

The Latin Prologues of John

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE Latin texts of the New Testament as recently presented in Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate,¹ have four different forms of preface to the respective Gospels, the MSS. which have prologues sometimes presenting one, sometimes another, sometimes more than one, in various orders of arrangement. In the present discussion I shall limit myself to the prologues to the Fourth Gospel, and shall dismiss with the briefest possible mention those forms which have already been adequately discussed, or for other reasons throw no new light upon the problem of its authorship.

The first form of prologue appears in only two codices, those designated H and Θ by W-W. Even here it is but the former of two alternates. It is a simple excerpt from Augustine's treatise *De Consensu Evangeliorum*, i. 4. As such we may designate it the Augustinian and dismiss it; for its variants are insignificant and Augustine himself is not employing sources nor reporting tradition, but only giving his own estimate of John as compared with the Synoptic Gospels.

The form of prologue next in order of dismissal is by far the most common. It is highly interesting and important, but has already been discussed with remarkable scholarship and acumen by Corssen under the title "Monarchianische Prologe" in vol. xv. of Gebhardt and Harnack's *T. u. U.* (1896, pp. 1-138). Corssen has demonstrated that while it accompanies many forms of Jerome's translation, it is not derived from him, but is a survival of the older period. He shows that the group of four prologues of this type presuppose a different order of the

¹ Referred to hereinafter as W-W.

Gospels in the canon from Jerome's. They further exhibit a Monarchian doctrine of the person of Christ which in Jerome's time had become antiquated and heretical, and in particular the prologue to the Fourth Gospel presents material independently traceable to an older source through no less than ten authorities including Augustine. Most of these are independent, several older than Jerome; and they refer the data explicitly to an ancient *Historia ecclesiastica*, which must have had written form to account for the coincidence in language of the excerptors. According to Corssen this *Historia*, probably current in the form of a prologue or argumentum, reflected still the controversies of the close of the second century on the canonicity of John. He dates the *Historia* accordingly in its primitive form, which he reproduces from the ten excerptors, no later than the first quarter of the third century, when Roman orthodoxy was still of a decidedly Monarchian type. If I am not mistaken, evidence could be added from Epiphanius,² as an eleventh excerptor, connecting some of the data with Hippolytus, the defender of the Johannine writings against Caius *ca.* 207 A. D. But I will not delay longer with this form of prologue, which with Corssen we may designate the Monarchian.

The third form of prologue is found in three codices designated by W-W H, Θ,³ and Benedictus. It might be dismissed as promptly as the first, but for its occurrence also in briefer recension in a fourth, the so-called Codex Toletanus, of which we have presently to speak more at length. Apart from this it would not detain us; for in the longer recension of H Θ Bened. this prologue is purely and simply an extract from ch. ix of Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus*. Not only does it transcribe the whole chapter almost unchanged and quite without regard to the fact that the later paragraphs are inappropriate, seeing they relate to the Epistles and Revelation and the death and burial of John; it does not even omit Jerome's promise to his readers to discuss the subject of John the Elder and the two tombs at Ephesus when he shall reach in order the name of Papias. This description of course was never written for any

² *Haer.* li. 2 and 12.

³ In H Θ as the alternate to the Augustinian.

other work than the *De Vir. Ill.* Indeed Cod. Θ is quite honest in its borrowing, and gives the extract the plain title $\overline{\text{I}\overline{\text{ncp}}}$ $\overline{\text{pr}\overline{\text{ef}}}$ $\overline{\text{hieronimi}} \overline{\text{pr}\overline{\text{b}}}$ in $\overline{\text{iohn}}$. Only this heading has had the misfortune to lose its place. It now stands over the extract from Augustine which in Θ precedes that from Jerome. Whatever, then, may be true of T's shorter recension, the longer, that of H Θ Bened., certainly rests upon Jerome. Its variations, of which only one, to be discussed hereafter, has any importance, give no indication of acquaintance with any outside source. We are therefore fully justified in designating this prologue—at least in its longer form—by the title Θ has given it: “ $\overline{\text{pr}\overline{\text{ef}}}$ $\overline{\text{hieronimi}}$ ” = Prologue of Jerome. That Jerome himself employs the *Historia Ecclesiastica* has been shown by Corssen.

The fourth and last form of prologue is given by W-W as appearing in only one codex (apart from T which must again be temporarily set aside). This MS. is the so-called Codex Reginae Suetiae, or Reginensis, a Vatican Vulgate MS. of the ninth century, catalogued as Alex. Nr. 14 and edited by Cardinal I. M. Thomasius (Opp. 1, p. 344, Romae 1747). But the limitation of W-W is due to oversight. Corssen, whom W-W do not mention, had given in the work above cited the collation of this prologue from another MS. in the Royal Public Library at Stuttgart (fol. 44). *Stuttgartensis*, as I shall call this MS., presents the same text as *Reginensis*, with three slight variations to be considered later. The form of prologue here represented we may designate the Graeco-Latin; for it gives clear evidence, at least in the first part, of translation from some Greek original. It is that which possesses for us at present the most vital interest; for while confessedly composite, corrupt and legendary, it professes to give the testimony of the *Exeges*⁴ of Papias to the publication of the Gospel by John himself “while yet in the body.” Moreover Clemen’s *Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums*, 1912, a work of the foremost rank, now proposes to accept the statement after due allowance for errors of translation and transcription. Clemen does not himself admit the Johannine authorship of the Gospel,

⁴ The texts vary between $\overline{\text{E}\overline{\text{x}}\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{u}}\overline{\text{s}}}$ and $\overline{\text{E}\overline{\text{x}}\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{g}}\overline{\text{h}}\overline{\text{e}}\overline{\text{u}}\overline{\text{s}}}$. As a matter of convenience only we employ the title *Exeges*.

but he holds that Papias did; and that he so testified in his *Exegeses*. If so, we have in this single clause of a rare Latin prologue a testimony outweighing in importance all the rest of the external evidence for the Fourth Gospel put together. But it is time we returned to T and its alleged extract from Papias.

