



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 1 of 16 [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [11](#) [>](#) [Last >>](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

06-27-2008, 01:27 PM

#1

[Ben C Smith](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

I am interested in collecting arguments concerning the following propositions:

Pro: *The nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel came later than and both used and modified the extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke.*

Con: *The extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke came later than and both used and modified the nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel.*

I would like to keep the arguments separately numbered according to whether they are *pro* or *con*. To be clear, the *pro* side of the debate basically supports the traditional view that Marcion took what we know as Luke and (tendentiously) abbreviated it; the *con* side of the debate

basically reverses this, arguing that what we know as Luke was created by taking the Marcionite gospel and (tendentiously) expanding it.

Please make each argument stand on its own. On the one side of the debate, you yourself may think that Luke copied from Matthew, but your argument *vis-ê-vis* Luke and Marcion would not be complete simply by arguing that Matthew postdates Marcion; you would also have to argue (openly) that Luke postdates Matthew, as well. On the other side of the debate, you yourself may think that Irenaeus is a great source of information about Marcion, but you would have to demonstrate how he was able to get the relationship between Luke and Marcion in particular correct (trace the tradition, as it were), since (according to Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 4.4.1-4) the accusations of alteration went both ways.

To get the ball rolling, here are two arguments, one for each side:

Pro 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, the second half of which bears several passages called the *we* passages; these passages imply that Acts was written by a sometime companion of Paul, and a contemporary of Paul cannot very well have survived past the time of Marcion. Therefore, Acts was written before Marcion, and, because of the common authorship, so was Luke.

Con 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Acts appears to claim authorship by a companion of Paul. By the time Luke was written, other gospel narratives had already been composed (according to the prologue), and that Marcion would choose Luke to use as his gospel would seem natural, given the profound Marcionite respect for Paul. Yet we must face the fact that (according to Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 4.2.3) the Marcionite gospel had no name attached to it, and (again according to Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.2.7) Marcion rejected the Acts. Why would Marcion choose a gospel based on its authorship by a companion of the great Paul, and yet simultaneously suppress the fact of that authorship? It seems more natural that the gospel began without the name of Luke, which was added after the time of Marcion.

Finally, kindly note that, while I have not necessarily referenced easy NT passages in the arguments above, I have definitely referenced patristic passages. Please do likewise; give your sources.

Many thanks in advance.

Ben.



Solitary Man

Veteran Member

Join Date: Sep 2006
Location: ירושלים
Posts: 1,701



Quote:

Con 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Acts appears to claim authorship by a companion of Paul. By the time Luke was written, other gospel narratives had already been composed (according to the prologue), and that Marcion would choose Luke to use as his gospel would seem natural, given the profound Marcionite respect for Paul. Yet we must face the fact that (according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 4.2.3) the Marcionite gospel had no name attached to it, and (again according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 5.2.7) Marcion rejected the Acts. Why would Marcion choose a gospel based on its authorship by a companion of the great Paul, and yet simultaneously suppress the fact of that authorship? It seems more natural that the gospel began without the name of Luke, which was added after the time of Marcion.

This is still a "pro" argument - the title "Kata Loukon" is not necessarily vital to the Gospel of Luke, and may have been added regardless whether it came before or after Marcionite Gospel.



06-27-2008, 01:39 PM

#3

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Solitary Man**

Quote:

Con 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Acts appears to claim authorship by a companion of Paul. By the time Luke was written, other gospel narratives had already been composed (according to the prologue), and that Marcion would choose Luke to use as his gospel would seem natural, given the profound Marcionite respect for Paul. Yet we must face the fact that (according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 4.2.3) the Marcionite gospel had no name attached to it, and (again according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 5.2.7) Marcion rejected the Acts. Why would Marcion choose a gospel based on its authorship by a companion of the great Paul, and yet simultaneously suppress the fact of that authorship? It seems more natural that the gospel began without the name of Luke,

which was added after the time of Marcion.

This is still a "pro" argument - the title "Kata Loukon" is not necessarily vital to the Gospel of Luke, and may have been added regardless whether it came before or after Marcionite Gospel.

What about Acts and the we passages? Did they influence Marcion in his decision to select Luke over the other gospels? If not, that is at least a coincidence to examine; if so, why did he then reject Acts? Did the connection between Acts and Luke come before Marcion or after?

Thanks.

Ben.



06-27-2008, 01:44 PM

#4

Solitary Man

Veteran Member


Join Date: Sep 2006

Location: ירושלים

Posts: 1,701



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
What about Acts and the we passages? Did they influence Marcion in his decision to select Luke over the other gospels? If not, that is at least a coincidence to examine; if so, why did he then reject Acts? Did the connection between Acts and Luke come before Marcion or after?

This can only be mere speculation, but the total irrelevance of Acts, and perhaps its late dating (it *can* be dated late) could have influenced Marcion to abandon it. Peter Kirby once ran some statistical tests which showed that the author of Luke was probably not the author of acts. It was all on Ebla, way back in the day, and so I don't know what came of it.



06-27-2008, 01:47 PM

#5

hatsoff

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006

Location: Rockford, IL

Posts: 740



I never saw the "we" passages as supporting eyewitness authorship. We pretty much know that Luke borrowed/plagiarized from at least two other Gospels. The "we" passages look like they came from a third such source document.



06-27-2008, 01:53 PM

#6

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member



Quote:

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787

Originally Posted by **hatsoff** 

I never saw the "we" passages as supporting eyewitness authorship. We pretty much know that Luke borrowed/plagiarized from at least two other Gospels.

How would borrowing from gospels about *Jesus* impeach the author being an eyewitness of *Paul*, who himself was not even an eyewitness of *Jesus*?

Ben.



06-27-2008, 02:06 PM

#7


hatsoff

Senior Member

Join Date: Jan 2006
Location: Rockford, IL
Posts: 740



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **hatsoff** 

I never saw the "we" passages as supporting eyewitness authorship. We pretty much know that Luke borrowed/plagiarized from at least two other Gospels.

How would borrowing from gospels about Jesus impeach the author being an eyewitness of Paul, who himself was not even an eyewitness of Jesus?

Ben.

Well, I ask myself why the "we" passages should be so awkward, alternating back and forth between first and third person, and with no mention of who that first person is. The most natural explanation, it seems to me, is that the "we" passages correspond to Luke's copying of a first-person source text. The borrowing from the Gospels in GLuke, as well as the introduction to that text, sets a precedent which makes the existence of a "we" passages source more plausible.

Of course, that's just speculation on my part. Nobody knows with any certainty who wrote Luke-Acts, much less how it was written.



06-27-2008, 02:12 PM

#8

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **hatsoff** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

How would borrowing from gospels about Jesus impeach the author being an eyewitness of Paul, who himself was not even an eyewitness of Jesus?

Well, I ask myself why the "we" passages should be so awkward, alternating back and forth between first and third person, and with no mention of who that first person is.

I guess I do not find them awkward at all. Theophilus surely does not need to be told who the author is; the author simply uses the first person for events he participated in, but the third person for events he did not participate in.

Quote:

The most natural explanation, it seems to me, is that the "we" passages correspond to Luke's copying of a first-person source text.

I agree that it is an explanation (indeed, it is one I am attracted to myself); I dispute that it is the most *natural* explanation.

Quote:

The borrowing from the Gospels in GLuke....

...is exactly what we would expect of someone who witnessed only Paul, never Jesus himself.

Ben.



06-27-2008, 04:35 PM

#9

[spamandham](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)
Pro 1: *The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, the second half of which bears several passages called the we passages; these passages imply that Acts was written by a sometime companion of Paul,.*

No they don't. They indicate that the author was following a standard formula used for fiction at the time, which was to use the personal plural in all discussions related to sea travel, as shown by Vernon K. Robbins in "[By Land and by Sea: The We-Passages and ancient Sea-Voyages](#)" (per RM Price in [The Pre-Nicene New Testament](#) (or via: [amazon.co.uk](#)), pg 605 of 2006 hardback edition).

Further, passages such as Acts 15:7 - a gross anachronism that is simply undeniable by any but the worst apologist - demonstrate that at least that portion of Acts is a MUCH later fabrication.



06-27-2008, 06:39 PM

#10

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006

Location: The Netherlands

Posts: 3,397



Since Luke/Acts are not mentioned until the late 2nd century, by which time Marcion is supposedly quite dead, I go with Con...



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:07 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, **neilgodfrey**.

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 2 of 16 [≤](#) [1](#) **[2](#)** [3](#) [4](#) [12](#) [≥](#) [Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

06-27-2008, 11:27 PM

#11

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**

No they don't. They indicate that the author was following a standard formula used for fiction at the time, which was to use the personal plural in all discussions related to sea travel, as shown by Vernon K. Robbins in "[By Land and by Sea: The We-Passages and ancient Sea-Voyages](#)" (per RM Price in [The Pre-Nicene New Testament](#) (or via: [amazon.co.uk](#)), pg 605 of 2006 hardback edition).

I have [read Robbins](#) (even before it was available online), and was initially excited about it. (This was years ago.)

But [I do not think the thesis withstands scrutiny](#); his own examples do not do what he needs them to do.

However, that said, he does of course make an argument, and this thread is about arguments, not necessarily conclusions. The problem is that it actually does not help to date Acts *with respect to Marcion*, which is the purpose of this thread.

Quote:

Further, passages such as Acts 15:7 - a gross anachronism that is simply undeniable by any but the worst apologist - demonstrate that at least that portion of Acts is a MUCH later fabrication.

Could you flesh out this anachronism into an argument for the *con* side? That is exactly the sort of thing I am looking for. Thanks.

Ben.



06-28-2008, 12:33 AM

#12

2-J

Regular Member

Join Date: Mar 2008
Location: UK
Posts: 179



No substantive contribution to make at this stage I'm afraid - just posting to say this is a topic very interesting to me, I'm glad someone's brought it up and I'll be following it with interest.



06-28-2008, 05:06 AM

#13

robto

Senior Member

Join Date: Aug 2005
Location: Maryland
Posts: 701



Interesting thread.

I was going to add

Pro2: Marcion's gospel begins:

3:1/4:31 In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar,
Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea,
Jesus descended [out of heaven] into Capernaum, a city in Galilee,
and was teaching [in the synagogue] on the Sabbath days;
And they were astonished at his doctrine...

This seems to be an edit that tacks Luke 4:31 onto 3:1 in an awkward way - the idea that Jesus descended out of heaven to earth seems to be missing from other early sources, and only shows up in John and later writings. The awkwardness and the implicit christology argue for a late dating for Marcion's version.

[End of PRO2]

However, in Googling for the passage (which I

remembered vaguely from some book read years ago), I came across a different translation of Marcion's gospel:

1. In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar,
2. [Pontius Pilatus being the Governor of Judaea,] Jesus came down to Capernaum, a city in Galilee, and was
3. teaching on the sabbath days: and they were astonished at his doctrine...

Here there is no suggestion of a descent from heaven - which in any case seems to be only implied in the first translation I quoted. I note too that "went down to Capernaem" is how my NIV translates Luke 4:31.

So, here are a couple of questions for those of you more expert than I:

- Is there anything in Adversus Marcion or Panarion to support "from heaven", or is this just a translator's suggestion of what Marcion intended?
- If "from heaven" is supported, is there any validity to the argument I sketched above?



06-28-2008, 05:48 AM

#14


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **robto** 
However, in Googling for the passage (which I remembered vaguely from some book read years ago), I came across a different translation of Marcion's gospel:

- 1. In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar,*
- 2. [Pontius Pilatus being the Governor of Judaea,] Jesus came down to Capernaum, a city in Galilee, and was*
- 3. teaching on the sabbath days: and they were astonished at his doctrine...*

Here there is no suggestion of a descent from heaven - which in any case seems to be only implied in the first translation I quoted. I note too that "went down to Capernaem" is how my NIV translates Luke 4:31.

The Greek words for *ascent* and *descent* are commonly used for merely journeying from one point to another. For example, when the gospels say that Jesus journeyed to Jerusalem, they are really saying that he *went up*, or *ascended*, to Jerusalem. (Cultural perspectives appear to have played a role here, since AFAICT people always seem to be going *up* to Jerusalem, rarely if ever *down*.) John 4.51 has Jesus *going down*, or *descending*, toward the house of the royal official. A similar verb (same prefix) is used in Luke 4.31.

This is what Tertullian has to say about this passage in the Marcionite gospel, in *Against Marcion* 4.7.1:

Marcion premises that in the fifteenth year of the principate of Tiberius he came down into Capernaum, a city of Galilee, from the heaven of the creator, of course, into which he had first come down out of his own.

The *from heaven* portion appears very clearly to me to be interpretation of the actual text, which must have simply read: *[Jesus] came down into Capernaum, a city of Galilee*. I think Tertullian is saying that Marcion interpreted *came down* as a descent from heaven, not that the text itself had anything explicitly about heaven.

As for Epiphanius, he confirms that the bit about Tiberius was there, but he fails to include anything either *pro* or *con* about Capernaum in his catalogue of variants, and I do not know offhand whether he ever discusses it elsewhere in the *Panarion*.

Ben.



06-28-2008, 05:53 AM

#15

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003
Location: Earth
Posts: 1,443



Counterproposal: Marcion's gospel was a rewrite of a proto-Luke (or a proto-Matthew, depending on how you look at it). Luke then rewrote Marcion, perhaps harmonizing it with proto-Luke, but also adding his own material (including, apparently, Acts, which may have been based on an earlier tradition.)



06-28-2008, 05:56 AM

#16


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave** 
Counterproposal: Marcion's gospel was a rewrite of a proto-Luke (or a proto-Matthew, depending on how you look at it). Luke then rewrote Marcion, perhaps harmonizing it with proto-Luke, but also adding his own material (including, apparently, Acts, which may have been based on an earlier tradition.)

This would be a variant of my *con* proposal above. The only difference would be the recognition that Marcion did not just take over the proto-gospel; he actually modified it. In both cases, for the purposes of this thread, our canonical (extant) Luke would postdate the Marcionite gospel, thus qualifying as a *con* proposal.

Ben.



06-28-2008, 06:06 AM

#17

spamandham

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
 Location: Dallas, TX
 Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

But I do not think the thesis withstands scrutiny; his own examples do not do what he needs them to do.

However, that said, he does of course make an argument, and this thread is about arguments, not necessarily conclusions. The problem is that it actually does not help to date Acts with respect to Marcion, which is the purpose of this thread.

True that it doesn't exactly help to date them relatively, but it does call into question one of the arguments that would date Acts early.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Could you flesh out this anachronism into an argument for the con side? That is exactly the sort of thing I am looking for. Thanks.

Sure.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Acts 15:7+, New Century Version**

After a long debate, Peter stood up and said to them, "Brothers, you know that in the early days God chose me from among you to preach the Good News to the nations. They heard the Good News from me, and they believed. God, who knows the thoughts of everyone, accepted them. He showed this to us by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us. To God, those people are not different from us. When they believed, he made their hearts pure. So now why are you testing God by putting a heavy load around the necks of the non-Jewish believers? It is a load that neither we nor our ancestors were able to carry. But we believe that we and they too will be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus."

So here we have Peter, referring to himself "in the early days". If Acts was written in "the early days" this would make no sense at all. So, at least this portion of Acts, was written long after the early days. That doesn't help us pin it down precisely, but it does favor a much later date rather than a much earlier date.

*I chose this version, because it was the closest online translation I could find to a scholarly translation as provided by RM Price



06-28-2008, 06:09 AM

#18

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**

So here we have Peter, referring to himself "in the early days". If Acts was written in "the early days" this would make no sense at all. So, at least this portion of Acts, was written long after the early days.

How long after the early days? What makes it have to come after Marcion?

Ben.



06-28-2008, 06:21 AM

#19

spamandham

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**

So here we have Peter, referring to himself "in the early days". If Acts was written in "the early days" this would make no sense at all. So, at least this portion of Acts, was written long after the early days.

How long after the early days? What makes it have to come after Marcion?

Ben.

There's no way of knowing how long, it's just "a long time". It does not have to have come after Marcion. I doubt we're going to come across a smoking gun. The argument is going to boil down to likelihoods.



06-28-2008, 07:19 AM

#20

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member




Quote:

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787

Originally Posted by **spamandham** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

How long after the early days? What makes it have to come after Marcion?

There's no way of knowing how long, it's just "a long time". It does not have to have come after Marcion. I doubt we're going to come across a smoking gun. The argument is going to boil down to likelihoods.

The arguments I gave attempted to date Luke and Marcion specifically with relation to each other. Your argument attempts to (very vaguely) date Luke alone with relation to the first days of Christianity. That would be a different thread, would it not?

Quote:

True that it doesn't exactly help to date them relatively, but it does call into question one of the arguments that would date Acts early.

My contention is that the Robbins article does no such thing; it attempts to do something like that, but falls very much short of its goal.

Did you read the review by Kirby? Various scholars have also responded in print. What do you think? Which examples adduced by Robbins do you think survive the criticism?

Ben.



