's doing.

The other differences between Marcion's Gospel and the Canonical Gospel of St. Luke are so small, that the reader need not be troubled with them here. For a fuller and more particular account of Marcion's Gospel he is referred to the works indicated in the footnote.<sup>469</sup> [275]

It will be seen from the list of differences between the “Gospel of our Lord” and the Gospel of St. Luke, that all the apparent omissions cannot be attributed to Marcion. The Gospel he had he regarded with supreme awe; it was because his Gospel was so ancient, so hallowed by use through many years, that it was invested by him with sovereign authority, and that he regarded the other Gospels as apocryphal, or at best only deuterocanonical.

<sup>469</sup> The Gospel is printed in Thilo's *Codex Apocryph. Novi Testamenti*, Lips. 1832, T.I. pp. 401-486. For critical examinations of it see Ritschl: *Das Evangelium Marcions und das Kanonische Ev. Lucas*, Tübingen, 1846. Baur: *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Kanonischen Evangelien*, Tübingen, 1847, p. 393 sq. Gratz: *Krit. Untersuchungen über Marcions Evangelium*, Tübing. 1818. Volckmar: *Das Evangelium Marcions*, Leipz. 1852. Nicolas: *Etudes sur les Evangiles Apocryphes*, Paris, 1866, pp. 147-160.

It is by no means certain that even where his Gospel has been apparently tampered with to suit his views, his hands made the alterations in it. What amplifications St. Luke's Gospel passed through when it underwent revision for a second edition, we cannot tell.

The Gospel of our Lord, if not the original Luke Gospel—and this is probable—was the basis of Luke's compilation. But that it was Luke's first edition of his Gospel, drawn up when St. Paul was actively engaged in founding Asiatic Churches, is the view I am disposed to take of it. As soon as a Church was founded, the need of a Gospel was felt. To satisfy this want, Paul employed Luke to collect memorials of the Lord's life, and weave them together into an historical narrative.

[276] The Gospel of our Lord contains nothing which is not found in that of St. Luke. The arrangement is so similar, that we are forced to the conclusion that it was either used by St. Luke, or that it was his original composition. If he used it, then his right to the title of author of the third Canonical Gospel falls to the ground, as what he added was of small amount. Who then composed the Gospel? We know of no one to whom tradition even at that early age attributed it.

St. Luke was the associate of St. Paul; ecclesiastical tradition attributes to him a Gospel. That of "Our Lord" closely resembles the Canonical Luke's Gospel, and bears evidence of being earlier in composition, whilst that which is canonical bears evidence of later manipulation. All these facts point to Marcion's Gospel as the original St. Luke—not, however, quite as it came to Marcion, but edited by the heretic.

That the first edition of Luke bore a stronger Pauline impress than the second is also probable. The Canonical Luke has the Pauline stamp on it still, but beside it is the Johannite seal. More fully than any other Gospel does it bring out the tenderness of Christ towards sinners, a feature which has ever made it exceeding precious to those who have been captives and blind

and bruised, and to whom that Gospel proclaims Christ as their deliverer, enlightener and healer.<sup>470</sup>

It is not necessary here to point out the finger-mark of Paul in this Gospel; it has been often and well done by others. It is an established fact, scarcely admitting dispute, that to him it owes its colour, and that it reflects his teaching.<sup>471</sup>

And it was this Gospel, in its primitive form, before it had passed under the hands of St. John, or had been recast by its author, that I think we may be satisfied Marcion possessed. That he made a few erasures is probable, I may almost say certain; but that he ruthlessly carved it to suit his purpose cannot be established. [277]

Of the value of Marcion's Gospel for determining the original text of the third Gospel, it is difficult to speak too highly.

[278]

---

<sup>470</sup> Luke iv. 18.

<sup>471</sup> Luke iv. 28; compare vi. 13 with Matt. x. and Luke x. 1-16, vii. 36-50, x. 38-42, xvii. 7-10, xvii. 11-19, x. 30-37, xv. 11-32; Luke xiii. 25-30, compared with Matt. vii. 13; Luke vii. 50, viii. 48, xviii. 42, &c.