Codex T is a Spanish MS. of the tenth century of somewhat mixed descent. According to Burkitt it contains "not a few Old Latin readings." Like codd. H, Θ, and Bened. it has more than one prologue to John, placing first the common or Monarchian, under the title: *Incipit Praefatio s̄c̄i evangelii s̄c̄um Iohannem*. After this prologue follows another with the heading "Incipit Prologus Secundus," whose peculiarities we have now to consider. The first two-thirds of this second prologue of T (T 2^a) are parallel to the first part of the chapter of *De Vir. Ill.* which in H Θ Bened. constitutes the prologue of Jerome. The last third (T 2^b) is parallel to the prologue of the fourth form—that of Regin. and Stuttg. According to Burkitt this singular combination is not due to conflation. He denies that the scribe of T has merely attached the Graeco-Latin prologue after the pertinent part of the Hieronymian, and alleges as the true explanation of the phenomena that the second prologue of T represents the original source from which both Jerome and Regin. have drawn. Jerome, says Burkitt, has used its first two-thirds (= T 2^a) for what he has to say about John's relation to the Gospel; Regin. has used its last third (= T 2^b) as a separate argumentum. This view is presented by Burkitt in an Excursus entitled "The Prologue to St. John in Codex Toletanus" appended to his *Two Lectures on the Gospels*.⁵ It is based on a comparison of the prologue with its two parallels, in which the differences from T (changes and additions as Burkitt considers them) are marked by italics, and omissions by ^ ^ . His conclusion is that the second prologue of T "gives the earliest form known to us of a very remarkable theory of the origin of the Fourth Gospel". To judge of the value of this conclusion we must reproduce Burkitt's comparison, placing the texts for greater convenience in parallel columns,

⁵ Macmillan, 1901, p. 90.

and adding to the text of Cod. Reg. in [] the variant readings of Cod. Stuttg. For Burkitt, in exclusive dependence on W-W, overlooks Corssen's additional MS. It should be observed that in Codex Toletanus there is no division, T2^b being linked to T2^a by a simple *igitur*.

Tolet.

Iohannes apostolus, quem Dominus Iesus amavit plurimum, novissimus omnium scripsit hoc Evangelium, postulantibus Asiae episcopis, adversus Cerinthum aliosque haereticos et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt stultitiae suae pravitate — sic enim Ebionitae appellantur — Christum antequam de Maria nasceretur non fuisse, nec natum ante saecula a Deo Patre. Unde etiam compulsus est divinam eius a Patre nativitatem dicere.

Sed et aliam causam conscripti huius Evangelii ferunt: quia, cum legisset Matthei, Marci, et Lucae de Evangelio volumina, probaverit quidem textum historiae et vera eos dixisse firmaverit, sed unius tantum anni in quo et passus est post carcerem Iohannis historiam texuisse. Praetermisso itaque anno cuius acta a tribus exposita fuerint, superioris temporis antequam Iohannes clauderetur in carcere gesta narravit, sicut manifestum esse poterit his qui quattuor Evangeliorum volumine legerint diligenter.

Jerome.

Iohannes apostolus quem ^ Iesus amabat plurimum, *filius Zebedei et frater Jacobi apostoli quem Herodes post passionem Domini decollaverat*, novissimus omnium scripsit ^ Evangelium, *rogatus ab Asiae episcopis*, adversus Cerinthum aliosque haereticos et maxime tunc Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt ^ ^ Christum ante ^ Mariam ^ non fuisse ^ ^. Unde etiam compulsus est *et* divinam eius ^ nativitatem edicere.

Sed et aliam causam *huius scripturae* ferunt: quod, cum legisset Matthei, Marci ^ Lucae volumina, probaverit quidem textum historiae ^ vera eos dixisse firmaverit, sed unius tantum anni in quo et passus est post carcerem Iohannis historiam texuisse. Praetermisso itaque anno cuius acta a tribus exposita fuerant, superioris temporis antequam Iohannes clauderetur in carcerem gesta narravit, sicut manifestum esse poterit his qui diligenter quattuor Evangeliorum volumina legerint. *Quae res et διαφωλια quae videtur Iohannis esse cum ceteris tollit.*

To the comparison thus instituted Burkitt adds as his only comment:—

“I feel thoroughly convinced that St. Jerome has borrowed from the document now represented to us by the prologue in Codex Toletanus, and not *vice versa*. There are just the stylistic alterations that

a rapid and practised pen would make in borrowing a document for incorporation in a Biographical Dictionary. The awkward sentences in lines 5, 6 and 10 (here lines 3, 4, 10) of the prologue are curtailed, while fresh, though rather commonplace information is inserted in convenient places, such as the first sentence."

Against this inference of dependence by Jerome, based exclusively on the internal evidence, we must set: (1) the universal rule that where a reading occurs compounded of two factors each of which is separately attested it is the compound and not the factors which is derived, (2) the composite character of T, which as Burkitt himself declares has "not a few Old Latin readings"; (3) the analogy of the other three codices H, Θ, and Benedictus which unmistakably (and in one case avowedly) depend on Jerome.

But the real explanation of the omissions and variations of T will become apparent from a comparison of the variations of H Θ Bened. from their acknowledged source. Only one differs from the ordinary trifling transcriptional variation, and this exception occurs only in H Θ, not in Bened. Its nature is at once so amusing and so instructive on the point at issue that I must once more resort to the 'deadly parallel'.

Jerome.

Iohannes apostolus quem Iesus amabat plurimum, filius Zebedei et frater Iacobi apostoli quem Herodes post passionem Domini decollaverat novissimus omnium scripsit &c.

Θ [H].

Iohannes apostolus quem Iesus amavit plurimum, filius Zebedei ⁊ frater Iacobi apostoli qui narrat Iohannem Baptistam ab Herode decollatum fuisse [H fuisset] novissimum omnium scripsit &c.