Page 2 of 16 [≤](#) [1](#) **[2](#)** [3](#) [4](#) [12](#) [≥](#) [Last](#) [»](#)

[« Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread »](#)

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

[Search this Thread](#)

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:08 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 3 of 16 [≤](#) [1](#) [2](#) **3** [4](#) [5](#) [13](#) [≥](#) [Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

06-28-2008, 09:44 AM

#21

[spamandham](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)
Did you read the review by Kirby?

No, but then again, neither have I read Robbins. I merely presented Price's support of it. You may well be right that it's invalid, and I'll try to make time to read your link this evening.



06-28-2008, 02:21 PM

#22

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)

Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874

I am interested in collecting arguments concerning the following propositions:

Pro: *The nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel came later than and both used and modified the extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke.*

Con: *The extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke came later than and both used and modified the nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel.*

There is a third argument that has been advanced by Tyson in "Marcion and Luke Acts". It is that canonical Luke (with Acts) is post Marcion. But that canonical Luke is a redaction of an "original Luke", a pre-Marcionite Luke. Marcion also knew and used this "original Luke".

This "original" presumably knew Mark's gospel and Q (or Matthew if you prefer, maybe), and other (Sundergut) material.

But it did not include the infancy narratives (chapters 1-2) and it began at Luke 3:1. Nor did it include most of the post-resurrection chapter (24).

These bookend sections demonstrate strong anti-Marcionite motifs. It is not very plausible to think that Marcion would choose to use a gospel that contained so much material to be excised when there were other shorter ones around closer to his desired starting point.

The final author of canonical Luke has also made a few anti-Marcionite changes to some of the main body of this "original" gospel, and worked his material well enough to overlay it with a unifying style and thematic development that leads the reader into Acts, which he also wrote.

I've recently compiled comprehensive [notes from Tyson's argument](#). But am happy to discuss details here if this third alternative is also up for grabs.



06-28-2008, 02:58 PM

#23

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874

relevance of the we-passages

The we-passages are not prima facie evidence of personal eye-witness or involvement in the story. The storm at sea is riddled like swiss cheese with poetic and other literary allusions testifying to its creative fictional character. All of these outweigh any plausibility that the "we" should be taken as prima facie evidence of a real eyewitness participant in that scene at least:

This is [a summary by Steven Carr](#) from a [fuller discussion](#) of mine:

Quote: _____

Acts 27:41 'they ran the ship aground' =
EPEKEILAN THN NAUN

This is a distinctively poetic (Homeric) phrase.

This is the only time in the New Testament 'NAUS' is used for a 'ship'. Everywhere else the author of Luke-Acts uses PLOIA (Lk.5.3, 7, 11; 8.22, 37; Acts20.13, 38; 21.2, 3, 6).

Another word used nowhere else in the NT (nor even in the LXX) is EPIKELLEIN = 'to ground'. 'In fact, EPIKELLEIN and [its uncompounded form] KELLEIN are poetic forms' prose prefers EPOKELLEIN or OKELLEIN.' (MacDonald, p.94)

Commenting on EPEKEILAN ('beached') the Lake and Cadbury commentary on Acts says: 'According to Blass this is an Homeric form not found in prose-writers, who used OKELLW and EPOKELLW, . . . He compares Odyssey IX 148 . . . and 546. . . . It is also remarkable that the word NAUN is used only here in Acts, which always has the ordinary Hellenistic word PLOION. Blass' suggestion that there is a conscious reminiscence of Homer in this collocation of two unusual words is very attractive. If Luke was acquainted with Aratus and Epimenides, his knowledge of Homer is easily credible.' (p.339)

F. F. Bruce calls it one of Acts 'unmistakable Homeric reminiscences.'

According to Susan M. Praeder, - Little else except a reminiscence of the Odyssey would explain the only appearance of EPIKELLEIN and NAUS in the New Testament.

We may as well have people quoting Gulliver's Travels and claiming that they obviously knew all about sea-journeys :-)

Odyssey

There are two shipwreck scenes in the Odyssey. In book 5 Odysseus suffers alone and in book 12 Odysseus loses his entire crew. MacDonald observes that other writers, Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil, composed shipwreck scenes that drew on both these Homeric accounts, and that Paul's shipwreck scene similarly contains elements of both.

Prediction of disaster: Acts 27:9-10 - cf Od.12 (portents predict disaster) and Od.5 (Odysseus fears disaster)

Sail out in fine weather: Acts 27:13 - cf Od.12 and Od.5 (Odysseus set sail in good weather)

Storm soon follows: Acts 27:14 - cf Od.12 (Zeus soon sends a storm) and Od.5 (Poseidon later sends a storm)

Winds, waves and darkness: Acts 27:14, 18-20 -cf Od.12 (south, east, west, north winds) and Od.5 (south, west winds) and traditional Greek names for the winds used in both Acts and Odyssey.

Abandon all hope: Acts 27:20 - cf Od.5 (Odysseus abandons hope) The abandonment of all hope was a topos in ancient storm stories

Winds drive the helpless ship: Acts 27:15, 17 - cf Od. 12 and Od.5 (the word is FERW, 'to drive')

Expect to die: Acts 27:20 (except for Paul) - cf Od.5 (Odysseus expects to die at sea)

Fulfilled prophecy: Acts 27:21 - cf Od.5 (Calypso's prophecy came true)

Divine figures suddenly appear: Acts 27:23 - cf Od.5 (goddess Ino appears to Odysseus in the middle of the storm)

The divine figure tells the hero none will be lost but the ship: Acts 27:22 - cf Od.5 (the divinity tells Odysseus he will survive but his ship will not)

The divine figure assures the hero of his 'fate': Acts 27:24 - cf Od.5 (it is the fate of Odysseus to escape as it is the fate of Paul to stand before Caesar)

Why believe a divinity?: Acts 27:30 - cf Od.5 (Odysseus did not trust the message of the goddess any more than the crew on Paul's ship trusted the word of the angel - both continued to attempt managing on their own.)

Everyman for himself: Acts 27:43-44 - cf Od.12 and Od.5 (Odysseus rides a plank, in Acts some swim and others ride planks)

An island to the rescue: Acts 28:1 - cf Od.12 and Od.5 (Odysseus arrives on an island)

Friendly locals: Acts 28:2 - cf Od.12 (Calypso shows generosity) and Od.5 (locals show generosity)

Hero experiences cold and warmth: Acts 28:2-3 - cf Od.5 (Odysseus gathered leaves when cold; Paul gathered firewood when cold)

Locals are most unimpressed by the hero: Acts 28:4 - cf Od.5 (locals recoil in fear at Odysseus's appearance, just as they rejected Paul as a murderer doomed to divine punishment)

Locals subsequently see the hero as a god: Acts 28:6 - cf Od.5 (locals believe Odysseus must be a god because of his appearance, just as they later believed Paul was a god for surviving the snake bite)

Wild beasts: Acts 28:3 - cf Od.5 (Odysseus feared wild beasts; Paul was bitten by one)

The hero is highly honoured: Acts 28:9-10 - cf Od.5 (Phaeacians entertain and honour Odysseus with many gifts for his stories as Maltese entertained and honoured Paul for his many healings)

Locals provide the necessities and a new ship: Acts 28:10 - cf Od.5 (Alcinous provided Odysseus with a ship to continue his journey)

Smooth sailing from then on: Acts 28:11-14 - cf Od.5/13 (The renowned Phaeacian sailors drove Odysseus ship to his destination with astonishing speed; Pauls ship led by the Dioscuri (the twin gods Castor and Pollux, protectors of ships and sailors) and with help of a NOTOS (south wind) arrived quickly at Puteoli.)

So forget about "we" being a prima facie indicator of real life biography. In that context above, one has to argue that "we" should indicate a real participant, not assume it.

Similarly, historians never used an anonymous "we" or "I" as we find in Acts:

Quote:

Susan Marie Praeder
Novum Testamentum, Vol. 29, Fasc. 3. (Jul., 1987), pp. 193-218.

"In fact, the issue of first person sea voyages aside, ancient histories still offer no parallels to first person narration in Acts and no proof that first person narration refers to factual or fictional participation by the author of Acts. Quite a few ancient historians participate in their own histories. Ammianus Marcellinus, Cassius Dio, and Velleius Paterculus refer to themselves as first person singular participants and to themselves and others as first person plural participants. Caesar, Josephus, Thucydides, and Xenophon refer to themselves as third person participant. If Acts is a first person ancient history, then it is alone in its lack of first person singular participation. If Luke was referring to his factual or fictional participation by portraying himself as one of several first person plural participants, then his self-portrayal was not influenced by the practice of ancient historians who refer to themselves as first person participants. They clearly refer to themselves as first person singular participants

who are responsible for first person narration."
(p.17)

See also [another post](#) on this topic where it is shown that first person involvement in a story is arguably more likely to appear in the third person in a historical work.

Also note that the "we" passages do not occur consistently with an eyewitness participant. If so, we should find the "we" used more often, such as when Paul is in Ephesus I think, but the text seems to drop in and out of "we" without any really satisfactory explanation -- except possibly maybe the one by Robbins, Peter Kirby's very detailed article notwithstanding.

But I think there might be another explanation for the we-passages that I have not seen discussed anywhere yet, and that is that in each case the movement is towards Rome or a signified Rome proxy, such as the colony or Philippi. If so, this might be something that needs explanation, and I wonder if it might be found in the thesis of Bonz who sees in Acts a transvaluation of a founding epic like the Aeneid. I would also add the possibility the author is tying in the Israelite epic of its Primary history, which also concluded with the final lead character in a comfortable prison-like situation (2 Kings), thus leaving the reader with a hint of hope for what was to follow.

If so, then the we passages might have been originally read vicariously by a Roman audience as a narrative of a movement towards their city -- to found the "new Rome" which by the middle of the second century (when Acts was possibly written) was seeing itself as a rightful base of ecclesiastical leadership. I began a series on this on my blog but found my notes too scattered to organize quickly enough -- will have to return to them and finish them sometime.

Neil Godfrey

<http://vridar.wordpress.com>



06-28-2008, 09:06 PM

#24

[andrewcriddle](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: Sep 2004

Location: Birmingham UK

Posts: 4,876



Argument **Pro 2**

(This Argument assumes Marcan priority)

i/ Both Marcion's Gospel and Luke have numerous passages based on Mark.

However some of the pasages in Luke derived from Mark are omitted in Marcion's Gospel (One can find a reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel here

<http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Itha...7/Library.html>

which gives references to the Patristic sources being used).

ii/ Hence we have two possibilities:
 a/ Marcion's Gospel used some of Mark while omitting passages uncongenial to the agenda of its author while Luke later added some but not all of the Markan material omitted in Marcion's Gospel. (I *think* one could show that in some of these places Luke is adding from Mark not Matthew.)
 b/ Luke used Mark, Marcion's Gospel then abbreviated Luke omitting (among other material) some Lukan material derived from Mark.

ii/ although a/ and b/ are both formally possible; b/ seems more straightforward and plausible and a/ seems over-complicated.

Andrew Criddle



06-28-2008, 10:03 PM

#25

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
 Location: Darwin,
 Australia
 Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **andrewcriddle**

(One can find a reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel here <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Itha...7/Library.html> which gives references to the Patristic sources being used).

This reconstruction is, of course, not a definitive reconstruction but one of several impressions. The evidence does not permit a word for word reconstruction of the gospel of Marcion (see [Marcion's gospel: its character and contents](#)) but only, at best, a general idea of its contents. Some variations in wording can be deduced, but we cannot reconstruct with very high confidence the complete gospel of Marcion.

But the mere fact that there were undeniably two versions of the Gospel of Luke in existence, Marcion's and the canonical version (see Tyson notes I've titled [Did Marcion mutilate the Gospel of Luke?](#)), should give pause before basing a hypothesis on a single-stream chicken-egg question.



06-29-2008, 01:59 AM

#26

robto

Senior Member

Join Date: Aug 2005
 Location: Maryland
 Posts: 701



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

The from heaven portion appears very clearly to me to be interpretation of the actual text, which must have simply read: [Jesus] came down into Capernaum, a city of Galilee. I think Tertullian is

saying that Marcion interpreted came down as a descent from heaven, not that the text itself had anything explicitly about heaven.

Ben.

Thanks for that, Ben. It looks like my argument won't fly.



06-29-2008, 04:20 AM

#27


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
So forget about "we" being a prima facie indicator of real life biography.

(A) I cannot forget about the most obvious answer to the question.

(B) I am not necessarily arguing for a real life biography; it is also possible that the we references are fraudulent. That is, they are intended to indicate eyewitness participation, but falsely so.

(C) The vast majority of the items on that list have nothing, but nothing, to do with whether the author is claiming to have participated in the events. Using Homeric vocabulary and motifs? Come now.

The issue of the we passages is far from settled, and settling it is not nearly so easy as you seem to be making out.

Ben.

ETA: Just for the record, I do not think there is any way Luke was ignorant of Homer.



06-29-2008, 04:23 AM

#28


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
I am interested in collecting arguments concerning the following propositions:

Pro: *The nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel came later than and both used and modified the extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke.*

Con: *The extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke came later than and both used and modified the nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel.*

There is a third argument that has been advanced by Tyson in "Marcion and Luke Acts". It is that canonical Luke (with Acts) is post Marcion. But that canonical Luke is a redaction of an "original Luke", a pre-Marcionite Luke. Marcion also knew and used this "original Luke".

I probably should have included this option in a trio of possibilities, but I was really after the nature of the canonical gospel of Luke; did it come before Marcion, or was it a reaction to Marcion?

Quote:

But am happy to discuss details here if this third alternative is also up for grabs.

I would love to see the details if you have them, Neil.

Ben.

ETA: Oh, and see my pending PM to you on a completely different matter. Thanks.



06-29-2008, 07:32 AM

#29

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: the fringe of the caribbean

Posts: 18,988



The information provided by Church writers about Luke appear to be seriously flawed. It is now thought that the author of Luke wrote very late in the 1st century or beyond, and that the author was not a follower of Paul. How could the Church writers be so wrong about the author of Luke?

According to Eusebius, Luke was with "Paul" and wrote gLuke and Acts before Paul died at around 66 CE. Biblical scholars disagree that Luke and Acts were written before 66 CE.

Where did the Church writers get their information about Luke and Marcion? They all seemed to be using erroneous data about Luke.

Why did the Church writers claim Acts was written before 66 CE when it was not?



06-29-2008, 09:13 AM

#30


JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003
 Location: Nazareth
 Posts: 2,357



Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** 
Since Luke/Acts are not mentioned until the late 2nd century, by which time Marcion is supposedly quite dead, I go with Con...

JW:

Related to this:

Con 1:

Marcion is the earliest attributed, non-controversial **user** of "Luke". As far as I know the orthodox provide no evidence that Marcion was aware of any other version of "Luke". Neil?

Related to this it is likely that the orthodox have a **false** earliest attribution to "Luke". Since it's likely that "Luke" used Josephus as a source it is unlikely that the author of "Luke" was a traveling companion of Paul.

Related to this the orthodox have attribution to **two** different "Luke's". The Epiphanius' Hippolytus/Forged Hippolytus' tradition is that "Luke" was a Disciple who fell from the Faith and was restored by Paul. So much for the Prologue.

Clearly, based on Attribution, it is Marcion who has the credibility. And this is based solely on orthodox testimony!

Joseph

PLAGIARISM, n.

A literary coincidence compounded of a discreditable priority and an honorable subsequence.

PLAGIARIZE, v.

To take the thought or style of another writer whom one has never, never read.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



Page 3 of 16 [≤](#) [1](#) [2](#) **[3](#)** [4](#) [5](#) [13](#) [≥](#) [Last](#) »

« [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) »

Thread Tools

[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)**Forum Jump**

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:09 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 4 of 16 [« First](#) [≤](#) [2](#) [3](#) **4** [5](#) [6](#) [14](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

06-29-2008, 09:45 AM

#31

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**
*Related to this it is likely that the orthodox have a **false** earliest attribution to "Luke". Since it's likely that "Luke" used Josephus as a source it is unlikely that the author of "Luke" was a traveling companion of Paul.*

Now, why did the Church writers, ALL OF THEM, claim "Paul" had a travelling companion named Luke when he did not?

Was there really a "Paul"?

Marcion rejected Luke's history of Paul as written by the supposed Luke according to the Church writer Tertullian.

Where did this author get Paul's history from?

The names of Luke and Paul are NOT in the reconstructed gospel of Marcion.



06-29-2008, 03:24 PM

#32

spamandham

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

The information provided by Church writers about Luke appear to be seriously flawed. It is now thought that the author of Luke wrote very late in the 1st century or beyond, and that the author was not a follower of Paul.

I don't disagree really, but this thread is all about the arguments that support these conclusions, rather than simply the conclusions themselves. So, what do propose supports this idea?



06-29-2008, 05:19 PM

#33

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

The information provided by Church writers about Luke appear to be seriously flawed. It is now thought that the author of Luke wrote very late in the 1st century or beyond, and that the author was not a follower of Paul.

I don't disagree really, but this thread is all about the arguments that support these conclusions, rather than simply the conclusions themselves. So, what do propose supports this idea?