The scribe of the H Θ archetype in attempting to correct what he took to be a blunder of his authority has piled up such a monument of nonsense as rarely breaks the monotony of the textual critic's road. Not recognizing Agrippa I. of Acts 12:1 under the name "Herodes," he informs us gravely that the Fourth Gospel makes Herod the murderer of the Baptist. Now it so happens that the clause of Jerome thus murdered by the overwise transcriber is the same clause which Burkitt relies on to prove that Jerome is here adding to the archetype of T, not T omitting from Jerome; for there is no other *plus* of Jerome in the portion paralleled. But suppose

the scribe of T found this text of H Θ in his copy under its proper heading, Praefatio Hieronymi Presbyteri. What would he do when he encountered this ridiculous snarl? There are only three things he could do. (1) He might attempt to improve upon it, but has wisely abstained. (2) He might simply cut it out, since the sense does not require it. (3) He might possibly refer to the original to see what it did mean; but even then he would be most likely to cut it out, for even if he was more successful than his predecessors in discovering the real sense, he could not fail to see that for his purposes it was superfluous. The real explanation then is the opposite of Burkitt's. Jerome has not added, but T has omitted. The same of course applies to all that follows "evangeliorum volumine legerint diligenter." The whole passage down to *quæ res et διαφωνίαν quæ videtur Johannis esse cum ceteris tollit* is simply Jerome's paraphrase of Eusebius' *H. E.* III. xxiv, 7-13, the very Greek word being borrowed. But for the purposes of a prologue to the Gospel all that related to the Epistles and Apocalypse, the two Johns in Ephesus, and all the rest included by H Θ Bened., was most unsuitable. Even a scribe, if he gave any consideration at all to space, would feel that it ought to be cut off; and in cutting it off the obvious place for amputation would be after "legerint diligenter." To include the clause about *διαφωνία* would be to raise more devils than one might be able to lay.

But if the *plus* of Jerome is wrongly interpreted by Burkitt, the case with the supposed "alterations" and "curtailments" is still worse. It is true that T has a *plus* of a number of explanatory words and clauses such as *Dominus Iesus, hoc evangelium stultitiae suae pravitate, sic enim Ebionitae appellantur, and nec natum ante saecula a Deo Patre*; but additions of this sort are precisely what we should expect in the later and derived form (*brevior lectio praeferenda*). Moreover some of these differences (e. g. *amavit* for *amabat*, cancellation of *et* before *divinam*, addition of *et* before *vera*) coincide with the minute variations of H Θ Bened., a phenomenon which is proof positive of affinity between T and the codices which undeniably depend on Jerome.

Herewith then we may eliminate the third form of prologue, the Praefatio Hieronymi. The second prologue of T as a whole (T²) is not early, but is a typical example of conflation. The factors are, for T^{2a} the source represented in H Θ Bened., i. e. *De Vir. Ill.* ix, with or without recomparison of Jerome. For T^{2b} it is the Prologus Graeco-Latinus of Stuttg. and Regin., to the consideration of which we now proceed.

One cannot but feel a sincere regret when so hopeful and suggestive a theory as Burkitt's of the great antiquity and value of Prologus Secundus Toletani collapses. Fortunately in this case the antiquity and value of the portion which really concerns us, viz, T^{2b}, the Graeco-Latin prologue, is not affected. Burkitt attempted to prove that this was older than Jerome because of its connection with T^{2a}. He seems to have overlooked the fact that Harnack had already proved it older than Philastrius, Jerome's older contemporary.⁶ The following table exhibits the textual evidence for the prologue from our three authorities, the right hand column exhibiting the variations of Regin. (and in [] Stuttg.) from T. To it we append the passage from Philastrius cited by Harnack.

T^{2b}.

Hoc igitur evangelium post apocalipsin scriptum manifestum et datum est ecclesiis in Asia a Iohanne aduc in corpore constituto sicut Papias nomine Iheropolitanus episcopus discipulus Iohannis et carus in exotericis suis id est in extremis quinque libris retulit qui hoc evangelium Iohanne subdictante conscripsit.

Verum Archinon hereticus quum ab eo fuisset reprobatus eo quod contraria sentisset prelectus est a Iohanne. hic vero scriptum vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus missus qui in Ponto erant fideles in domino nostro. amen.

Regin. [Stuttg.]

Incipit argumentum secundum Iohannem ^ ^ Evangelium *Iohannis* ^ ^ manifestatum et datum [Stuttg. om. et datum] est ecclesiis ^ ab Iohanne aduc in corpore constituto sicut Papias nomine Hieropolitanus ^ discipulus Iohannis ^ carus in exotericis ^ id est in extremis quinque libris retulit ^ *descripsit vero* ^ evangelium ^ dictante Iohanne *recte*.

Verum [Stuttg. recte verum Marcion] *Martion* haereticus cum ab eo fuisset [Stuttg. esset] improbatum eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus est a Iohanne. *is* vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus ^ qui in Ponto fuerunt ^ ^ .
Explicit Argumentum.

⁶ 383-384 A. D. is the approximate date of Philastrius' compend of heresies. The *De Vir. Ill.* appeared about ten years later.

Philastrius.

(Marcion) devictus et fugatus a beato Iohanne evangelista et a presbyteris de civitate Ephesi Romae hanc haeresim seminabat.⁷

Philastrius himself had previously said: "Marcion de civitate Sinope urbem Romam devenit." Harnack draws the logical inference that the archetype of our prologue is older.

This conclusion of Harnack probably represents about the limit of our attainment along the line of textual transmission. The prologue of Regin., closely paralleled by Stuttg. and more remotely by T^{2b}, is probably derived from some copy of the Old Latin of 250—350 A. D. It represents an alternate to the Monarchian traced by Corssen to an at least equally remote age, but rests (in its first paragraph) upon Greek sources, and (in its second) is anti-Marcionite and not Monarchian.

Comparison of the three texts indicates that the scribe of T has used considerable freedom, especially in the way of addition, as we found to be the case in T^{2a}. At the beginning he has linked on to T^{2a} with a *hoc igitur* and added (probably from the Monarchian prologue which he had just copied as his Praefatio prima) *post apocalipsin scriptum*. Manifestum for manifestatum is probably a mere slip of the pen⁸, but Stuttg. in omitting here *et datum* betrays a consciousness of tautology, of which we must speak later. The next *plus* of T need not be an addition. *In Asia* is quite as likely to have been omitted by the archetype of Regin. and Stuttg. because it too narrowly limited the destination of the Gospel, as added by T. We must leave the question open. *Episcopus et* [carus discipulus] is probably T's addition, and *qui hoc subdictante conscripsit* is a manifest attempt to improve upon the awkward style of the parallel, while doing justice to its incomprehensible *recte*, which Stuttg. tries to connect with *verum*.

In the second paragraph *reprobatus* and *prelectus* (!) may be due to mere accident, like the corruption of the proper name

⁷ The text and references are taken from Harnack, *Chron.* p. 308f. Corssen (*T. u. U.* xv., [1896] p. 115) gives the variants of the Stuttgart MS. (in the Royal Public Library, Stuttgart, fol. 44).

⁸ Manifestum occurs just above, l. 27.

(Archinon from Marcion, which has lost its initial M to the *verum* preceding). Burkitt surrenders the problem. Praelectio (*Vorlesung*) seems to him a 'cruel and unusual form of punishment', even for heretics. It may be, however, that T understands "Archinon" to have been first reprov'd (*reprobatus*) for his errors (*eo quod contraria sentisset*), and afterward "raised to special favor" (*praelectus*) by John. Philastrius is certainly nearer the original in rendering: *devictus* (*ἐλληλεγμένος*) et *fugatus*. In this sentence accordingly Regin. has the most authentic form. Stuttg. attempts a slight grammatical improvement (*esset*), and T runs wild. In the next sentence *missus* is doubtless T's harmless addition, *erant* his grammatical improvement; while the appended phrase *fideles in Domino nostro* betrays its alien origin by its lack of agreement in case (*fratribus fideles*); or else, if *fideles* (*lis*) be taken as a masc. sing., belongs to T's false conception of "Archinon." T^{2b} would seem thus to have the later, more arbitrary, form of the text, as well as the more transcriptionally corrupt. The Spanish scribe was at least as far as Candace's eunuch from understanding what he was reading.

Having thus established, so far as the data permit, the primitive text of this prologue, and having determined its date as not later than 383 A. D., we may give our attention with greater confidence to the questions now again brought before us by Clemen's proposal to regard its citation from Papias as authentic. This involves a review of the internal evidence, to which many critics have already given careful attention, and first of all of the judgement of Lightfoot, which Clemen takes as the basis of his own. It appears in Lightfoot's well known defense of the Fourth Gospel against the author of *Supernatural Religion*. After citing the prologue of Regin. in the form above given from the text of Card. Thomasius,⁹ Lightfoot guards himself against seeming to rest weight upon "a passage which contains such obvious anachronisms and other inaccuracies," yet thinks the mention of Papias worthy of attention, and endeavors to account for it. In this he adopts in the main the conclusions

⁹ Opp. I. p. 344, Romae 1747. Cf. Zahn's exacter transcription in *K. G.*, I., p. 898.

previously given by Westcott in his *History of the Canon* as follows:—¹⁰

"The text of the fragment is evidently corrupt, and it seems to have been made up of fragments imperfectly put together. But the main fact seems certainly to be based on direct [?] knowledge of Papias' book, which is rightly described (in quingue libris). The general tenor of the account is like that given in the Muratorian Canon."

The clumsy attachment of supplementary data by three successive *vero's* (*verum*) is doubtless the ground of Westcott's characterization of the prologue as composite. Lightfoot also remarks that it "seems to be made up of notices gathered from different sources." Lightfoot believes, however, that the reference to Papias can be better explained as an authentic extract, perverted "by clerical errors and mistranslations," than as mere legend growing out of "historical confusion." He even thinks the clause "descripsit vero evangelium" might also have an authentic basis. Papias might have written ἀπέγραφον ("they wrote down") and this have been read as first person sing., "I wrote down." He would account for the silence of Eusebius by supposing:—

"that Papias, having reported some saying of St. John on the authority of the elders, went on somewhat as follows: 'And this accords with what we find in his own Gospel, which he gave to the churches when he was still in the body' (ἐτι ἐν τῷ σώματι καθεστῶτος)."

A mere obiter dictum of this kind in Papias Lightfoot thinks might have escaped the notice of Eusebius. The silence of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and the other defenders of the apostolicity of the Gospel against Gaius and the Alogi he does not consider.

Zahn agrees with Westcott and Lightfoot in making the distinction between possibly authentic and plainly legendary material after the reference to the five books of Papias, dismissing politely but briefly Lightfoot's rather fanciful explanation of the statement that Papias was the amanuensis of the Gospel. In his *Forschungen*, vi. p. 127, n. 1 he characterizes this as "pure fable", pointing out that it does not even claim to be derived from Papias. It is drawn, however, from Greek sources; for it appears independently in a Greek prologue cited

¹⁰ Ed. 6 (1889), p. 77, note 1.

by Corderius.¹¹ Lightfoot's inference of a Greek original from *aduc in corpore constituto* (= ἔτι ἐν τῷ σώματι καθεστῶτος) is thus confirmed as regards the portion relating to Papias. Zahn would extend the proof to that relating to Marcion, regarding *scripta vel epistolas* as a double rendering of *γράμματα*, and a *fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt* as an awkward rendering of *παρὰ τῶν ἐν Πόντῳ ἀδελφῶν*. He leaves undecided the possibility suggested by Corssen of a derivation from Prochorus of the statement concerning the dictation of the Gospel to Papias. Prochorus' Acts of John twice aver (Zahn: *Acta Joannis* 155. 9 and 16) that John dictated the Gospel while standing (*καὶ κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν λοιπὸν ἔλεγεν πάντα οὕτως ἑστῶς*). *Recte*, then, at which T and Stuttg. seem not unnaturally to have stumbled, would be a rendering of *ἑστῶς*.