Scholars have deduced gLuke was written after gMark and as late as the 2nd century. Eusebius in Church History claimed Paul died during Nero, and that Paul was aware of the Gospel of Luke before he died.

It would appear the Church writers cannot truly account for the author of Luke or Paul.

Tertullian claimed Marcion's Gospel the Antithesis has no named author. I don't really know if the Church writers were correct when they claimed Marcion wrote the

Antithesis.

They were wrong about Matthew, Mark, Luke John, Acts, the Epistles and Revelation.

Who told the Church writers Marcion wrote the Antithesis, the same person who told them Luke was a disciple of Paul and wrote Acts of the Apostle before Paul died at around 66 CE?

Against Marcion 4.2

Quote:

..... **Marcion, you must know, ascribes NO author to his Gospel.....**

Marcion was already dead when Tertullian claimed Marcion wrote the Antithesis.



06-29-2008, 05:58 PM

#34


[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
(C) The vast majority of the items on that list have nothing, but nothing, to do with whether the author is claiming to have participated in the events. Using Homeric vocabulary and motifs? Come now.

The list demonstrates that the whole story is made to believe. There is nothing distinctive from the real world. Everything is drawn from known literary images. Like the Passion being drawn from OT allusions. Sure those can be used to embellish an otherwise historical account, but if once we strip away those embellishments there is no core of historical account left, then we are left with nothing but a made up tale. The list is definitely relevant because it clarifies the literary as opposed to historical context of the "we" references.



06-29-2008, 06:45 PM

#35


[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack** 
[
Con 1:
*Marcion is the earliest attributed, non-controversial **user** of "Luke". As far as I know the orthodox provide no evidence that Marcion was aware of any other version of "Luke". Neil?*

Sort of. But in an indirect way they do provide evidence

that Marcion did think that there were at least 2 versions of Luke that had existed . . .

Irenaeus is the first to identify Luke as the author of the gospel. But his accusation against Marcion is anachronistic. He accuses Marcion of essentially picking a revered text from an existing canon and egregiously proceeding to mutilate it. But the idea of 'revered texts' and canons in the sense Irenaeus is thinking simply did not exist at the time of Marcion.

The more plausible scenario is that Marcion was rewriting a text at a time when mostly what was known were various editions of texts, nothing formal let alone "canonical". Texts were fluid before the post-Marcionite canonization process.

Some suggest it would have been natural for Marcion to have chosen a gospel by the companion of Paul, but this again is an anachronistic notion. The name of Luke was evidently not attached to the gospel until the time of Irenaeus.

But whatever text Marcion used, it did have clear overlaps with canonical Luke.

And even despite the anachronistic claims of the fathers, it is those same fathers who do provide evidence that there was more than one version of Luke: at the very least, Marcion's and theirs.



06-29-2008, 07:06 PM

#36

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



[QUOTE=Ben C Smith;5418546]

Quote:

Originally Posted by [neilgodfrey](#)

Quote:

But am happy to discuss details here if this third alternative is also up for grabs.

I would love to see the details if you have them, Neil.

I meant I'd be happy to discuss specific questions by drawing on Tyson's work, as I did with another post here by JoeW. But to present the details all here would simply be too much work.

Of relevance to your question are Tyson's discussions on the following:

[Did Marcion mutilate the gospel of Luke?](#)

[Character and contents of Marcion's gospel](#)

[The date of canonical Luke](#)[Discovering an original gospel behind canonical Luke and Marcion's gospel](#)[Luke's infancy narratives as response to Marcionism](#)[Luke's resurrection chapter . . .](#)[Luke's Preface](#)[The body of Luke \(chapters 3-23\)](#)

Those are the notes from Tyson's work that are of most direct relevance to the argument that there was an original gospel behind both Marcion's and canonical Luke's. So you will probably agree it would be a bit of a task to spill the details in a few posts here. But certainly happy to discuss specifics, as per my response to JoeW.

P.S. -- Have decided to try posting one of the above here, the general one on "discovering the original gospel behind...." --

The early church fathers accused Marcion of mutilating the canonical gospel of Luke. But there are problems with accepting this charge, as discussed in a previous post. Tyson in Marcion and Luke-Acts resurrects the hypothesis that both Marcion and the author of canonical Luke used another text no longer surviving and which he calls, after Baur, "original Luke".

Tyson traces the historical pedigree of this hypothesis of "original Luke" through Ritschl, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Volckmar and Knox.

Albert Ritschl, in 1846, argued that the author of our canonical Luke used Marcion's Luke as his source:

- * he showed that inconsistencies in canonical Luke disappeared in the reconstructed gospel of Marcion
- * Ritschl later came to reject his view that the canonical author used Marcion's gospel. It requires one to imagine a proto-orthodox author would base his work on a text he believed to be heretical

Ferdinand Christian Baur, in 1847, disagreed with Ritschl's 1846 argument. Baur's argument was that the author of canonical Luke wrote it as an anti-Marcionite gospel by using material from:

- * an "original Luke" (apparently also known to Marcion),
- * from Matthew
- * and from other material unique to him (Sondergut)

Baur dismissed the claims of the church fathers that Marcion had "mutilated" canonical Luke. Such a charge, he said, carried as little weight as any other evil charge the fathers delivered against those they deemed heretics, such as their propensity to seduce virgins. "A heretic may be

presumed to have done both."

Baur's most convincing evidence that canonical Luke was a mishmash of other sources was the number of inconsistencies throughout it. He drew on Ritschl for most of these inconsistencies in canonical Luke:

* The pericope of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (4:16-30) refers to a scene in Capernaum that has not happened, but that is narrated as happening later (4:31-37)

o Baur saw this as evidence that the author of canonical Luke rearranged his source

+ so that Jesus' ministry began at his hometown (more natural in view of the canonical author),
 + so that it began as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy as per 4:21 (thus anti-Marcionite)
 + so that it began with a link to Elijah and Elisha who preached to both Israel and the gentiles

* Luke 4:24 ("no prophet is accepted in his own country") makes better sense if the reader has already seen a contrast between how Jesus is accepted in other places and in his own town

* Luke 11:29-32 allegedly contains two interpretations of the sign of Jonah and a seemingly irrelevant note about Solomon and the Queens of the South

o Old Testament signs and relevance is anti-Marcionite

* Luke 16:16-17 says both that the law has come to an end and that it can never come to an end

o Baur believed that in the second verse the "original Luke" spoke of Jesus' "words" never failing, and the author of canonical Luke changed this to the law never failing, thus creating a contradiction

Baur's hypothesized "original Luke", however, was very similar to Marcion's gospel.

Gustav Volckmar, 1850, maintained that both Marcion and Ritschl had oversimplified the question. Simply reversing the order of events in Luke 4 (so that the Capernaum pericope preceded the Nazareth one) in Marcion's gospel did not work either, for the following reasons:

1. the Capernaum-Nazareth order provided no motivation for the Nazareth residents to turn against Jesus, since the verse immediately preceding the rejection (4:22) says they all highly approved of him
2. 4:23 has the Nazareth people speaking of the things, plural, that Jesus had done in Capernaum so the one Capernaum incident preceding it is not enough. 4:22 assumes a long history of deeds in Capernaum has preceded this scene.

3. 4:24 ("no prophet is accepted in the prophet's hometown") only makes sense in the context it is used in Mark 6:4 and Matthew 13:57 -- after Jesus has first been shown to be a great prophet

Volckmar's conclusion: both the Marcionite and canonical authors took the two pericopes (Nazareth and Capernaum) from a common original.

John Knox, 1942, summarized the nineteenth century German debate as ending "in the establishment of a new view which denied both that Luke was derived from Marcion and that Marcion was derived from canonical Luke."

Knox also argued that a gospel preceding both Marcion's and the canonical one would have contained:

1. roughly the same Markan and Matthean units that our canonical Luke contains
2. and some of Luke's Sondergut

and that this primitive gospel was:

1. shortened by Marcion
2. and enlarged by the canonical author of Luke-Acts

Tyson writes, p. 85:

This formidable scholarly tradition, which includes Baur, Ritschl, and Knox, has established grounds for serious doubts about the claims of the church fathers and has encouraged an alternative theory, namely that canonical Luke, although not based directly on Marcion's gospel, was composed, among other factors, in reaction to the preaching of Marcion.

Tyson then goes on to show how this argument is strengthened by observing some of the differences between Marcion's gospel and canonical Luke.

Nope, trying to edit the formatting to post here is too much work -- no more.



06-29-2008, 11:56 PM

#37

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003
Location: Nazareth
Posts: 2,357



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack** >

[

Con 1:

*Marcion is the earliest attributed, non-controversial **user** of "Luke". As far as I know the orthodox provide no evidence that Marcion was aware of any other*

version of "Luke". Neil?

Sort of. But in an indirect way they do provide evidence that Marcion did think that there were at least 2 versions of Luke that had existed . . .

JW:

Ahem. Tertullian, even though he was a very little man, seems to be our best source on Marcion as he was close to Irenaeus and wrote in detail on the subject. The starting point for this investigation should be **Attribution** of usage because that is the simplest and most direct category. Trying to determine attribution based on what you think Tyson thinks Tertullian thought, is [understatement] inefficient [/understatement]. We need to start here with extant Tertullian. Of course Tertullian lacks credibility and his testimony requires huge discounts but it looks to be the best source we have on the subject.

If you try and trek through the Internet you will see lots of discussion on the subject which misapplies what Tertullian has to say about "Marcionites" of *his* time to Marcion. Let's try and look at Tertullian's "testimony" as to Marcion's attribution of "Luke":

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...ullian124.html>

Quote:

CHAP. II.--ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL, SELECTED BY MARCION AS HIS AUTHORITY, AND MUTILATED BY HIM. THE OTHER GOSPELS EQUALLY AUTHORITATIVE. MARCION'S TERMS OF DISCUSSION, HOWEVER, ACCEPTED, AND GRAPPLED WITH ON THE FOOTING OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL ALONE.

You have now our answer to the Antitheses compendiously indicated by us. I pass on to give a proof of the Gospel--not, to be sure, of Jewry, but of Pontus--having become meanwhile adulterated; and this shall indicate the order by which we proceed. We lay it down as our first position, that the evangelical Testament has apostles for its authors, to whom was assigned by the Lord Himself this office of publishing the gospel. Since, however, there are apostolic men also, they are yet not alone, but appear with apostles and after apostles; because the preaching of disciples might be open to the suspicion of an affectation of glory, if there did not accompany it the authority of the masters, which means that of Christ, for it was that which made the apostles their masters. Of the apostles, therefore, John and Matthew first instil faith into us; whilst of apostolic men, Luke and Mark renew it afterwards. These all start with the same principles of the faith, so far as relates to the one only God the Creator and His Christ, how that He was born of the Virgin, and came to fulfil

the law and the prophets. Never mind if there does occur some variation in the order of their narratives, provided that there be agreement in the essential matter of the faith, in which there is disagreement with Marcion. **Marcion, on the other hand, you must know,**

ascribes no author to his Gospel, as if it could not be allowed him to affix a title to that from which it was no crime (in his eyes) to subvert the very body. And here I might now make a stand, and contend that a work ought not to be recognised, which holds not its head erect, which exhibits no consistency, which gives no promise of credibility from the fulness of its title and the just profession of its author. But we prefer to join issue on every point; nor shall we leave unnoticed what may fairly be understood to be on our side. Now, of the authors whom we possess, Marcion seems to have singled out Luke for his mutilating process. Luke, however, was not an apostle, but only an apostolic man; not a master, but a disciple, and so inferior to a master--at least as far subsequent to him as the apostle whom he followed (and that, no doubt, was Paul) was subsequent to the others; so that, had Marcion even published his Gospel in the name of St. Paul himself, the single authority of the document, destitute of all support from preceding authorities, would not be a sufficient basis for our faith. There would be still wanted that Gospel which St. Paul found in existence, to which he yielded

his belief, and with which he so earnestly wished his own to agree, that he actually on that account went up to Jerusalem to know and consult the apostles, "lest he should run, or had been running in vain;" in other words, that the faith which he had learned, and the gospel which he was preaching, might be in accordance with theirs. Then, at last, having conferred with the (primitive) authors, and having agreed with them touching the rule of faith, they joined their hands in fellowship, and divided their labours thenceforth in the office of preaching the gospel, so that they were to go to the Jews, and St. Paul to the Jews and the Gentiles. Inasmuch, therefore, as the enlightener of St. Luke himself desired the authority of his predecessors for both his own faith and preaching, how much more may not I require for Luke's Gospel that which was necessary for the Gospel of his master.

JW:

So far, all Tertullian says on the subject of Marcion attribution of "Luke" is that he did not ascribe a name to authorship. We can see above that all of Tertullian's attributions of names are likely wrong. Therefore, at this point, Point Marcion! Score:

Marcion 3:15

Tertullian Love

[Joseph](#)

SCRIPTURES, n.

The sacred books of our holy religion, as distinguished from the false and profane writings on which all other faiths are based.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



06-30-2008, 01:17 AM

#38

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003

Location: Nazareth

Posts: 2,357



JW:

Let's move this forward:

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...ullian124.html>

Quote:

CHAP. IV.--EACH SIDE CLAIMS TO POSSESS THE TRUE GOSPEL. ANTIQUITY THE CRITERION OF TRUTH IN SUCH A MATTER. MARCION'S PRETENSIONS AS AN AMENDER OF THE GOSPEL.

We must follow, then, the clue of our discussion, meeting every effort of our opponents

with reciprocal vigor. I say that my Gospel is the true one; Marcion, that his is. I affirm that Marcion's Gospel is adulterated; Marcion, that mine is. Now what is to settle the point for us, except it be that principle of time, which rules that the authority lies with that which shall be found to be more ancient; and assumes as an elemental truth, that corruption (of doctrine)

belongs to the side which shall be convicted of comparative lateness in its origin. For, inasmuch as error is falsification of truth, it must needs be that truth therefore precede error. A thing must exist prior to its suffering any casualty; and an object must precede all rivalry to itself. Else how absurd it would be, that, when we have proved our position to be the older one, and Marcion's the later, ours should yet appear to be the false one, before it had even received from truth its objective existence;

and Marcion's should also be supposed to have experienced rivalry at our hands, even before its publication; and, in fine, that that should be

thought to be the truer position which is the later one--a century later than the publication of all the many and great facts and records of the Christian religion, which certainly could not have been published without, that is to say, before, the truth of the gospel. With regard, then, to the pending

question, of Luke's Gospel (so far as its being the common property of ourselves and Marcion enables it to be decisive of the truth,) that portion of it which we alone receive is so much older than Marcion, that Marcion, himself once believed it, when in the first warmth of faith he contributed money to the Catholic church, which along with himself was afterwards rejected, when he fell away from our truth into his own heresy. What if the Marcionites have denied that he held the primitive faith amongst ourselves, in the face even of his own letter? What, if they do not acknowledge the letter? They, at any rate, receive his Antitheses; and more than that, they make ostentatious use of them. Proof out of these is enough for me. **For if the Gospel, said to be Luke's which is current amongst us (we shall see whether it be also current with Marcion), is the very one which, as Marcion argues in his Antitheses, was interpolated by the defenders of Judaism, for the purpose of such a conglomeration with it of the law and the prophets as should enable them out of it to fashion their Christ, surely he could not have so argued about it, unless he had found it (in such a form).** No one censures things before they exist, when he knows not whether they will come to pass. Emendation never precedes the fault. To be sure, an amender of that Gospel, which had been all topsy-turvy from the days of Tiberius to those of Antoninus, first presented himself in Marcion alone--so long looked for by Christ, who was all along regretting that he had been in so great a hurry to send out his apostles without the support of Marcion! But for all that, heresy, which is for ever mending the Gospels, and corrupting them in the act, is an affair of man's audacity, not of God's authority; and if Marcion be even a disciple, he is yet not "above his master;" if Marcion be an apostle, still as Paul says, "Whether it be I or they, so we preach;" if Marcion be a prophet, even "the spirits of the prophets will be subject to the prophets," for they are not the authors of confusion, but of peace; or if Marcion be actually an angel, he must rather be designated "as anathema than as a preacher of the gospel," because it is a strange gospel which he has preached. So that, whilst he amends, he only confirms both positions: both that

our Gospel is the prior one, for he amends that which he has previously fallen in with; and that that is the later one, which, by putting it together out of the emendations of ours, he has made his own Gospel, and a novel one too.

JW:

Tertullian claims that in *Antitheses* Marcion acknowledged that he was aware of another Gospel. Tertullian assumes/concludes that this other Gospel was orthodox "Luke". Was it "Luke" or maybe "Mark"? Neil?

We also have two **Attribution** issues:

1) **Who** did each side attribute "Luke" to?

Here Marcion wins because it is likely that the orthodox have a False attribution to a Partner of Paul.

2) Who was the earliest identified attributed **user**?

Marcion wins again as Tertullian does not identify anyone earlier than Marcion who used "Luke" unless you can conclude from the above that Marcion used orthodox "Luke" before he used Marcion "Luke". Neil?

Joseph

SCRIPTURES, n.