Harnack¹² agrees with Zahn that the prologue "is certainly translated from the Greek", and in rejecting as not even claiming authority the clause *descripsit vero* &c. He also agrees with his predecessors Lightfoot and Zahn, that the clause *id est in extremis* is a mere explanatory addition of the Latin translator attached to the corruption *exotericis* for *exegeticis*. But Harnack cannot admit the authenticity of the fragment in its present form, because to say that John's Gospel was "published and given out to the churches by John (*ab Iohanne*) while still in the body" would be nonsense; no one maintaining that it was done "by John" after his death, but only (as might seem to be implied in Jn. 21 24) that it had been done (by others) after his death. This would require *Iohanne . . . constituto*, not *ab Iohanne . . . constituto*. Harnack is therefore prepared to admit the possible authenticity of the utterance, on condition that the preposition *ab* be omitted. Even so, however, he would consider the silence of Eusebius to be "suspicious," Lightfoot to the contrary notwithstanding. For Eusebius, who reported what he found in Papias regarding Matthew and Mark, could hardly have passed it over.

Harnack's distinction is grammatically correct, but his in-

¹¹ *Catena in S. Joann.*: Antwerp. 1630. Cf. Harmer-Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, 1891, p. 524.

¹² *Chron.* p. 664 f.

ferences are unwarranted. We have no right to assume that the testimony had reference only to the date and not to the agency of the transaction. As Zahn points out, referring to Mt. 27 63 as a parallel, the use of the preposition does imply, by its assertion of John's personal agency, the disposition in some quarter to regard John's relation to the publication as indirect, or at least the possibility of so regarding it. Here, and here alone, is there ground for Westcott's remark (quite too sweeping in its form): "The general tenor of the account is like that given in the Muratorian Canon." Harnack's proposal to emend, accordingly, has value only as calling attention to the distinctive feature of the extract, if such it be.

In view of Lightfoot's wariness of attributing to Papias an utterance which could not fail to catch the eye of Eusebius, and the wariness of his successors, including even "defenders" such as Badham and Zahn, to adopt Lightfoot's conjecture in aid of the clause: *descripsit vero evangelium dictante Iohanne recte*, it is somewhat unexpected to find Clemen in 1912 adopting not only Lightfoot's explanation of how the clause really attributed to Papias might have been contained in the *Exegeses*, but even that of the "pure fable", as Zahn calls it, which follows. In Clemen's judgment "Papias might very well make a statement of this kind about the Gospel, without either Irenaeus or Eusebius having occasion to repeat it".¹³

In first mentioning Clemen's verdict we characterized the testimony he finds in our prologue as "outweighing in importance all the rest of the external evidence for the Fourth Gospel put together." This may seem at first sight an extravagant estimate. But consider what is alleged. Not mere *employment*, such as Eusebius credibly attributes to Papias in the case of the First Epistle, and such as the present writer concurs with many other critics in attributing to Papias with

¹³ Diese Erklärung (Lightfoot's) ist wahrscheinlicher, als die von Corssen und Badham, die meinen, Papias sei durch eine Verwechslung mit Prochorus, dem die Abfassung eines Lebens des Johannes zugeschrieben wird, hier hereingekommen. Eine solche Angabe über das Evangelium konnte Papias auch sehr wohl machen, ohne daß Irenaeus und Eusebius Veranlassung hatten, sie zu wiederholen. *Entstehung des Johannes-evangeliums*, Halle, 1912, p. 375.

respect to *some form of* the Gospel also. We are dealing here with direct, downright assertion. Papias will have made explicit affirmation on the supreme point at issue in all the long controversy over the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel which raged at Rome between 175 and 225 A. D. And however slight the value the modern critic may attribute to Papias' testimony, advocates such as Proclus, the *Muratorianum*, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus were very far from despising it. Can all these have overlooked the statement? The argument from the silence of Eusebius, bound by his promise to relate all that he found in the earliest writers concerning the origin of the Gospels, and more than willing to relate anything confirmatory of the Johannine authorship, is so strong as to make Harnack reject the statement *in toto* and even Lightfoot and Zahn hesitate to appeal to it, even after conjectural emendation. And wholly independent of Eusebius' silence is the silence of all the participants in the Alogistic controversy, not one of whom on either side betrays the consciousness that a close disciple of John (as Irenaeus esteems him) had put the whole question out of court by his explicit and authoritative statement.

If, then, our prologue really contains an authentic testimony of Papias to the Fourth Gospel its importance even for our own time cannot be minimized. It will imply the currency in Asia early in the second century of this Gospel, *including the appendix* with its covert suggestion of Johannine authorship (21 19-24). And this suggestion, however non-committal, has always proved plain *enough* for the purpose in view. *If* this is Papias' testimony regarding the Fourth Gospel the *ab Iohanne* will have to be understood with reference to Jn. 21 24, as Zahn says. Clemen will find few converts even among moderns to his idea that Papias' testimony is a *quantité négligeable*. But it is not on this ground that we deny the possibility of such a statement having stood in the *Exegesés*. The difficulty is first and foremost (1) that neither Papias nor any of his contemporaries, down to and inclusive of Justin Martyr, treat the Fourth Gospel with anything approaching the respect they pay to Gospels esteemed apostolic, or betray

in any manner the idea of its authorship which forms the culminating statement of the appendix. But over and above this is (2) the importance which testimony such as this from Papias would have had to defenders such as Irenaeus, Proclus, Hippolytus, and the author of the *Muratorianum*. That importance is so great that we cannot agree with Clemen that neither these nor Eusebius "would have occasion to repeat it."