The sacred books of our holy religion, as distinguished from the false and profane writings on which all other faiths are based.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



06-30-2008, 03:53 AM

#39

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: the fringe of the caribbean

Posts: 18,988



Marcion would have rejected the entire NT. Marcion did not need gLuke.

Without the birth narrative and the genealogy, gLuke would be substantially similar to gMark or gMatthew, without the birth and genealogy.

Marcion's Gospel does not need a birth narrative or genealogy.

Marcion rejected Revelations, Acts of the Apostles and Paul according to Tertullian.

Against Marcion 5.2

Quote:

Now since the Acts of the Apostles thus AGREE with PAUL, it becomes apparent why you REJECT

them.

It is because **they declare no other God than the Creator, and prove Christ to belong to no other God than the Creator....**

All the Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John **declare no other God than the Creator, and prove Christ to belong to no other God than the Creator.**

Marcion would have REJECTED all the Gospels.



06-30-2008, 08:48 AM

#40


mountainman

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2006
Location: Falls Creek, Oz.
Posts: 11,192



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
I am interested in collecting arguments concerning the following propositions:

Pro: *The nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel came later than and both used and modified the extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke.*

Con: *The extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke came later than and both used and modified the nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel.*

I would like to keep the arguments separately numbered according to whether they are pro or con. To be clear, the pro side of the debate basically supports the traditional view that Marcion took what we know as Luke and (tendentiously) abbreviated it; the con side of the debate basically reverses this, arguing that what we know as Luke was created by taking the Marcionite gospel and (tendentiously) expanding it.

Please make each argument stand on its own. On the one side of the debate, you yourself may think that Luke copied from Matthew, but your argument vis-ê-vis Luke and Marcion would not be complete simply by arguing that Matthew postdates Marcion; you would also have to argue (openly) that Luke postdates Matthew, as well. On the other side of the debate, you yourself may think that Irenaeus is a great source of information about Marcion, but you would have to demonstrate how he was able to get the relationship between Luke and Marcion in particular correct (trace the tradition, as it were), since (according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 4.4.1-4) the accusations of alteration went both ways.

To get the ball rolling, here are two arguments, one for each side:

Pro 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, the second half of which bears several passages called the we passages; these passages imply that Acts was written by a sometime companion of Paul, and a contemporary of Paul cannot very well have survived past the time of Marcion. Therefore, Acts was written before Marcion, and, because of the common authorship, so was Luke.

Con 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Acts appears to claim authorship by a companion of Paul. By the time Luke was written, other gospel narratives had already been composed (according to the prologue), and that Marcion would choose Luke to use as his gospel would seem natural, given the profound Marcionite respect for Paul. Yet we must face the fact that (according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 4.2.3) the Marcionite gospel had no name attached to it, and (again according to Tertullian, Against Marcion 5.2.7) Marcion rejected the Acts. Why would Marcion choose a gospel based on its authorship by a companion of the great Paul, and yet simultaneously suppress the fact of that authorship? It seems more natural that the gospel began without the name of Luke, which was added after the time of Marcion.

Finally, kindly note that, while I have not necessarily referenced easy NT passages in the arguments above, I have definitely referenced patristic passages. Please do likewise; give your sources.

Many thanks in advance.

Ben.

What sort of exercise is this Ben? We are very much aware that the prologues to these gospels were written no earlier than the fourth century. We have discussed this before in another thread - the prologues are dated very very late with respect to the (ahem) traditional dating of the texts. What admixture of logic are you cooking?

Best wishes,

Pete



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools	Search this Thread
 Show Printable Version	Search this Thread: <input type="text"/> <input type="button" value="Go"/>
	Advanced Search

Forum Jump

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:09 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 5 of 16 [« First](#) [≤](#) [3](#) [4](#) **5** [6](#) [7](#) [15](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

06-30-2008, 11:47 AM

#41

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by [JoeWallack](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by [neilgodfrey](#)

Sort of. But in an indirect way they do provide evidence that Marcion did think that there were at least 2 versions of Luke that had existed . . .

JW:

*Ahem. Tertullian, even though he was a very little man, seems to be our best source on Marcion as he was close to Irenaeus and wrote in detail on the subject. The starting point for this investigation should be **Attribution** of usage because that is*

the simplest and most direct category. Trying to determine attribution based on what you think Tyson thinks Tertullian thought, is [understatement] inefficient [/understatement]. We need to start here with extant Tertullian. Of course Tertullian lacks credibility and his testimony requires huge discounts but it looks to be the best source we have on the subject.

If you try and trek through the Internet you will see lots of discussion on the subject which misapplies what Tertullian has to say about "Marcionites" of his time to Marcion. Let's try and look at Tertullian's "testimony" as to Marcion's attribution of "Luke":

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...ullian124.html>

.

So far, all Tertullian says on the subject of Marcion attribution of "Luke" is that he did not ascribe a name to authorship. We can see above that all of Tertullian's attributions of names are likely wrong. Therefore, at this point, Point Marcion! Score:

Marcion 3:15

Tertullian Love

What are you talking about? I'm not sure that you read more than one line of my post. At least I cannot relate any of your post to anything I have said or think about the subject. Can you explain your point without any presuppositions about what you think I should understand?

And you would be nice if you could do it without the supercilious condescension (no idea how or why i provoked that in you), but that would be an optional extra.

Neil Godfrey

P.S. -- just one more thing, do please explain your grounds for the following put-down of yours:

Quote:

Trying to determine attribution based on what you think Tyson thinks Tertullian thought, is [understatement] inefficient [/understatement].



06-30-2008, 11:51 AM

#42

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**

Posts: 874

Tertullian claims that in Antitheses Marcion acknowledged that he was aware of another Gospel. Tertullian assumes/concludes that this other Gospel was orthodox "Luke". Was it "Luke" or maybe "Mark"? Neil?

We also have two **Attribution** issues:

1) **Who** did each side attribute "Luke" to?

Here Marcion wins because it is likely that the orthodox have a False attribution to a Partner of Paul.

2) **Who** was the earliest identified attributed **user**?

Marcion wins again as Tertullian does not identify anyone earlier than Marcion who used "Luke" unless you can conclude from the above that Marcion used orthodox "Luke" before he used Marcion "Luke". Neil?

It might help if you summed up exactly what you think my argument is that you are apparently refuting and sum up your own refutation too. How the passages you cite from Tertullian is (presumably) meant to counter the argument I was proposing completely escapes me. And the point of your commentary to what I was saying escapes me too. Maybe you are not approaching me with sufficient condescension and need to spell it out even more clearly.

Neil

P.S. Is there anyone who would like to discuss this topic in a good-natured and even kind of professional way?



07-01-2008, 12:05 AM

#43

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **robto** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >

The from heaven portion appears very clearly to me to be interpretation of the actual text, which must have simply read: [Jesus] came down into Capernaum, a city of Galilee. I think Tertullian is saying that Marcion interpreted came down as a descent from heaven, not that the text itself had anything explicitly about heaven.

Ben.

Thanks for that, Ben. It looks like my argument won't fly.

You are welcome. It was well worth a shot. 😊

Ben.



07-01-2008, 12:33 AM

#44

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** ➤

I meant I'd be happy to discuss specific questions by drawing on Tyson's work, as I did with another post here by JoeW. But to present the details all here would simply be too much work.

I see.

Quote:

Of relevance to your question are Tyson's discussions on the following:

[Did Marcion mutilate the gospel of Luke?](#)

[Character and contents of Marcion's gospel](#)

[The date of canonical Luke](#)

[Discovering an original gospel behind canonical Luke and Marcion's gospel](#)

[Luke's infancy narratives as response to Marcionism](#)

[Luke's resurrection chapter . . .](#)

[Luke's Preface](#)

[The body of Luke \(chapters 3-23\)](#)

I have read most of those before; what I was hoping was that you would present a few tidbits from them on this thread as a sort of third proposal. Turns out you did post some, and for that I thank you.

Quote:

The list demonstrates that the whole story is make believe.

I do not think it does, though I agree readily that it may cast doubt on some of the details (many of which were already doubtful for other reasons).

Quote:

There is nothing distinctive from the real world.
Everything is drawn from known literary images.

I think this is exaggeration. Unless your list is severely truncated or abbreviated.

Quote:

Like the Passion being drawn from OT allusions.

Likewise, there are elements of the passion story that are not drawn from OT allusions.

Quote:

Sure those can be used to embellish an otherwise historical account, but if once we strip away those embellishments there is no core of historical account left, then we are left with nothing but a made up tale.

Again, I think this is accomplished only with exaggeration and guilt by association. How, for example, do you remove all the details of Acts 27.6-8 in the manner you suggest?

Let me be clear here. It is possible these details derive from novelistic concerns; good details make for good stories. But your claim seems to be that, once we have compared Acts with the epic literature and stripped away everything that lines up as a parallel, there is *nothing* left, not even incidental details of this kind.

If that is *not* what you are really claiming, then I think the language you used is misleading; if that *is* what you are really claiming, then I think you are mistaken.

Quote:

The list is definitely relevant because it clarifies the literary as opposed to historical context of the "we" references.

I think this is the source of our disagreement; you write of the **literary as opposed to historical context**, as if they were mutually exclusive, and in my view they are not. History is a form of literature; historians are allowed to write literarily and allude to other literature in their histories.

Let me point out something else about the *we* passages in Acts. I have casually searched for parallels for this anonymous first person usage in ancient literature, so far without exact results. The ancient writers tend to name themselves at some point (the **I Porphyry**, for example, in the *Life of Plotinus*); or at least they are more specific as to the nature of their participation. However, *so far* I

have found this to be the case in the ancient novels and romances, too. Am I right?

IOW, if the first person plural narration (not forgetting the first person singular prologue, however) does not exactly match the practice as we find it in the ancient histories, encomia, and biographies, does it exactly match the practice as we find it in the ancient novels and romances? So far it does not appear to me to be so.

If the phenomenon we find in Acts does not precisely match any of the ancient genre markers, where does that leave us? I think we are left with the usual meaning of the first person; the only reason an author would not need to use genre markers is because he is using the first person in its *usual* sense, as an indication that he participated in the events being narrated.

I welcome being proven wrong on this score; I really do. If there is an exact parallel out there to this apparently anonymous first person collective narration from antiquity, I would love to see it, be it from the novels, from the romances, from the histories, from the biographies, or from the epics. Robbins tried to provide some; and I think he failed to do so.

Ben.



07-01-2008, 12:37 AM

#45

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben**
[T]hese passages imply that Acts was written by a sometime companion of Paul....

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**
No they don't. They indicate that the author was following a standard formula used for fiction at the time....

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**
Did you read the review by Kirby?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**
No, but then again, neither have I read Robbins. I merely presented Price's support of it.

You mean you corrected my statement on the basis of an article you have never read? Not only the reviews of it, but indeed the article itself??

Ben.

07-01-2008, 12:41 AM

#46

spamandham

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)
You mean you corrected my statement on the basis of an article you have never read? Not only the reviews of it, but indeed the article itself??

Yes. I rest on authority occasionally (this time RM Price), until shown to have been unwise.

07-01-2008, 12:57 AM

#47

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham** [▶](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)
You mean you corrected my statement on the basis of an article you have never read? Not only the reviews of it, but indeed the article itself??

Yes. I rest on authority occasionally (this time RM Price), until shown to have been unwise.

Well, so do I sometimes, but I like to mark those occasions as such. You seemed so... definite (*no they don't*).

Ben.

07-01-2008, 01:14 AM

#48

spamandham

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham** [▶](#)

Yes. I rest on authority occasionally (this time RM Price), until shown to have been unwise.

Well, so do I sometimes, but I like to mark those occasions as such. You seemed so... definite (no they don't).

Ben.

I guess you missed the parenthetical, where I thought I had made it clear I was resting on Price.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**
(per RM Price in *The Pre-Nicene New Testament*, pg 605 of 2006 hardback edition).



07-01-2008, 01:29 AM

#49

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Well, so do I sometimes, but I like to mark those occasions as such. You seemed so... definite (no they don't).

Ben.

I guess you missed the parenthetical, where I thought I had made it clear I was resting on Price.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spamandham**
(per RM Price in *The Pre-Nicene New Testament*, pg 605 of 2006 hardback edition).

No, I saw that parentheses. I did not interpret it as your sole source for the assertion; I interpreted it as support for it.

Ben.



07-01-2008, 12:20 PM

#50

neilgodfrey

Senior Member


Join Date: Mar 2005



[QUOTE=Ben C Smith;5421454]

Quote:

Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

Quote:

The list is definitely relevant because it clarifies the literary as opposed to historical context of the "we" references.

*I think this is the source of our disagreement; you write of the **literary as opposed to historical context**, as if they were mutually exclusive, and in my view they are not. History is a form of literature; historians are allowed to write literarily and allude to other literature in their histories.*

I think you are right. By historical context I mean the reality of events outside the text itself. By literary context, I mean nothing more than the words within the page of the text. And the author of those words is again another entity entirely. I'm thinking of how authors necessarily project through a literary persona, or a literary voice. That voice, then, is the expression not of the real person, but of the "implied narrator" projected by the real person. Now it may happen that the meaning of the words in the text really do coincide with the historical reality outside the text, but we need independent evidence to confirm that. We can't assume it from the internal evidence of the text alone. The text alone is only evidence of itself, not of anything external to it. It only becomes evidence of something external to it (history) if there is some external control that allows us to interpret it as such. So we have archaeological and other contemporary literary texts (primary evidence) that give us some confidence that Julius Caesar's memoirs of his Gallic wars are by and large what they claim to be. But we have no external primary evidence to give us any confidence that any of the text of Acts is what it claims to be. Without primary evidence there is simply a lot of "history" that we simply cannot do for ancient times. We can't change the rules and give ancient history special allowances because justifiable historical methods (starting with primary evidence) can't get a foothold in many topics that we'd like to know about there. Acts is primary evidence of something, but not of the events it relates. It is primary evidence of its own provenance. We don't know what that was for sure. So the best we can do is put Acts under a microscope and attempt to analyse exactly what it is, and then consider those findings against the first layers of texts we find testifying to its existence.

Quote:

Let me point out something else about the we passages in Acts. I have casually searched for parallels for this anonymous first person usage in ancient literature, so far without exact results. The ancient writers tend to name themselves at some point (the **I Porphyry**, for example, in the *Life of Plotinus*); or at least they are more specific as to the nature of their participation. However, so far I

have found this to be the case in the ancient novels and romances, too. Am I right?

IOW, if the first person plural narration (not forgetting the first person singular prologue, however) does not exactly match the practice as we find it in the ancient histories, encomia, and biographies, does it exactly match the practice as we find it in the ancient novels and romances? So far it does not appear to me to be so.

If the phenomenon we find in Acts does not precisely match any of the ancient genre markers, where does that leave us? I think we are left with the usual meaning of the first person; the only reason an author would not need to use genre markers is because he is using the first person in its *usual* sense, as an indication that he participated in the events being narrated.

If we don't have a precedent, and can't match something to anything else we know, then we cannot arbitrarily decide to give it any specific meaning at all. It is just as valid to say we are left with the usual meaning, a first person of an implied narrator, regardless of the extent to which that implied narrator coincides with a real person and external history. In fact, rhetorical analysis means the "we" in Acts must necessarily refer to the implied narrator. All narratives are spoken through a voice of an implied narrator. That's the very nature of narrative literature. It is another question whether that voice and implied narrator expresses the historical experiences of the real narrator external to the text. It may do, but we need external controls to assess that. The narrative alone can't do it for us.

Quote:

I welcome being proven wrong on this score; I really do. If there is an exact parallel out there to this apparently anonymous first person collective narration from antiquity, I would love to see it, be it from the novels, from the romances, from the histories, from the biographies, or from the epics. Robbins tried to provide some; and I think he failed to do so.

Ben.

I think our differences arise over how we understand and approach literary texts. A naive reading of a text (naive in the technical sense -- I'm not meaning to be pejorative at all) requires as much justification as any other kind of reading of it. I see no justification for any default position (such as a naive reading) in the absence of any external controls relating to a text. The self-attestation of texts, especially ancient texts, has proven unreliable in too many cases.

So when I speak of the literary context of "we" I am

purposefully distinguishing it from historical context. The only evidence we have available to us for the identity of "we" is the text itself, the voice of the implied narrator. Pending further evidence (external to the text), all we can come to understand about the meaning and identity of "we" can only come from within the text itself.

Neil



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:09 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, **neilgodfrey**.

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 6 of 16 [« First](#) [≤ 4](#) [5](#) **6** [7](#) [8](#) [≥ Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-01-2008, 03:58 PM

#51

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

If we don't have a precedent, and can't match something to anything else we know, then we cannot arbitrarily decide to give it any specific meaning at all.

I think you modify this correctly below.

Quote:

It is just as valid to say we are left with the usual meaning, a first person of an implied narrator....

In my view, that **is** the usual meaning. The narrator is saying that he himself participated in the events being

narrated in the first person (whether singular or plural). Whether those events and that participation is fictional or historical is a matter for the genre of the whole.

Quote:

...regardless of the extent to which that implied narrator coincides with a real person and external history. In fact, rhetorical analysis means the "we" in Acts must necessarily refer to the implied narrator. All narratives are spoken through a voice of an implied narrator. That's the very nature of narrative literature.