We have, then, a dead-lock between those who think it possible that the statement reported by our prologue or something like it could have stood in the *Exegeses*, and those who think it impossible. A new way must be struck out. But first of all let us define such reasonable concession as may properly be expected from each side. On the one side *something* of this nature must have stood in Papias. At least the clause which actually purports to quote his *Exegeses* cannot be a pure figment of the imagination. Back of the Latin transcribers, whose mutilation of the title of Papias' book proves their ignorance of it, is some Greek prologue or subscription so early as to be well within the period when the battle over the authorship of the writings attributed to John (a controversy carried on in Greek) was still a recent thing, and Papias was far from unknown. It must have contained a statement of his capable of transformation into that of our Prologue.

Reciprocally the difficulty must also be admitted—to a certain extent it is admitted—of accounting for the silence of all the early defenders of the Gospel, if Papias' testimony had anything like the form proposed by modern defenders. Is it possible to find an explanation which solves both difficulties together? Closer scrutiny of the text is our only resource.

The *composite* character of our prologue is the characteristic most universally insisted upon by all who attach any value to it whatever. Lightfoot and Clemen are alone in the attempt to trace the clause "descripsit vero evangelium dictante Iohanne recte" to anything in Papias; and even they regard it as only a mistaken inference. It was probably part of the Greek argumentum, but whether an element of its original form, or a later attachment would be hard to say. The looseness of

the connection (vero) favors the latter. But did the Greek argumentum include the second, anti-Marcionite paragraph?

This paragraph with its "anachronisms and other inaccuracies" about Marcion and John is naturally rejected by all critics as worthless. Still we may reasonably be asked for some possible explanation of its origin before we reject it. As affording such a possibility I have two parallels to submit, the first of which relates to the *scriptum vel epistolas*:—

Regin.

Verum Martion haereticus abiectus est a Iohanne. Is vero scripta vel epistolas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.

Tert. Adv. Marcion iv, 3. 4.

Sed enim Marcion *nactus epistulam* connitur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum quae propria et sub apostolorum nomine (i. e. John and Matthew) eduntur . . . et pecuniam in primo calore fidei catholicae ecclesiae contulit, *proiectam mox cum ipso*, postquam in haeresim descivit. Quid nunc si negaverint Marcionitae primam apud nos fidem eius *adversus epistulam quoque ipsius?* Quid si nec *epistulam* agnoverint?

The passage from Tertullian with its perplexing reference to "letters" which Marcion had brought with him from Pontus, when he fell into heresy and was "cast out" from the church together with his money, seems to me a *possible* source for the reference of our prologue. It is true that Tertullian is referring to two different letters, one our own Galatians (in Marcion's recension), the other apparently a composition of Marcion's own, and that he clearly describes the former (in words above indicated by . . .) as "epistulam Pauli ad Galatas etiam ipsos apostolos suggillantis". But a medieval scribe may be forgiven for not recognizing our canonical Epistle when described as one which Marcion had "happened upon", and one wherein Paul "reviled (literally 'smote in the eye') the very apostles themselves". That he should be at a loss regarding a document described in such extraordinary terms and finding, immediately after, Tertullian proceeding to speak of a letter of Marcion's own, not otherwise known, should exhibit his perplexity in the dubious phrase *scriptum (scripta) vel epistolas*, seems a possible explanation of the curious final clause of our prologue. Zahn's proposal to regard *scripta vel epistolas* as a double rendering of the very common term *γράμματα* will then be superfluous.

Greater uncertainty attends the clause preceding. Here two questions arise: (1) How comes the discomfiture of Marcion to be attributed to *John*? (2) Why is his heresy referred to in such curiously mild terms as "eo quod contraria sentiebat" (var. l. sentiset)? Such mildness almost excuses T's false notion of a conversion of the heretic from his errors.

A further parallel from the same context of Tertullian may afford some light. As regards (1) we observe that in the context of the passage just cited it is primarily the Gospel of John which Tertullian is defending against Marcion. Luke, he maintains, must be dependent on "John and Matthew, who first instil faith, whilst Luke and Mark renew it afterward". Paul, Luke's master, says Tertullian, sought correction of *his* gospel from the 'Pillars'; but Marcion rejects these primary, apostolic sources, and censured even the apostles themselves, in favor of a secondary non-apostolic Gospel, which he alters to suit his own ideas. Tertullian had just before (III, 8) appealed to II Jn. 7 as proof that (prophetically) the Apostle John had on the contrary censured Marcion as an 'Anti-Christ'.

As regards question (2) the phrase *improbare* (or, *reprobare*) *quia contraria sentiebat* is quite Tertullianesque, and is repeatedly applied (in substance) to Marcion's arbitrary rejection of the elements of the catholic canon.¹⁴ We encounter it in the very next paragraph but one of the *Adv. Marcion.* (iv. 6). Only, here the sense is the opposite. *Marcion's* rejections were of "everything that was contrary to his own opinion." I cannot resist the impression that so arbitrary a reason for radical action must originally have been attributed to the heretic rather than to the Apostle. I therefore suggest with all due reserve that the original participle may have been active and not passive, *reprobans* (var. *improbans*), not *reprobatus*. Motives similar to those acknowledged in the *Tikkunê Sopherim*, would easily account for the change. If scribes could alter Gen. 18 22 from "The Lord yet stood before Abraham" to "Abraham yet stood before the Lord," because it was more respectful, an original *reprobans* in the clause *Verum Marcion haereticus*

¹⁴ E. g. *De Carn.* 2; *Praescr.* 30.

reprobans (sc. evang. Ioannis) eo quod contraria sentiebat, abjectus est a Iohanne, might be changed to reprobatus. *Un*-changed the clause would express Tertullian's essential meaning very tersely and epigrammatically: Marcion the heretic, who rejects John's Gospel merely because it does not agree with his own opinion, has himself been rejected by John (*i. e.* in his Epistle).