Agreed. But recall that I (we?) are in dialogue with Robbins, too (or rather with those who have interpreted Robbins in certain ways). I am not certain whether Robbins is the actual source for this notion, but I think many who have read him wind up claiming that the we narration has a purpose **different** than implying narrator involvement, that the author is now merely writing in a generic style that his readers would not interpret as involving the narrator in the events. This, I think, is false. I think the reader of Acts is supposed to imagine the narrator boarding the ship and sailing Romeward.

I think the same criticism can be levelled at [your idea of a vicarious audience experience with regard to the voyage to Rome](#). Unless you have examples of we passages implying this sort of collective experience in other literature, I think we have to stick to narrator involvement as the meaning, as it were, of the passages. Unless I am completely misunderstanding you.

Quote:

It is another question whether that voice and implied narrator expresses the historical experiences of the real narrator external to the text.

I agree; that is in great part a question of genre.

Quote:

The only evidence we have available to us for the identity of "we" is the text itself, the voice of the implied narrator. Pending further evidence (external to the text), all we can come to understand about the meaning and identity of "we" can only come from within the text itself.

What do you think the genre of Acts is? If you determined that it was a novel or a romance, would that affect your judgment on whether the narrator participation is fictional or historical? If you determined that it was a(n auto)biography, an historical monograph, or an historical treatise of some kind, would that affect your judgment?

Ben.



07-01-2008, 06:32 PM

#52

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*In my view, that **is** the usual meaning. The narrator is saying that he himself participated in the events being narrated in the first person (whether singular or plural). Whether those events and that participation is fictional or historical is a matter for the genre of the whole.*

Genre cannot tell us if a specific incident has a historical reality outside the text. This is the position of those who would argue that we should believe in miracles and supernatural prodigies on the basis of the genre in which they appear. And authors have been known to tell fabrications about their personal involvement in the events they say are historical. Personal diary genres can be completely fictitious and people can be fooled if they read a genre naively on the basis of its genre. Personal letters can also be completely fictitious despite their genre. While on the other hand fiction genres can inform readers of historical events that happened outside the text.

Genre, of itself, cannot determine the question of fact or fiction. Biblical scholars are very aware of this truism when they decide that some gospels and acts are spurious and others are genuine.

Quote:

But recall that I (we?) are in dialogue with Robbins, too (or rather with those who have interpreted Robbins in certain ways). I am not certain whether Robbins is the actual source for this notion, but I think many who have read him wind up claiming that the *we* narration has a purpose **different** than implying narrator involvement, that the author is now merely writing in a generic style that his readers would not interpret as involving the narrator in the events. This, I think, is false. I think the reader of Acts is supposed to imagine the narrator boarding the ship and sailing Romeward.

I was not thinking of Robbins here. I think Peter Kirby has done well to add a note to his critique of Robbins to explain that the question under discussion is a genre or stylistic one, as you clearly acknowledge, and not one about identity of authorship.

My argument is that the only "we" we know is the "we" in the literary text, and is therefore, by definition, a "literary-textual we" -- not an "historical we". There is no external control to give us any grounds for assuming

anything more than the "literary we".

Obviously (to me, anyway) a "we boarded the ship" type expression is meant to convey the image of an implied narrator, or the image of another character within the narrative, boarding a ship in company with another.

But it is arbitrary to assume that this coincides with an historical event outside the text.

Quote:

I think the same criticism can be levelled at your idea of a vicarious audience experience with regard to the voyage to Rome. Unless you have examples of we passages implying this sort of collective experience in other literature, I think we have to stick to narrator involvement as the meaning, as it were, of the passages. Unless I am completely misunderstanding you.

I would agree that there is "implied narrator involvement". But we have no way of deciding if behind the implied narrator is a real person who experienced historically the events described. There is no way that can be determined given the evidence we have to work with. Some questions are beyond any possibility of serious enquiry simply because there is no evidence to work with.

Quote:

What do you think the genre of Acts is? If you determined that it was a novel or a romance, would that affect your judgment on whether the narrator participation is fictional or historical? If you determined that it was a(n auto)biography, an historical monograph, or an historical treatise of some kind, would that affect your judgment?

Ben.

It is not a novel or a romance. I suspect (at the moment) the author was attempting to write something of an historical epic to glorify and promote a certain theological position as the rightful one for the Church. He employs many features of Hellenistic romances, but he is writing something he wants readers to take as their history for a certain theological perspective/establishment.

Texts need to be judged and understood in their own right. They need to be studied as literary texts within some overall theory of literary texts. It is an error, I believe, to confuse narrative claims with events or characters external to the text, unless there are external controls of some sort that justify this.

Whatever the genre of Acts, a reader reads the implied narrator's voice. Often this voice will be relayed down through various levels of characters within the narrative.

Or sometimes through what appears to be some anonymous "objective from-the-outside" comment on the action and characters. This is true of all genres. It is an implied narrator's voice. Without external evidence we have no way of determining what the real narrator thinks or believes or has experienced. Regardless of genre, we can only gain confidence in "historicity" or "facticity" insofar as external controls relating to a text -- any text of any genre, ancient or modern -- allow us to.

Neil



07-01-2008, 06:44 PM

#53

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: The Netherlands
Posts: 3,397



Acts is nothing more than religious propaganda, disguised as history. Its purpose being to attack the Marcionite church by rewriting the history of Paul (the Marcionite main man), making him (Paul) subservient to a fictitious group of men that were invented to give "authority" via "Apostolic Succession" to a certain other ROMAN church.



07-01-2008, 11:10 PM

#54

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

I am interested in collecting arguments concerning the following propositions:

Pro: *The nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel came later than and both used and modified the extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke.*

Con: *The extant gospel known as the gospel of Luke came later than and both used and modified the nonextant gospel known as the Marcionite gospel.*

.

To get the ball rolling, here are two arguments, one for each side:

Pro 1: *The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, the second half of which bears several passages called the we passages; these passages imply that Acts was written by a sometime companion of Paul, and a contemporary of Paul cannot very well have survived past the time of Marcion. Therefore, Acts was written before Marcion, and, because of the common authorship, so was Luke.*

Ben, I have too much time on my hands. In between jobs. And I have probably had too much time to rain extraneous stuff on this post instead of just being good and responding directly.

So here goes my comment on Pro 1:

Is there any reason other than the self-attestation of the narrative to assume its historicity? Is self-attestation the sole reason for assuming historicity?

It is commonplace in biblical studies to accept self attestation of a text as primary evidence for historicity. I don't know, so this is an open question, but in what other studies is self attestation of a text, alone, in the absence of external controlling evidence, allowed to pass for historicity?

On Con 1:

Quote:

Con 1: The gospel of Luke appears (by the prologues especially) to have the same author as the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Acts appears to claim authorship by a companion of Paul. By the time Luke was written, other gospel narratives had already been composed (according to the prologue), and that Marcion would choose Luke to use as his gospel would seem natural, given the profound Marcionite respect for Paul. Yet we must face the fact that (according to Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 4.2.3) the Marcionite gospel had no name attached to it, and (again according to Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.2.7) Marcion rejected the Acts. Why would Marcion choose a gospel based on its authorship by a companion of the great Paul, and yet simultaneously suppress the fact of that authorship? It seems more natural that the gospel began without the name of Luke, which was added after the time of Marcion.

Other significant arguments Con are that:

- there is no sure evidence that Acts was known until Irenaeus, and no secure evidence that canonical Luke was known before then either;
- there are numerous features of canonical Luke that can be understood as a polemical response to Marcionism (the prologue, the overt tying of Jesus to the Jewish scripture's "prophecies", the infancy and some of the resurrection narratives)
- the prologue of canonical Luke seems to say that there had been quite a few other gospels extant for some time, so it is difficult to imagine Marcion selecting a gospel that appears to have had the largest amount of work to be done by way of erasing passages he did not like.

But having said all that, it does appear that Marcion's followers used a gospel that "orthodox" writers identified as an abridged form of Luke.

That's it for an intro response. Happy to elaborate with patristic references etc.



07-01-2008, 11:40 PM

#55

[aa5874](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by [dog-on](#)

Acts is nothing more than religious propoganda, disguised as history. Its purpose being to attack the Marcionite church by rewriting the history of Paul (the Marcionites main man), making him (Paul) subserviant to a fictitious group of men that where invented to give "authority" via "Apostolic Succession" to a certain other ROMAN church.

But, according to Tertullian, Macion rejected both Acts of the Apostles and **Paul** because they [Acts and Paul] declared no other God than the Creator and and the Christ is the Son of the Creator.

Against Marcion by Tertullian

Quote:

Now, since the Acts of the Apostles then agree with Paul, it becomes apparent why you REJECT them.

It is because they declare no other God than the Creator, and prove Christ to belong to no other than the Creator.

Paul was not Marcion's main man at all. Paul's Christ was the son of the God of the Jews, Marcion's Christ was from another Greater God.



07-01-2008, 11:53 PM

#56

[dog-on](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: The Netherlands
Posts: 3,397



Quote:

Originally Posted by [aa5874](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by [dog-on](#)

Acts is nothing more than religious propoganda, disguised as history. Its purpose being to attack the Marcionite church by rewriting the history of Paul (the Marcionites main man), making him (Paul)

subserviant to a fictitious group of men that were invented to give "authority" via "Apostolic Succession" to a certain other ROMAN church.

*But, according to Tertullian, Marcion rejected both Acts of the Apostles and **Paul** because they [Acts and Paul] declared no other God than the Creator and and the Christ is the Son of the Creator.*

Against Marcion by Tertullian

Quote:

Now, since the Acts of the Apostles then agree with Paul, it becomes apparent why you REJECT them.

It is because **they declare no other God than the Creator, and prove Christ to belong to no other than the Creator.**

Paul was not Marcion's main man at all. Paul's Christ was the son of the God of the Jews, Marcion's Christ was from another Greater God.

Tert is merely saying that Marcion rejected Acts...

(I actually think Tert's showing a gross anachronism here...)



07-02-2008, 12:23 AM

#57


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
Genre cannot tell us if a specific incident has a historical reality outside the text.

Agreed.

Quote:

And authors have been known to tell fabrications about their personal involvement in the events they say are historical. Personal diary genres can be completely fictitious and people can be fooled if they read a genre naively on the basis of its genre.

Agreed. But all of these things are true even if the author names himself as he describes his involvement. IOW, we are in the same boat with Josephus, Porphyry, Thucydides, and many others.

Quote:

I was not thinking of Robbins here. I think Peter Kirby has done well to add a note to his critique of Robbins to explain that the question under discussion is a genre or stylistic one, as you clearly acknowledge, and not one about identity of authorship.

I do, too, but Kirby [elsewhere](#) goes on to draw a firmer conclusion (one of probability, not certainty, of course) based partly on his findings with Robbins.

Quote:

My argument is that the only "we" we know is the "we" in the literary text, and is therefore, by definition, a "literary-textual we" -- not an "historical we".

Is that the case with other historians who use the first person, as well? The question still remains: Does the literary we line up with an historical we? One cannot define this historical question out of existence.

Quote:

There is no external control to give us any grounds for assuming anything more than the "literary we".

If this is true, then we are stuck with internal controls. As is the case with other first person historians.

Quote:

Obviously (to me, anyway) a "we boarded the ship" type expression is meant to convey the image of an implied narrator, or the image of another character within the narrative, boarding a ship in company with another.

Agreed.

Quote:

But it is arbitrary to assume that this coincides with an historical event outside the text.

No, it is not arbitrary. It is just a first step to assessing the probabilities. Kirby, for example, mentions the alternative, to wit, that the author of Acts was making a false affectation to being a companion of Paul. And he weighs in against it.

Quote:

But we have no way of deciding if behind the implied narrator is a real person who experienced historically the events described. There is no way that can be determined given the evidence we

have to work with. Some questions are beyond any possibility of serious enquiry simply because there is no evidence to work with.

I think this underestimates the abilities of a critical mind. It may be the case that we do not yet have enough evidence to make an evaluation of Acts (and I know that I myself do not yet have enough; hence this thread!). But I would hate to stifle the inquiry by stating from the outset that some questions are beyond the possibility of serious inquiry. We are not waiting for new manuscript discoveries, though such would be splendid indeed. We are not waiting for time travel. We are striving to invent ever more creative ways to evaluate the evidence that we have on hand.

It may even be that these new tests we devise end up *disproving* my pro 1 argument. As I said before, some of the materials from the *we* passages already seem doubtful. But I would rather go the distance and devise the test anyway than sit back and say *there is no way we can know*.

Quote:

It is not a novel or a romance. I suspect (at the moment) the author was attempting to write something of an historical epic to glorify and promote a certain theological position as the rightful one for the Church. He employs many features of Hellenistic romances, but he is writing something he wants readers to take as their history for a certain theological perspective/establishment.

That is a solid first step.

Quote:

So here goes my comment on Pro 1:

Is there any reason other than the self-attestation of the narrative to assume its historicity? Is self-attestation the sole reason for assuming historicity?

No, it stands in a continuum, as I see it. There is self attestation (the *we* passages); there is genre (the author intends to be taken seriously in an historical sense); and there is the utterly nondescript way of inserting himself into the narrative. In a textual world where first person claims are routinely asserted, all gilded up and with silver linings (the *I Peter* of the gospel of Peter, for example, or the *I James* of the infancy gospel of James), one has to wonder why the author is so modest in this case, and why the earliest evaluators of these gospels wound up accepting the modest claim over and against the fantastic ones.

There is a bit more to the case, but for now I would like simply to observe that I find it difficult just to dispense with the we passages and have done. Maybe this is too subjective, but when I used to accept Robbins in the sense that I thought this was simply a genre device with no real implications for personal involvement, I always had this haunting suspicion that I was wrong, that I had given the more obvious option a short shrift.

I am certainly not trying to be unbalanced on this thread. My con 1 argument also haunts me in this same sense; despite the possibilities given by, for example, Solitary Man, I cannot shake the suspicion that Marcion did not name his gospel because he had no name to hand... and then how did Irenaeus get the name a generation later?

Trouble is, these twin suspicions of mine are not mutually compatible. 😊

Ben.



07-02-2008, 12:46 AM

#58


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
Ben, I have too much time on my hands. In between jobs. And I have probably had too much time to rain extraneous stuff on this post instead of just being good and responding directly.

I would rather read your extraneous stuff than most of the central stuff that many of the posters on this board write!

Ben.



07-02-2008, 05:35 AM

#59

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 

*But, according to Tertullian, Macion rejected both Acts of the Apostles and **Paul** because they [Acts and Paul] declared no other God than the Creator and and the Christ is the Son of the Creator.*

Against Marcion by Tertullian

Paul was not Marcion's main man at all. Paul's Christ was the son of the God of the Jews, Marcion's Christ was from another Greater God.

Tert is merely saying that Marcion rejected Acts...

(I actually think Tert's showing a gross anachronism here...)

But, it is right there in the passage. Marcion rejects Acts and it agrees with Paul, so Marcion rejects **them**.

Can you show me where Marcion claims Paul is his main man?

This is Paul in Romans 1.1-3 [quote] Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God [which he had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures] Concerning His son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, **according to the FLESH.**

Paul claimed Jesus was made of the seed of David, according to the FLESH.

Paul could not be Marcion's main man.



07-02-2008, 05:51 AM

#60

2-J

Regular Member

Join Date: Mar 2008

Location: UK

Posts: 179



It's possible Marcion believed that Paul's original teaching had been perverted, hence he edited the epistles to remove the offending content. In this case, Marcion still believed Paul to be his 'main man'.

Another scenario is that a lot of stuff was later interpolated into Paul (after Marcion, or contemporaneous to him) in which case it's possible Marcion's version of the epistles are more faithful to Paul... in which case also Paul is definitely Marcion's 'main man'!



Page 6 of 16 << First < 4 5 **6** 7 8 > Last >>

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is [09:09 AM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 7 of 16 [« First](#) [≤](#) [5](#) [6](#) **7** [8](#) [9](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-02-2008, 07:02 AM

#61

Casper

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2004

Location: Texas

Posts: 430



It may involve too much speculation based on the limited sources we have for Marcion's text, but are those things which extant gLuke is suspected of deriving from Josephus present or absent from Marcion's gospel?

This could probably work as a pro or a con but I am curious because I have never seen this particular question; it may not be something we can deduce, either.



07-02-2008, 07:13 AM

#62

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper** [»](#)
It may involve too much speculation based on the

Posts: 4,787

limited sources we have for Marcion's text, but are those things which extant gLuke is suspected of deriving from Josephus present or absent from Marcion's gospel?

This could probably work as a pro or a con but I am curious because I have never seen this particular question; it may not be something we can deduce, either.

That is a very perceptive question, and the sort of inquiry that stands a chance of moving the dialogue forward. Perhaps you could list a couple of items in Luke you think are suspected as having derived from Josephus; then we could check the Marcionite version (through Tertullian and Epiphanius, of course) for a *yea* or a *nay*.

Ben.



07-02-2008, 09:10 AM

#63

[aa5874](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: the fringe of the caribbean

Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **2-J**

It's possible Marcion believed that Paul's original teaching had been perverted, hence he edited the epistles to remove the offending content. In this case, Marcion still believed Paul to be his 'main man'.

Another scenario is that a lot of stuff was later interpolated into Paul (after Marcion, or contemporaneous to him) in which case it's possible Marcion's version of the epistles are more faithful to Paul... in which case also Paul is definitely Marcion's 'main man'!

Are you now claiming that Paul was the first Macionite?

Whenever you start to talk about the authors of the Pauline Epistles, you will run into chronological errors.. The authors of these Epistles are all after the Synoptics and they lived well beyond the fall of the Jewish Temple, possibly up to the late 2nd century.



07-02-2008, 10:19 AM

#64

[JoeWallack](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003

Location: Nazareth

Posts: 2,357



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

Maybe you are not approaching me with sufficient condescension and need to spell it out even more clearly.

JW:

< comment deleted >

The Messiah for Skepticism, Bar El-man, preaches a message of repentance for the sin of textual corruption. His teaching for the Unfaithful is lack of Faith in what was originally written. This is the means of his Salvation by Reason. Is it coincidence that the all-time greatest Textual expert would lose his Faith as a result of being the all-time greatest Textual expert? Is it the work of the Devil? Is it the sort of Irony that the author of "Mark" would really appreciate? Or is it exactly what we would expect based on Science and Reason. Who better to understand that based on the evidence we can not be sure what was originally written.

The subject of this Thread is important because it goes way beyond **individual** textual variation. Here we have potentially an entire Gospel that has evidence it existed in two significantly different forms with entirely different messages. The orthodox version is *the* Gospel for orthodox Christianity which claims a chain of historical witnesses between Jesus and orthodox Christianity. The Marcion version is anti-historical witness.

The orthodox here have Faith that orthodox "Luke" is the original based on **Internal** evidence. But, as this Thread should demonstrate and as you have impressively demonstrated on your blog, even the orthodox should at least have some doubt as to what was original. And that is all El-man is saying (at this point).

All I Am trying to do here is add **External** evidence to the discussion. Specifically, what quality evidence is there that Marcion was aware of another version of "Luke" or any other Gospel for that matter. Related to this is can the orthodox provide quality evidence of identifying a user of orthodox "Luke" before Marcion?

Usually Spin chastises people to get down (to sources) but in his absence I guess I have to. The discussion of Internal evidence here (and at your blog) is interesting but subjective and most of it is weaker than what has not been discussed here regarding External evidence. On that note:

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...ullian124.html>

Quote:

CHAP. V.--BY THE RULE OF ANTIQUITY, THE CATHOLIC GOSPELS ARE FOUND TO BE TRUE, INCLUDING THE REAL ST. LUKE'S. MARCION'S ONLY A MUTILATED EDITION. THE HERETIC'S WEAKNESS AND INCONSISTENCY IN IGNORING THE OTHER GOSPELS.

On the whole, then, if that is evidently more true which is earlier, if that is earlier which is from the very beginning, if that is from the beginning which has the apostles for its authors, then it will certainly be quite as evident, that that comes

down from the apos

ties, which has been kept as a sacred deposit in the churches of the apostles. Let us see what milk the Corinthians drank from Paul; to what rule of faith the Galatians were brought for correction; what the Philippians, the Thessalonians, the Ephesians read by it; what utterance also the Romans give, so very near (to the apostles), to whom Peter and Paul conjointly bequeathed the gospel even sealed with their own blood. We have also St. John's foster churches. For although Marcion rejects his Apocalypse, the orders of the bishops (thereof), when traced up to their origin, will yet rest on John as their author. In the same manner is recognised the excellent source of the other churches. I say, therefore, that in them (and not simply such of them as were rounded by apostles, but in all those which are united with them in the fellowship of the mystery of the gospel of Christ) that Gospel of Luke which we are defending with all our might has stood its ground from its very first publication; whereas Marcion's Gospel is not known to most people, and to none whatever is it known without being at the same time condemned. It too, of course, has its churches, but specially its own--as late as they are spurious; and should you want to know their original, you will more easily discover apostasy in it than apostolicity, with Marcion forsooth as their founder, or some one of Marcion's swarm. Even wasps make combs; so also these Marcionites make churches. The same authority of the apostolic churches will afford evidence to the other Gospels also, which we possess equally through their means, and according to their usage--I mean the Gospels of John and Matthew--whilst that which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's whose interpreter Mark was. For even Luke's form of the Gospel men unsually ascribe to Paul. And it may well seem that the works which disciples publish belong to their masters. Well, then, Marcion ought to be called to a strict account concerning these (other Gospels) also, for having omitted them, and insisted in preference on Luke; as if they, too, had not had free course in the churches, as well as Luke's Gospel, from the beginning. Nay, it is even more credible that they existed from the very beginning; for, being the work of apostles, they were prior, and coeval in origin with the churches themselves. But how comes it to pass, if the apostles published nothing, that their disciples were more forward in such a work; for they could not have been disciples, without any instruction from their masters? **If, then, it be evident that these (Gospels) also were current in the churches, why did not Marcion touch them--either to amend them if they were adulterated, or to acknowledge**

them if they were uncorrupt? For it is but natural that they who were perverting the gospel, should be more solicitous about the perversion of those things whose authority they knew to be more generally received. Even the false apostles (were so called) on this very account, because they imitated the apostles by means of their falsification. In as far, then, as he might have amended what there was to amend, if found corrupt, in so far did he firmly imply that all was free from corruption which he did not think required amendment. In short, he simply amended what he thought was corrupt; though, indeed, not even this justly, because it was not really corrupt. For if the (Gospels) of the apostles have come down to us in their integrity, whilst Luke's, which is received amongst us, so far accords with their rule as to be on a par with them in permanency of reception in the churches, it clearly follows that Luke's Gospel also has come down to us in like integrity until the sacrilegious treatment of Marcion. In short, when Marcion laid hands on it, it then became diverse and hostile to the Gospels of the apostles. I will therefore advise his followers, that they either change these Gospels, however late to do so, into a conformity with their own, whereby they may seem to be in agreement with the apostolic writings (for they are daily retouching their work, as daily they are convicted by us); or else that they blush for their master, who stands self-condemned either way--when once he hands on the truth of the gospel conscience smitten, or again subverts it by shameless tampering.

JW:

Here based on extant Marcion, Tertullian seems to indicate that Marcion was not aware of any other Gospel.

Neil, to think that when I use your name here I am primarily addressing you is as mistaken as the orthodox thinking that "Mark's" Jesus was primarily addressing his audience (let the IIDB Reader understand).

Joseph

"The enemy of my enemy is my friend." - The State of Israel

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



07-02-2008, 06:04 PM

#65

[dog-on](#)



Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: The Netherlands
Posts: 3,397

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** 

Tert is merely saying that Marcion rejected Acts...

(I actually think Tert's showing a gross anachronism here...)...

*But, it is right there in the passage. Marcion rejects Acts and it agrees with Paul, so Marcion rejects **them**.*

Can you show me where Marcion claims Paul is his main man?

This is Paul in Romans 1.1-3

Quote:

Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God [which he had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures] Concerning His son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, **according to the FLESH.**

Paul claimed Jesus was made of the seed of David, according to the FLESH.

Paul could not be Marcion's main man.

I don't think that Marcion's version of Romans ready "quite" the same way. 😊



 07-02-2008, 06:05 PM

#66

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: The Netherlands
Posts: 3,397



Quote:

Originally Posted by **2-J** 

It's possible Marcion believed that Paul's original teaching had been perverted, hence he edited the epistles to remove the offending content. In this case, Marcion still believed Paul to be his 'main man'.

Another scenario is that a lot of stuff was later interpolated into Paul (after Marcion, or contemporaneous to him) in which case it's possible Marcion's version of the epistles are more faithful to Paul... in which case also Paul is definitely Marcion's 'main man'!

...and I'll take Door number 2, Monty!



07-02-2008, 11:40 PM

#67

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003
Location: Nazareth
Posts: 2,357



JW:

Let's move this forward. Justin looks like the earliest External evidence regarding Marcion:

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...stapology.html>

Quote:

CHAPTER XXVI -- MAGICIANS NOT TRUSTED BY CHRISTIANS.

And, thirdly, because after Christ's ascension into heaven the devils put forward certain men who said that they themselves were gods; and they were not only not persecuted by you, but even deemed worthy of honours. There was a Samaritan, Simon, a native of the village called Gitto, who in the reign of Claudius Caesar, and in your royal city of Rome, did mighty acts of magic, by virtue of the art of the devils operating in him. He was considered a god, and as a god was honoured by you with a statue, which statue was erected on the river Tiber, between the two bridges, and bore this inscription, in the language of Rome:--

"Simoni Deo Sancto,"

"To Simon the holy God." And almost all the Samaritans, and a few even of other nations, worship him, and acknowledge him as the first god; and a woman, Helena, who went about with him at that time, and had formerly been a prostitute, they say is the first idea generated by him. And a man, Meander, also a Samaritan, of the town Capparetaea, a disciple of Simon, and inspired by devils, we know to have deceived many while he was in Antioch by his magical art. He persuaded those who adhered to him that they should never die, and even now there are some living who hold this opinion of his. **And there is Marcion, a man of Pontus, who is even at this day alive, and teaching his disciples to believe in some other god greater than the Creator. And he, by the aid of the devils, has caused many of every nation to speak blasphemies, and to deny that God is the maker of this universe, and to assert that some other being, greater**

than He, has done greater works. All who take their opinions from these men, are, as we before said, called Christians; just as also those who do not agree with the philosophers in their doctrines, have yet in common with them the name of philosophers given to them. And whether they perpetrate those fabulous and shameful deeds--the upsetting of the lamp, and promiscuous intercourse, and eating human flesh--we know not; but we do know that they are neither persecuted nor put to death by you, at least on account of their opinions. But I have a treatise against all the heresies that have existed already composed, which, if you wish to read it, I will give you.

JW:

[W First Apology of Justin Martyr](#)

Quote:

The First Apology was an early work of Christian apologetics addressed by Justin Martyr to the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius. It is dated to the period **150-155**.

Note that through Justin Christian arguments are **philosophical** in nature as opposed to Textual oriented. In Justin's limited description of Marcion there is only a primary difference in belief between Justin and Marcion, the nature of the God of the Jewish Bible. Note that this is consistent with the Christian belief through Justin that "Scripture" is only the Jewish Bible.

Although there's not much to work with here this suggests that the nature of dispute between Justin and Marcion's versions of Christianity was not primarily based on variations in Christian writings, but rather interpretations of the Jewish Bible.

Joseph

SATAN, n.

One of the Creator's lamentable mistakes, repented in sashcloth and axes. Being instated as an archangel, Satan made himself multifariously objectionable and was finally expelled from Heaven. Halfway in his descent he paused, bent his head in thought a moment and at last went back. "There is one favor that I should like to ask," said he.

"Name it."

"Man, I understand, is about to be created. He will need laws."

"What, wretch! you his appointed adversary, charged from the dawn of eternity with hatred of his soul -- you ask for the right to make his laws?"

"Pardon; what I have to ask is that he be permitted to make them himself."

It was so ordered.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



07-02-2008, 11:55 PM

#68

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006

Location: The Netherlands

Posts: 3,397



Simon the Holy God and his prostitute!

Where have I heard such a story before... 😊



07-03-2008, 01:45 AM

#69

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: the fringe of the caribbean

Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** ➤

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** ➤

*But, it is right there in the passage.
Marcion rejects Acts and it agrees with Paul, so Marcion rejects **them**.*

Can you show me where Marcion claims Paul is his main man?

This is Paul in Romans 1.1-3

I don't think that Marcion's version of Romans ready "quite" the same way. 😊

So all along you are just using your imagination to make up the contents of the Pauline Epistles.

How many versions of Romans or the Pauline Epistles have been ever been found?



07-03-2008, 01:50 AM

#70

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006

Location: The Netherlands

Posts: 3,397



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** ➤

Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** ➤

I don't think that Marcion's version of Romans ready "quite" the same way. 😊

So all along you are just using your imagination to make up the contents of the Pauline Epistles.

How many versions of Romans or the Pauline Epistles have been ever been found?

Said the fox, when interviewing for the night watchman position at the local hen-house...



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:09 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 8 of 16 [« First](#) [≤ 6](#) [7](#) **8** [9](#) [10](#) [≥ Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-03-2008, 02:27 AM

#71

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by [aa5874](#)
How many versions of Romans or the Pauline Epistles have been ever been found?

Two versions of Romans have been found, with solid patristic evidence of a third. Refer to Harry Gamble, Jr, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*.

Excellent question, BTW. Glad you asked.

Ben.

07-03-2008, 02:29 AM

#72

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
 Location: the fringe of the
 caribbean
 Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

*So all along you are just using your
 imagination to make up the contents of the
 Pauline Epistles.*

*How many versions of Romans or the
 Pauline Epistles have been ever been
 found?*

*Said the fox, when interviewing for the night
 watchman position at the local hen-house...*

Can you please give me one verse of Marcion's version of Romans, or any of Marcion's version of any "Pauline" Epistles?

By the way, it would seem that the Church writers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius did NOT even "know" all the "Pauls". They ALL thought the "Paul" who wrote "Romans" was the same "Paul" who wrote "Timothy".

The Church writers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius did NOT really know the history of their own Church.

Do you really THINK that Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius knew the true history of Marcion or were they mistaken like they were with "Paul"?

You can use your imagination, now.



07-03-2008, 02:52 AM

#73

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
 Location: The Netherlands
 Posts: 3,397



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on**

*Said the fox, when interviewing for the
 night watchman position at the local hen-
 house...*

*Can you please give me one verse of Marcion's
 version of Romans, or any of Marcion's version of
 any "Pauline" Epistles?*

By the way, it would seem that the Church writers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius did NOT even "know" all the "Pauls". They ALL thought the "Paul" who wrote "Romans" was the same "Paul" who wrote "Timothy".

The Church writers, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius did NOT really know the history of their own Church.

Do you really THINK that Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius knew the true history of Marcion or were they mistaken like they were with "Paul"?

You can use your imagination, now.

Tert gives a few verses in his polemic against Marcion. One of those early church fathers even refers to Paul as the apostle of the heretics.

I think that the church fathers, you have mentioned, used the "Fox News" version of Marcion for their own purposes. What the Marcionites actually believed is simply conjecture based on their diatribe.



07-03-2008, 03:15 AM

#74


aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** 
Tert gives a few verses in his polemic against Marcion. One of those early church fathers even refers to Paul as the apostle of the heretics.

I think that the church fathers, you have mentioned, used the "Fox News" version of Marcion for their own purposes. What the Marcionites actually believed is simply conjecture based on their diatribe.

Where can I find that information that Paul was the apostle of the heretics?

"Paul" was NOT EVER called a heretic in Against Heresies by Irenaeus written late 2nd century.

Paul was NOT EVER called a heretic by Eusebius in Church History written early 4th century.

Which Church writer claimed "Paul" was an apostle of the heretics between the time of Irenaeus and Eusebius?

The **Marcionites** would do such a thing, based on Tertullian.



07-03-2008, 03:28 AM

#75

Casper

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2004

Location: Texas

Posts: 430



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper**

It may involve too much speculation based on the limited sources we have for Marcion's text, but are those things which extant gLuke is suspected of deriving from Josephus present or absent from Marcion's gospel?

This could probably work as a pro or a con but I am curious because I have never seen this particular question; it may not be something we can deduce, either.

That is a very perceptive question, and the sort of inquiry that stands a chance of moving the dialogue forward. Perhaps you could list a couple of items in Luke you think are suspected as having derived from Josephus; then we could check the Marcionite version (through Tertullian and Epiphanius, of course) for a yea or a nay.

Ben.

Thanks ben, I'll try. I'm new to the Josephus as source concept, and I don't want to get circular, so everyone please feel welcome to restate my thoughts if you feel you can.

Luke 2:41-47 is a unique childhood narrative possibly taken from Josephus biography, and, like the birth narrative, is not present in Marcion (so far as we know).

Luke 9:52-53, and Luke 17:11, are possibly sourced from Antiquities, or that seems to have been a reference used in constructing Luke's geography. These are in gMarcion.

Luke 7:1-10, the story of the centurion, seems a very plausible candidate for using Antiquities as a source, and it too is present in gMarcion.

I think this points to a pro; the likely Josephus references are present in gMarcion except for the childhood narrative, which, along with the birth narrative, are prime candidates for Marcionite redaction due to the physical vs spiritual Jesus conflict that is often cited for reasons to assume redaction (I'm thinking the party line by the Catholic Encyclopedia, for instance).

It is a weak pro; the missing element is sourced (possibly)

from a different work by Josephus. In fact i can see a basis for the argument that gMarcion, or proto-Luke for that matter, if we wish to go there, pre-dates the author's knowledge of Josephus' biography while acknowledging familiarity with Antiquities, while aLuke would have been familiar with both, the biography portion an interpolation by aLuke. I don't want to try and set a date for aLuke between Antiquities and Life of Josephus, because order of writing may not coincide with order of reading by the author, but I suppose it could be explored.