Tertullian's mention of Marcion's "letters" and declaration that the presumption of the heretic in rejecting John is more than offset by John's (prophetic) rejection of *him*, are adduced as *possibly* accounting for the "fabulous" and "anachronistic" second paragraph of the prologue. The coincidences may be illusive. If so, we can only follow our predecessors in dropping the whole paragraph into the general limbo of medieval fable. I must leave also to better linguists than myself the question whether this paragraph affords any real evidence of translation from the Greek. In any event the separation of it from the statements relating to Papias, insisted on by all who maintain the value of these, is amply justified.

We come thus at last to the real point of burning interest, the question what authority—if any—lies back of the statement that Papias declared the Fourth Gospel to have been given out "by John during his life-time."

Our first question is of necessity as to the meaning. Does *manifestatum* (var. *manifestum*) mean "published"? Lightfoot so renders it, and it seems to be taken in this sense by Stuttg., which thereupon cancels *et datum*; for the two additional words will then be superfluous. But so far as I am able to learn there is no other example known where *manifestare* takes the place of *edere*. It is the proper synonym of 'revelare' (*ἀποκαλύπτειν*), and applies to things hidden and 'brought to light'. As applied to a canonical book the natural sense would be "revealed by God", and it is possible that the scribes of Regin. and T so understood it. But could Papias so write? Few, I think, will regard it as probable that he spoke of John's Gospel as "revealed," while employing ordinary terms (*συνέγραψε, ἔγραψε*) for Matthew and Mark. But since it is universally recognized that this part of the prologue at least has

been translated from the Greek, let us retranslate. Retranslation makes it doubly difficult to take the sense "was published"; for it will anticipate the succeeding words: *et datum est ecclesiis* (T: + Asiae). So far as I can see the translation must run: *ἔξεδόθη καὶ ἰδόθη*, the very tautology in aggravated form which Stuttg. seeks to avoid by dropping *et datum*. No alternative, then, remains but to take the ordinary, natural sense of *manifestare* = *revelare*, the common equivalent of *ἀποκαλύπτειν* in ecclesiastical Latin. We shall then render: *ἀπεκαλύφθη καὶ ἐξεδόθη ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (ταῖς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ)*. Is not the single solution of our two-fold difficulty already apparent? This statement cannot refer to the Gospel. It can only refer to the *Revelation* of John. If attached as a note in any MS. it must have stood between the two, and while intended as an epilogue to Revelation, was transcribed as a prologue to the Gospel.¹⁵

The superscription of Revelation has become part of our text. It runs: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to show unto his servants, and he sent it by his angel unto his servant John." The text proper proceeds: "John to the seven churches which are in Asia." The corresponding statement suitable for an epilogue would be precisely in the form of our prologue. Now as the Monarchian prologues and T inform us, Revelation was understood to have been written first, and in the 'Instrumentum Iohanneum' it may have often stood before the Gospel. Even if always in the other order, the two writings were certainly in some texts adjacent, so that a note intended as a suffix to the one might easily be mistaken for a prefix to the other, or conversely.

Is there then any intrinsic improbability that Papias should have testified that the Apocalypse was "revealed" to John and given out by him to the churches (of Asia)? Quite the contrary. Difficult or impossible as such a supposition would be regarding the *Gospel*, regarding *Revelation* it not only corre-

¹⁵ A similar supposition has been made to account for the curious title *πρὸς πάρχουσι* attached in some MSS. to the Epistles of John. It has been understood as a corruption of *πρὸς παρθένουσι*, and the latter accounted for as the superscription of Second Jn. (II Jn. 1) taken by mistake as a subscript to First John.

sponds to the statements of Justin and Irenaeus, both of whom used Papias, but is (in substance) explicitly attested by Andreas of Caesarea, who states in so many words that Papias testified to the ἀξιώπιστον of Revelation. Moreover this testimony of Papias is most likely to have stood in the latter part of his *Exegeses*, where the writer especially dealt with eschatology, if we may judge from the extracts in Irenaeus. Our prologue, it is true, speaks only of the "five" books of Papias, but in a reference the numeral ε' is more likely to have been originally intended as ordinal than cardinal.

But the "distinctive feature" of the statement is that John's action was "while yet in the body" (ἔτι ἐν σώματι καθεστῶτος). Why add this? Is not Zahn justified in saying that this can only be a denial of such posthumous editing as seems to be suggested by Jn. 21 24? Does it not recall the Muratorian Canon? We will admit that it does. We will further grant to Zahn against Harnack that the clause is by no means otiose, but contains the very kernel of the contention. Still it may apply quite as well to Revelation as to the Gospel. Dispute about the boldly asserted authorship of Revelation antedates dispute about the cautiously suggested claims of the Gospel. Its defenders were Papias, Justin, and Melito, the latest writing about 168 A. D. And in both cases the obstacle was the same. In order to maintain the authenticity of either book some account would have to be taken of the primitive tradition, corroborated by Mk. 10 35-40, and by early calendars of martyrdoms, that "John the son of Zebedee was killed by the Jews"; for the evidence is now too strong to be resisted that Papias himself reported this tradition. The form of statement, ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, probably implied *originally* (i. e. in the mouth of Papias' informants, Palestinian "elders", as I take it, among whom both the Apostle and his namesake the Elder John had lived) a martyrdom while "the Jews" were still a political body. At all events some of the early defenders of Revelation might naturally be expected to adopt this early date for John's martyrdom—in point of fact we know that some did. The authenticity (ἀξιώπιστον) of the book would then require either (1) a very early date, or else (2) some theory

of posthumous publication. The former course (1) is actually taken by the *Muratorianum*, which makes the seven letters of John to the churches of Asia *precede* the letters of Paul.¹⁶ This is in line with the multitude of later authorities beginning with Tertullian, who date the imprisonment and release of John under Claudius and Nero (!) though whether through pure blunder, or in part because of traditions of John's early martyrdom, we cannot say. The latter course (2) would be naturally suggested by the very nature and structure of the book, which every Greek reader would inevitably recognize as a translation in at least its central portion, even if he did not recognize that this central mass is utterly unrelated to the introductory letters to the churches of Asia, cc. 1-3, and the epilogue 22 8-21. Nevertheless evidence of actual recourse to such a theory of posthumous authorship, patent as it is in Jn. 21 19-24 with respect to the Gospel, is lacking in respect to Revelation.