So much for a poor addition to the discussion, but that is where my brain is pointing on the matter.



07-03-2008, 03:31 AM

#76

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 3.5.4:

Even the very **apostle of the heretics** [*haereticorum apostolus*] interprets that law which grants an unmuzzled mouth to the oxen that tread out the corn as concerning not oxen but ourselves, and he affirms that the rock that followed them to provide drink was Christ, in the same way as he instructs the Galatians that the two narratives of the sons of Abraham took their course as an allegory, and advises the Ephesians that what was foretold in the beginning, that a man would leave his father and mother, and that he and his wife would become one flesh, is seen by him to refer to Christ and the church.

Ben.



07-03-2008, 03:34 AM

#77

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper** [▶](#)
So much for a poor addition to the discussion, but that is where my brain is pointing on the matter.

Hey, it was well worth a try. And that is the sort of thing we *should* be doing, the sort of thing that, if it pans out, slowly (sometimes quickly) starts to change the face of the debate. *If* it could be shown that the Josephan overlaps in Luke-Acts belonged only to parts of the text already marked off as special for some other reason (the Marcionite version, the western version, or what have you), then we might have something to look into.

Ben.



07-03-2008, 03:47 AM

#78

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
 Location: the fringe of the
 caribbean
 Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Tertullian, Against Marcion 3.5.4:

*Even the very **apostle of the heretics** [haereticorum apostolus] interprets that law which grants an unmuzzled mouth to the oxen that tread out the corn as concerning not oxen but ourselves, and he affirms that the rock that followed them to provide drink was Christ, in the same way as he instructs the Galatians that the two narratives of the sons of Abraham took their course as an allegory, and advises the Ephesians that what was foretold in the beginning, that a man would leave his father and mother, and that he and his wife would become one flesh, is seen by him to refer to Christ and the church.*

Ben.

So, who is that apostle of the heretics? Marcion or "Paul"?

In Against Marcion by Tertullian, who is referred to as the heretic? Marcion or "Paul"?

In "Against Marcion" by Tertullian, Marcion is introduced as a heretic.



07-03-2008, 03:51 AM

#79

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
 Location: Midwest
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

So, who is that apostle of the heretics? Marcion or "Paul"?

In Against Marcion by Tertullian, who is referred to as the heretic? Marcion or "Paul"?

Paul.

Ben.



07-03-2008, 03:51 AM

#80

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003
Location: Earth
Posts: 1,443



Quote:

Luke 7:1-10, the story of the centurion, seems a very plausible candidate for using Antiquities as a source, and it too is present in gMarcion.

Why do you argue that it's taken from Antiquities?
Wouldn't the War be the source of this instead?



Page 8 of 16 << [First](#) < [6](#) [7](#) **8** [9](#) [10](#) > [Last](#) >>

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:09 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 9 of 16 [« First](#) [≤](#) [7](#) [8](#) **9** [10](#) [11](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-03-2008, 04:07 AM

#81

[Ben C Smith](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Refer also to *Against Marcion* 5.14.9:

If **Marcion** has of set purpose cut out these passages, what is this exclamation **his apostle** [*apostolus eius*] makes?

Paul = *his* apostle = the apostle of *Marcion*.

Marcion = heretic.

Marcionites = heretics.

Paul = apostle of the heretic(s).

Ben.

07-03-2008, 04:50 AM

#82


[aa5874](#)



Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
 Location: the fringe of the
 caribbean
 Posts: 18,988

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
Refer also to Against Marcion 5.14.9:

*If **Marcion** has of set purpose cut out these passages, what is this exclamation **his apostle** [apostolus eius] makes?*

*Paul = his apostle = the apostle of Marcion.
 Marcion = heretic.
 Marcionites = heretics.
 Paul = apostle of the heretic(s).*

Ben.

This is most illogical.

You have no understanding of logics at all. You are hopeless.

Tertullian uses Paul to show that Marcion was indeed a heretic and now you claim Paul was also an heretic. This is incredible stuff.

Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius ALL refer to Marcion as a HERETIC.

Irenaeus wrote a book about heretics, he did not mentioned that Paul was a heretic.

Origen did not claim Paul was a heretic, neither Eusebius who wrote the history of the Church.

Paul becomes an apostle of heretics just from an ambiguous passage. This is just mind-boggling.



07-03-2008, 05:13 AM

#83


Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
 Location: Midwest
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 
Tertullian uses Paul to show that Marcion was indeed a heretic and now you claim Paul was also an heretic.

Please show me where I said Paul was a heretic. What I said was that Paul was, according to Tertullian, the apostle of heretics.

Quote:

Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius ALL refer to Marcion as a HERETIC.

Correct.

Quote:

Irenaeus wrote a book about heretics, he did not mentioned that Paul was a heretic.

Correct (so far as I know).

Quote:

Origen did not claim Paul was a heretic, neither Eusebius who wrote the history of the Church.

Correct (again so far as I know).

But you forgot Tertullian. Tertullian does not call Paul a heretic either. He calls Paul the *apostle of heretics*, or the *apostle of Marcion* (his apostle, where the *his* refers back to Marcion).

Quote:

Paul becomes an apostle of heretics just from an ambiguous passage.

The passage is not ambiguous at all. Tertullian, I suspect, would **never** call Paul a heretic; but he most certainly **did** call Paul *the apostle of heretics*. That is not the same thing.

I get the distinct impression you have *no idea* what calling Paul *the apostle of heretics* meant.

Ben.



07-03-2008, 05:51 AM

#84

spamandham

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2004
Location: Dallas, TX
Posts: 11,525



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** [▶](#)
This is Paul in Romans 1.1-3

Quote:

Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God [which he had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures] Concerning His son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, **according to the FLESH.**

I think caution is warranted against making too much of this passage (and many others that have Paul referring to Jesus as fleshy).

I recently addressed this particular passage in another thread:

<http://iidx.infidels.org/vbb/showpos...&postcount=101>



07-03-2008, 07:38 AM

#85

Casper

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2004
Location: Texas
Posts: 430



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave**

Quote:

Luke 7:1-10, the story of the centurion, seems a very plausible candidate for using Antiquities as a source, and it too is present in gMarcion.

*Why do you argue that it's taken from Antiquities?
Wouldn't the War be the source of this instead?*

I may very well be mistaken. I'll have to check. If that is the case then we have 3 Josephus sources for gLuke and two for gMarcion.



07-03-2008, 09:10 AM

#86

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

I get the distinct impression you have no idea what calling Paul the apostle of heretics meant.

Ben.

I cannot follow your illogical equations.

[Paul = his apostle = the apostle of Marcion.]

Marcion rejected Paul. Paul is not an apostle of Marcion. Paul was not regarded as a Marcionite.



07-03-2008, 09:27 AM

#87

Casper

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2004
Location: Texas
Posts: 430



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

I get the distinct impression you have no idea what calling Paul the apostle of heretics meant.

Ben.

I cannot follow your illogical equations.

[Paul = his apostle = the apostle of Marcion.]

Marcion rejected Paul. Paul is not an apostle of Marcion. Paul was not regarded as a Marcionite.

I am confused. Who was the attributed author of the Apostolicon? Not the compiler but the author of the letters? A rejected prophet or mentor would not be venerated in such a way, in my mind.



07-03-2008, 10:17 AM

#88

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

I cannot follow your illogical equations.

[Paul = his apostle = the apostle of Marcion.]

Marcion rejected Paul. Paul is not an apostle of Marcion. Paul was not regarded as a Marcionite.

I am confused. Who was the attributed author of the Apostolicon? Not the compiler but the author of the letters? A rejected prophet or mentor would not be venerated in such a way, in my mind.

The information coming from Tertulian about Marcion and Paul is flawed and dubious. Tertulian appear not know when Acts of the Apostles or Luke were written. Tertullian appear not to know when or who wrote the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, he thought that they were written by the same Paul who wrote the other Epistles.

Justin Martyr never mentioned Luke wrote any gospel or that any person named Paul wrote any epistles. Justin never mentioned Acts of the Apostles or that Luke wrote the Acts.

Tertullian himself claimed there were three different versions of Against Marcion circulated during his time, all ,initially, written by Tertullian. One, he did in a hurry,

another, full of mistakes and the third amended.

This is total confusion.



07-03-2008, 06:26 PM

#89

dog-on

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: The Netherlands
Posts: 3,397



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper**

I am confused. Who was the attributed author of the Apostolicon? Not the compiler but the author of the letters? A rejected prophet or mentor would not be venerated in such a way, in my mind.

The information coming from Tertullian about Marcion and Paul is flawed and dubious. Tertullian appear not know when Acts of the Apostles or Luke were written. Tertullian appear not to know when or who wrote the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, he thought that they were written by the same Paul who wrote the other Epistles.

Justin Martyr never mentioned Luke wrote any gospel or that any person named Paul wrote any epistles. Justin never mentioned Acts of the Apostles or that Luke wrote the Acts.

Tertullian himself claimed there were three different versions of Against Marcion circulated during his time, all ,initially, written by Tertullian. One, he did in a hurry, another, full of mistakes and the third amended.

This is total confusion.

AA, though it was amusing for a while, maybe you should step back and let the trip wear-off.

No one ever claimed that Paul was a heretic (at least as far as Ireneaus and forward). I do think that there possibly was a time prior to Paul's reformation, that he may have been exclusive to the other team, but any such reference must be in Roger's 99% pile. 😊

(Maybe Justin would have viewed Paul as a heretic, I don't know, but do have my suspicions).



07-04-2008, 12:25 AM

#90


Ben C Smith



Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 
Marcion rejected Paul.

Incorrect, as has been shown you before.

Quote:

Paul is not an apostle of Marcion.

Tertullian said Paul was the apostle of Marcion. I gave you the text, and it is plain.

Quote:

Paul was not regarded as a Marcionite.

Correct. Paul came before Marcion, and therefore could not have been a Marcionite.

Ben.



[« Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread »](#)

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:10 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, **neilgodfrey**.

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 10 of 16 [« First](#) [≤](#) [8](#) [9](#) **10** [11](#) [12](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-04-2008, 12:44 AM

#91

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003

Location: Nazareth

Posts: 2,357



JW:

Oh for Christ's sake Ben, this is the source of aa's confusion:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

So, who is that apostle of the heretics? Marcion or "Paul"?

In Against Marcion by Tertullian, who is referred to as the heretic? Marcion or "Paul"?

Paul.

Ben.

The ironic thing is after you said you would stop talking to me and bid me spend my time instead talking to aa, you have spent most of your time talking to aa.

Moving forward with the External evidence. Last, and least, Irenaeus of Lyons (yes "Lyons"):

[The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus](#)

Quote:

Chapter XXVII.—Doctrines of Cerdo and Marcion.

1. Cerdo was one who took his system from the followers of Simon, and came to live at Rome in the time of Hyginus, who held the ninth place in the episcopal succession from the apostles downwards. He taught that the God proclaimed by the law and the prophets was not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the former was known, but the latter unknown; while the one also was righteous, but the other benevolent.

2. Marcion of Pontus succeeded him, and developed his doctrine. In so doing, he advanced the most daring blasphemy against Him who is proclaimed as God by the law and the prophets, declaring Him to be the author of evils, to take delight in war, to be infirm of purpose, and even to be contrary to Himself. But Jesus being derived from that father who is above the God that made the world, and coming into Judæa in the times of Pontius Pilate the governor, who was the procurator of Tiberius Cæsar, was manifested in the form of a man to those who were in Judæa, abolishing the prophets and the law, and all the works of that God who made the world, whom also he calls Cosmocrator. **Besides this, he mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke**, removing all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most dearly confessing that the Maker of this universe is His Father. He likewise persuaded his disciples that he himself was more worthy of credit than are those apostles who have handed down the Gospel to us, **furnishing them not with the Gospel, but merely a fragment of it.** In like manner, too, he dismembered the Epistles of Paul, removing all that is said by the apostle respecting that God who made the world, to the effect that He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also those passages from the prophetic writings which the apostle quotes, in order to teach us that they

announced beforehand the coming of the Lord.

3. Salvation will be the attainment only of those souls which had learned his doctrine; while the body, as having been taken from the earth, is incapable of sharing in salvation. In addition to his blasphemy against God Himself, he advanced this also, truly speaking as with the mouth of the devil, and saying all things in direct opposition to the truth,—that Cain, and those like him, and the Sodomites, and the Egyptians, and others like them, and, in fine, all the nations who walked in all sorts of abomination, were saved by the Lord, on His descending into Hades, and on their running unto Him, and that they welcomed Him into their kingdom. But the serpent²⁹⁵⁸²⁹⁵⁸ [Comp. cap. xxv. 3.] which was in Marcion declared that Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and those other righteous men who sprang²⁹⁵⁹²⁹⁵⁹ We here follow the amended version proposed by the Benedictine editor. from the patriarch Abraham, with all the prophets, and those who were pleasing to God, did not partake in salvation. For since these men, he says, knew that their God was constantly tempting them, so now they suspected that He was tempting them, and did not run to Jesus, or believe His announcement: and for this reason he declared that their souls remained in Hades.

4. But since this man is the only one who has dared openly to mutilate the Scriptures, and unblushingly above all others to inveigh against God, I purpose specially to refute him, convicting³⁵³ him out of his own writings; and, with the help of God, I shall overthrow him out of those²⁹⁶⁰²⁹⁶⁰ A promise never fulfilled: comp. book iii. 12, and Euseb., Hist. Eccl., v. 8. discourses of the Lord and the apostles, which are of authority with him, and of which he makes use. At present, however, I have simply been led to mention him, that thou mightest know that all those who in any way corrupt the truth, and injuriously affect the preaching of the Church, are the disciples and successors of Simon Magus of Samaria. Although they do not confess the name of their master, in order all the more to seduce others, yet they do teach his doctrines. They set forth, indeed, the name of Christ Jesus as a sort of lure, but in various ways they introduce the impieties of Simon; and thus they destroy multitudes, wickedly disseminating their own doctrines by the use of a good name, and, through means of its sweetness and beauty, extending to their hearers the bitter and malignant poison of the serpent, the great author of apostasy.²⁹⁶¹

JW:

Irenaeus indicates that Marcion's beliefs were **inherited**. Note that Irenaeus provides no direct evidence that Marcion thought there was any other Gospel. Again, if

Marcion, in Rome, was aware of another Gospel, I can't help wondering if it was "Mark".

Joseph

FAITH, n.

Belief without evidence in what is told by one who speaks without knowledge, of things without parallel.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



07-04-2008, 01:14 AM

#92

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack** 
Oh for Christ's sake Ben, this is the source of aa's confusion....

My sincere thanks for pointing this out. I left more of his wording in the quote box than I intended. This is the exchange as it should have been:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**
So, who is that apostle of the heretics? Marcion or "Paul"?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben**
Paul.

Hope that helps, though this *is* aa5874 we are talking about.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**
The ironic thing is after you said you would stop talking to me and bid me spend my time instead talking to aa, you have spent most of your time talking to aa.

- 1.** His posts are clear; clearly mistaken most of the time, but clear. Yours are unclear. Even those whose views most closely match your own (Neil Godfrey, for example) have a trouble parsing you.
- 2.** His demeanor is consistent, even, and predictable. You flare up in weird ways at the silliest provocations.
- 3.** The expressions in his posts are the kinds of

expressions that most people use, and his capitalization is either conventional or used for emphasis. Your expressions are usually your own inventions, and your capitalization is almost Germanic. Your posts, in short, are almost painful to read, even when I agree with their contents.

4. He does not know any better. You do.

Ben.



07-04-2008, 01:49 AM

#93

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** >
Marcion rejected Paul.

Incorrect, as has been shown you before.

You are spouting nonsense. Let's deal with the facts as presented and not your imagination.

Marcion rejected Paul, according to Tertullian, and I will give the passage so everyone can see that you are erroneous.

Tertullian in Against Marcion

Quote:

Now, since the **Acts of the Apostles thus AGREE with Paul, it becomes apparent why you REJECT them.**

It is because they declare no other God than the Creator, and prove Christ to belong to no other God than the Creator, whilst the promise of the Holy Ghost is shown to have been fulfilled in no other document than the Acts of the Apostles.

Marcion rejected Paul, according to Tertullian.

And Paul could NOT be an apostle of Marcion, if you claim Paul was before Marcion.

Quote:

Paul was not regarded as a Marcionite.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >
Correct. Paul came before Marcion, and therefore

could not have been a Marcionite.

Ben.

You cannot **SHOW** that Paul came before Marcion.

Your assertion is **worthless**.

It is of very little use to use the words of Paul to verify or confirm Paul's own whereabouts.

The Church writers ALL failed to recognise that the Paul in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus was different to the Paul in other Epistles.

The history of Paul is not credible as given by Church writers, it would appear they really could not determine or confirm the AUTHENTICITY of the Pauline Epistles.



07-04-2008, 01:54 AM

#94

[dog-on](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: Jun 2006

Location: The Netherlands

Posts: 3,397



AA, maybe Marcion is Paul and wrote the some of the Epistles himself, (especially Galatians 😊).