Fortunately it is not needed. What is required to account for the assertion that John saw the vision and gave it out to the churches to which it was addressed "while yet in the body" is not the actuality but only the *potentiality* of the converse proposition. And this, as we have seen, is present in the very form and phraseology of the book which fairly invites the supposition that its vaguely defined sojourn of John in Patmos was not in the body but only "in the Spirit" (1 10).

Papias, however, while accepting the martyrdom, and yet certainly a defender of Revelation, can have followed neither of the two harmonistic expedients thus far suggested. He cannot have dated Revelation early; for we have the definite statement in Irenaeus that "the vision was seen almost in our own time, in the end of the reign of Domitian,"¹⁷ a statement quite generally (and very reasonably) regarded as derived from Papias himself; for it not only occurs in the midst of the "traditions of the elders" usually admitted to be drawn from Papias, but is given as from "the men who saw John face to

¹⁶ Paulus, sequens praedecessoris sui Iohannis ordinem, nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat.

¹⁷ *Hacr.* V. xxx, 3.

face." Moreover it would be far more natural for Papias than for Irenaeus to use the phrase "almost in our own time" of a date *ca.* 93-96 A. D. But even were direct dependence here not admitted, Irenaeus cannot have been on this point at odds with his own chief authority. For not only does this date (93-95 A. D.) coincide with the best results of modern criticism,¹⁸ it coincides also with that given by Epiphanius, where (in dependence on Hippolytus) he declares that the time of writing was "ninety-three years after the Lord's conception".¹⁹ Obviously the book was (rightly) believed in the circles dependent on Papias to have come into circulation at Ephesus about 93-96 A. D.²⁰ If, on the other hand, Papias had in any way advocated an indirect relation of Revelation to the Apostle, Dionysius and Eusebius would surely have seized upon it. We can only accept at its full value the testimony of Andreas that Papias vouched for its ἀξιόπιστον; and if so the only possible reconciliation with his tradition that "John was killed by the Jews" was to hold that the Apostle's fate overtook him *after his return* from Patmos (to Palestine). In other words Papias cannot have allowed that the residence of John in Patmos was any such vague and shadowy one as was suggested by the apocalyptic phraseology and the prevailing ignorance regarding it; neither could he regard John's letters to the seven churches as preceding Paul's. He held (in language very familiar to our ears) that John had "survived until the times of Trajan," thus making room for the authenticity of Revelation. Such a conviction regarding the origin of this much-disputed but to Papias most congenial book, and based upon it, would be most naturally expressed by a declaration that it had been "revealed and given out to the churches (of Asia) by John himself, while yet in the body." An utterance of this kind regarding *Revelation* we have every reason for crediting to Papias, in spite of the silence of opponents of the book such as Eusebius.

¹⁸ *E. g.* Harnack, *Chron.* gives 93-96 A. D.

¹⁹ *Haer.* li. 33 For ἀνάληψιν read σύλληψιν. Cf. Chapman, *J. T. S.* July 1907, p. 603, and *John the Presbyter*, 1911, p. 57, note.

²⁰ References like Rev. 2:13 might furnish easy clews.

On the other hand to make Papias a participant in the controversies which arose as to the authorship of the *Gospel* is an anachronism. His postdating of the martyrdom and endorsement of the stay in Patmos until the time of Trajan undoubtedly paved the way for later defenders. But the bringing of John from Patmos to *Ephesus* is a later development insupposable in Papias. The first trace of it is in the Leucian *Acts of John* (ca. 175). The further prolongation of the Apostle's residence there to admit the writing of the Gospel (post Apocalipsim scriptum), with the necessary rationalizing away of the martyrdom into mere suffering (exile, bath of oil, poison cup, &c.) belong to the still later period of controversy inaugurated (it would seem) by the appendix.

But I have gone too far and too fast. Mere conjecture, I may well be reminded, is a drug in the market. And what I have offered thus far is only conjecture. Let me return to the prologue, which we felt obliged to render: ἀπεκαλίφθη καὶ ἐξεδόθη ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (τῆς Ἀσίας) ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου ἔτι ἐν σώματι καθεστῶτος. We declared that if from Papias, this statement could only apply to Revelation and not to the Gospel. The assertion will certainly be challenged. We shall be asked whether any textual evidence exists to support it. Textual evidence for Revelation, I need not say, is scanty, but I will acknowledge that if MSS. once circulated having a subscription such as I have supposed to be the real source of our prologue, some trace of the note might be expected to survive in some quarter; and it is here that I must invoke the aid of critics having wider access than I to the textual sources.

Until the appearance of the long deferred volume of W-W containing the Latin text of Revelation with its various prologues and subscriptions, I fear I have very little to present. Yet that little contains at all events the distinctive feature, the curious declaration, explicable only from the conflict of the traditions of John's authorship with the preëxisting traditions of his death, that the work belonged to "his life-time." On the last page of Tischendorf's Editio Major, among the subscriptions to *Revelation*, will be found the following, taken, it appears, from the London polyglot:

"*Aeth.* Hic finita est visio Iohannis Abucalamsis. Amen. Quod est dictum: *quam vidit in vita sua*, visio: et scripta fuit a beato Iohanne evangelista dei eius."

I am indebted to my colleague Professor C. C. Torrey for a more accurate rendering of the Ethiopic, which, as the monstrosity Abucalamsis (i. e. Apocalypsis) shows, is based upon the Arabic. Professor Torrey renders as follows: "Here is ended the vision of John, the Apocalypse, Amen. That is to say, that vision *which he saw in his life-time*. And it was written by the blessed John the evangelist of God" (i. e. θεολόγος). —Did it occur to some one independently to say of this book as well as of the Gospel that it was the product of John's life-time and not a posthumous work? Or are we really face to face again with the old dictum of Papias, this time applied as he meant it—to Revelation?