07-04-2008, 02:10 AM

#95

[aa5874](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: the fringe of the caribbean

Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by [dog-on](#) AA, maybe Marcion is Paul and wrote the some of the Epistles himself, (especially Galatians 😊).

No way. Paul was fabricated by the Church writers to distort the history of Jesus believers.

Paul is fiction.

The authors of the Pauline Epistles were never converted to Christianity by a bright light after being blinded. These authors never had any revelations from a dead and resurrected Jesus.

These authors did not die during the time of Nero, THEY were ALL alive probably from Titus and maybe up to CONSTANTINE.

07-04-2008, 02:18 AM

#96


[Ben C Smith](#)

Veteran Member



Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 
Marcion rejected Paul, according to Tertullian, and I will give the passage so everyone can see that you are erroneous.

Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.2.7:

Now if even to this degree the Acts of the Apostles [*apostolorum acta*, neuter plural] are in agreement with Paul [*Paulo*, masculine singular], it becomes evident why you reject them [*ea*, neuter plural].

Your reading of this passage is impossible. The **neuter plural** pronoun for *them* cannot refer back to the **masculine singular** noun for *Paul*; it has to refer back to the neuter plural noun for *acts*.

You can check this with any Latinist you trust.

Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.1.2:

So then, shipmaster out of Pontus, ...will you please tell us under what bill of lading **you accepted Paul as an apostle** [*apostolum Paulum*]?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**
And Paul could NOT be an apostle of Marcion.

Again: Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5.14.9:

If **Marcion** has of set purpose cut out these passages, what is this exclamation **his apostle** [*apostolus eius*] makes?

Ben.



07-04-2008, 02:30 AM

#97

dog-on

Veteran Member


Join Date: Jun 2006
Location: The Netherlands
Posts: 3,397



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **dog-on** 
AA, maybe Marcion is Paul and wrote the some of the Epistles himself, (especially Galatians 😊).

No way. Paul was fabricated by the Church writers to distort the history of Jesus believers.

Paul is fiction.

The authors of the Pauline Epistles were never converted to Christianity by a bright light after being blinded. These authors never had any revelations from a dead and resurrected Jesus.

These authors did not die during the time of Nero, THEY were ALL alive probably from Titus and maybe up to CONSTANTINE.

None of this precludes the possibility that Marcion wrote some of the Epistles though, does it?



07-04-2008, 04:34 AM

#98


aa5874

Contributor


Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 
Marcion rejected Paul, according to Tertullian, and I will give the passage so everyone can see that you are erroneous.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
Tertullian, Against Marcion 5.2.7:

Now if even to this degree the Acts of the Apostles [apostolorum acta, neuter plural] are in agreement with Paul [Paulo, masculine singular], it becomes evident why you reject them [ea, neuter plural].

*Your reading of this passage is impossible. The **neuter plural** pronoun for them cannot refer back to the **masculine singular** noun for Paul; it has to refer back to the neuter plural noun for acts.*

Complete nonsense.

Acts of the Apostles AGREE with Paul.

Marcion REJECTED THEM.

Marcion REJECTED Acts of the Apostles and Paul.

Acts of the Apostles and Paul declare no other God than the Creator.

Marcion declared another God greater than the Creator.

Acts of the Apostles and Paul show that Christ belong to no other God but the Creator.

Marcion declared that Christ belonged to another God

greater than the Creator.


Marcion rejected Acts of the Apostles and Paul.

Marcion's Christ was a phantom, according to Tertullian

The Christ of Acts of the Apostles and Paul was of the seed of David.

Marcion rejected Acts of the Apostles and Paul.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 
Tertullian, Against Marcion 5.1.2:

*So then, shipmaster out of Pontus,
 ...will you please tell us under what
 bill of lading **you accepted Paul as
 an apostle** [apostolum Paulum]?*

But Tertullian continued in the same book to confound you.

Against Marcion 5.1

Quote:

**I deny him, to compel you to the proof of
 him, I deny him to convince you that HE IS
 MINE.**

Marcion rejected Paul. Tertullian accepted Paul.

And Tertullian clearly indicates the the aim of Marcion in
 Against Macion 5.21

Quote:

To this epistle alone did its brevity avail to protect
 it against **the falsifying hands of Marcion.**

I wonder, however, when he did received (into his
 Apostolicon) this letter which was written but to
 one man, that he REJECTED the two epistles to
 Timothy and the one to Titus, which all treat of
 ecclesiastical discipline.

**His aim, I suppose, to carry out his
 INTERPOLATING process even to the number
 of (ST.PAUL'S) epistles.**

Marcion REJECTED Paul and either discarded or
 interpolated his epistles, according to Tertullian.



Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
 Location: Midwest
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

Complete nonsense.

Have you consulted a trusted Latinist yet? The text is very clear.

Quote:

Marcion rejected Paul. Tertullian accepted Paul.

Both Marcion and Tertullian accepted Paul, according to Tertullian. They disagreed on interpreting Paul, and on the exact contents of his epistles.

Ben.



07-04-2008, 05:03 AM

#100

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
 Location: Midwest
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

And Tertullian clearly indicates the the aim of Marcion in Against Macion 5.21

Quote:

To this epistle alone did its brevity avail to protect it against **the falsifying hands of Marcion.**

I wonder, however, when he did received (into his Apostolicon) this letter which was written but to one man, that he REJECTED the two epistles to Timothy and the one to Titus, which all treat of ecclesiastical discipline.

His aim, I suppose, to carry out his INTERPOLATING process even to the number of (ST.PAUL'S) epistles.

You just proved that, according to Tertullian, Marcion accepted the Pauline epistle to Philemon. That is what I mean when I say that Marcion accepted Paul. Obviously he did not accept him into his clubhouse, into his yacht, or into his Ferrari. He accepted (some of) the Pauline epistles, and their author as an apostle.

Ben.



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is [09:10 AM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 11 of 16 [« First](#) [≤ 9](#) [10](#) **11** [12](#) [13](#) [≥ Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-04-2008, 05:13 AM

#101

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**
Complete nonsense.

Have you consulted a trusted Latinist yet? The text is very clear.

Quote:

Marcion rejected Paul. Tertullian accepted Paul.

Both Marcion and Tertullian accepted Paul,

according to Tertullian. They disagreed on interpreting Paul, and on the exact contents of his epistles.

Ben.

How can they both ACCEPT and DISAGREE about the interpretation of Paul at the same instance?

Tertullian ACCEPTED Paul as written.

Marcion REJECTED Paul as written.

According to Tertullian, Marcion used **"falsifying hands"** to interpolate and discard St. Paul's epistles.

Against Marcion 5.21

Quote:

His AIM was, I suppose, to carry out his INTERPOLATING process even to the number of (St .Paul's) epistles.

Marcion MUTILATED Paul.

Marcion REJECTED Paul.



07-04-2008, 05:58 AM

#102

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 
How can they both ACCEPT and DISAGREE about the interpretation of Paul at the same instance?

They both accepted Paul as an apostle. They disagreed on what Paul wrote or taught.

Quote:

According to Tertullian, Marcion used **"falsifying hands"** to interpolate and discard St. Paul's epistles.

Exactly. Marcion rejected the form of the epistles known to Tertullian and accepted what is known as the Marcionite form of the epistles.

Quote:

Marcion MUTILATED Paul.

According to Tertullian, yes.

Still unanswered: Have you consulted a trusted Latinist

yet?

Ben.



07-04-2008, 10:00 AM

#103

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the
caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**
*How can they both ACCEPT and DISAGREE
about the interpretation of Paul at the
same instance?*

*They both accepted Paul as an apostle. They
disagreed on what Paul wrote or taught.*

*Exactly. Marcion rejected the form of the epistles
known to Tertullian and accepted what is known as
the Marcionite form of the epistles.*

Quote:

Marcion MUTILATED Paul.

According to Tertullian, yes.

*Still unanswered: Have you consulted a trusted
Latinist yet?*

Ben.

So, it is now **"their apostle"**, no longer **"his apostle"**.

Against Marcion 5.1

Quote:

Should you, however disapprove of these types,
the Acts of the Apostles, at all events, have
handed down to me this career of Paul, which you
MUST not refuse to accept.[/B]

Clearly, Tertullian is begging and pleading with Marcion to
accept Paul, Tertullian's apostle.

Against Marcion 5

Quote:

I deny him, to compel you to the proof of him, I
deny him to convince you that **he is mine.**

Tertullian says, "Paul is mine"

Against Marcion

Quote:

The Acts of the Apostles AGREE with Paul, it becomes apparent why you reject them.

Paul is Tertullian's apostles.

Marcion did not accept the career of Paul as handed down in the Acts of the Apostles.



07-05-2008, 01:21 AM

#104

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003
Location: Nazareth
Posts: 2,357



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**
The ironic thing is after you said you would stop talking to me and bid me spend my time instead talking to aa, you have spent most of your time talking to aa.

1. *His posts are clear; clearly mistaken most of the time, but clear. Yours are unclear. Even those whose views most closely match your own (Neil Godfrey, for example) have a trouble parsing you.*

2. *His demeanor is consistent, even, and predictable. You flare up in weird ways at the silliest provocations.*

3. *The expressions in his posts are the kinds of expressions that most people use, and his capitalization is either conventional or used for emphasis. Your expressions are usually your own inventions, and your capitalization is almost Germanic. Your posts, in short, are almost painful to read, even when I agree with their contents.*

4. *He does not know any better. You do.*

Ben.

JW:

Fascinating. Continuing with the **External** evidence, summary so far:

Justin Martyr c. 153

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...stapology.html>

And there is Marcion, a man of Pontus, who is even at this day alive, and teaching his

disciples to believe in some other god greater than the Creator. And he, by the aid of the devils, has caused many of every nation to speak blasphemies, and to deny that God is the maker of this universe, and to assert that some other being, greater than He, has done greater works.

Irenaeus of Lyons (yes "Lyons") c. 180

The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus

Besides this, he mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke, removing all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most dearly confessing that the Maker of this universe is His Father. He likewise persuaded his disciples that he himself was more worthy of credit than are those apostles who have handed down the Gospel to us, **furnishing them not with the Gospel, but merely a fragment of it**

Tertullian c. 207

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...ullian124.html>

Marcion, on the other hand, you must know, ascribes no author to his Gospel

...

For if the Gospel, said to be Luke's which is current amongst us (we shall see whether it be also current with Marcion), is the very one which, as Marcion argues in his Antitheses, was interpolated by the defenders of Judaism, for the purpose of such a conglomeration with it of the law and the prophets as should enable them out of it to fashion their Christ, surely he could not have so argued about it, unless he had found it (in such a form).

...

If, then, it be evident that these (Gospels) also were current in the churches, why did not Marcion touch them--either to amend them if they were adulterated, or to acknowledge them if they were uncorrupt?

Epiphanius is the next Patristic source to write extensively on Marcion but the combination of his lack of credibility and relative lateness here gives his testimony relatively

little weight.

Evaluating the Patristic witness chronologically than for earliest Attributed authorship and use of "Luke":

Justin c. **153** sees the Marcion controversy as primarily a **Philosophical** difference and not a Textual one. This is completely consistent with Patristic writings to this point in time. Presumably different Christian sects started with a Philosophy (like Paul) and then wrote texts to support it. Historicity of the texts was not an issue.

We will see that most categories of evidence regarding who had the earlier version will favor Marcion. Note that Justin only chooses either the **one** or the main category that favors the orthodox, the claimed continuity of early Christian writings to the Jewish Bible. This is the Mark of an Advocate and not an objective witness.

Irenaeus of Lyons (yes "Lyons") c. **180** as opposed to Justin is separated from Marcion by generation and geography. Irenaeus sees the Textual issue but gives no sources so one has to wonder if Irenaeus is merely observing the textual differences of *his* time and projecting them to Marcion's time. Again, Irenaeus is an Advocate and not an objective witness. Like Justin he chooses the best category of evidence, *for his position*, supposed continuity, to emphasize, but unwittingly chooses another, disciple continuity, which he thinks favors the orthodox but actually favors Marcion.

Tertullian c. **207** comes a generation later and provides a detailed Textual analysis trying to answer the Attribution questions. Tertullian provides limited and mixed information regarding whether Marcion was aware of any other Gospel which existed before his and what that Gospel was. Again, it's quite possible that the other Gospel Marcion was aware of was "Mark" and not another version of "Luke". Tertullian's analysis of the differences between orthodox and Marcion "Luke" appears to be original and not based on previous such analysis suggesting that these Textual differences were an issue of Tertullian's time that he anachronistically is projecting back to Marcion's time.

So in summary for the External evidence you have Biased and few Patristic witness that gradually moves from a Philosophical argument to a Textual one removed from Marcion by generations and geography. The External evidence is inconclusive as to which version of "Luke" likely existed first.

By an Act of Providence though there is a simple and Objective test available based on **Internal** evidence. Compare Marcion and orthodox "Luke" to the original source, "Mark". Which is quantitatively closer based on mathematical measurement?

Joseph

FAITH, n.

Belief without evidence in what is told by one who speaks without knowledge, of things without parallel.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



07-06-2008, 12:57 AM

#105

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003

Location: Nazareth

Posts: 2,357



JW:

Objective **Internal** evidence test, which Gospel, Marcion or orthodox "Luke", is **closer** to the original source "Mark":

The Gospel of Marcion

Is Marcion's story substantially in "Mark"?

SECTION I (Lk.3:1-7:50)

3:1/4:31- 37 The Arrival of Jesus at Capernaum Yes

4: 16-30 The Synagogue in Nazareth No

4:40-44 At the Setting of the Sun Yes

5: 1-11The Lake of Gennesaret No

5:12-16 Healing of the Leper Yes

5:17-26 Healing of the Palsied Yes

5:27-35 The Feast of Levi the Publican Yes

5:36-38 The Old and the New Yes

6:1-11 The Lord of the Sabbath Yes

6:12-16 The Choosing of the Twelve Yes

6:17-42 New Edicts of the New God No

6:43-49 Good Fruit, Evil Fruit No

7:1-10 Faith of the Centurion Yes

7:11-17 Dead Corpse Rising No

7:18-35 John the Baptist No

7:36-50 The Alabaster Box No

Score Section I (Lk.3:1-7:50):

Marcion story substantially in "Mark" = 9

Marcion story substantially **not** in "Mark" = 7

Joseph

FAITH, n.

Belief without evidence in what is told by one who speaks without knowledge, of things without parallel.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



07-06-2008, 05:56 AM

#106

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**

Marcion story substantially in "Mark" = 9

*Marcion story substantially **not** in "Mark" = 7*

This is Tertullian in Against Marcion 4.2

Quote:

Now of the authors whom we possess, Marcion seems to have singled out LUKE for his MULTILATING process.

But it would seem that Tertullian's LUKE had passages from gMatthew and/or gMark.

It can be clearly shown that as Tertullian compared his Luke with Marcion's version, **passages in gMatthew and/or gMark were found** in Tertullian's LUKE.

This is Tertullian, comparing his contents of gLuke with Marcion's gospel.

Against Marcion 4.7

Quote:

....**He came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but rather to fulfill them**, for Marcion **has erased** the passage as an interpolation.

This passage is NOT found in [KJV] gLuke, it is ONLY found in gMatthew 5.17.

Quote:

Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfill.

Tertullian appear to be using a document that contains passages from gMatthew and gLuke **simultaneously**.

Yet again in Against Marcion 4.7, **Tertullian's Luke contained passages found ONLY in [KJV] gMatthew and/or gMark.**

Tertullian in Against Macion

Quote:

Marcion must even **expunge** from the Gospel, "**I am not sent but unto the LOST sheep of the house of Israel, and "It is not meet to take the CHILDREN'S bread, and to cast it to dogs...**

These passages are found ONLY in gMatthew 15.24-26 and/or gMark 7.27, not at all in [KJV] Luke, this again indicates that Tertullian's Luke was a document that **simultaneously** contained gMatthew, and/or gMark and Luke.

Matthew 15.24-26

Quote:

.....I am not sent but unto the LOST sheep of the house of Israel.....It is not meet to take the CHILDREN'S bread, and to cast it to dogs.[/b]

Tertullian may have been comparing the Memoirs of the Apostles or the Diatessaron with Marcion's Gospel.

Based on Tertullian, it can now be seen that Marcion mutilated passages found in gMatthew, and/or gMark and gLuke at the same time.

The Memoirs of the Apostles and the Diatessaron both have parts of gMatthew, gMark and Luke **simultaneously**.



07-09-2008, 10:18 AM

#107

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003

Location: Earth

Posts: 1,443



Quote:

Based on Tertullian, it can now be seen that Marcion mutilated passages found in gMatthew, and/or gMark and gLuke at the same time.

This is quite interesting...could it be possible that Tertullian knew a version of Luke that did *not* contain the Lukan nativity sequence?

The evidence seems to suggest this...Tertullian, in *Adversus Marcionem* IV-V, where he is supposedly focusing on a comparison between GLuke and GMarcion, mentions the visit of the Magi, and the census of Augustus--both details present in GMatthew...but not in GLuke. He has an open opportunity to quote the entirety of GLuke's nativity story when he ridicules the beginning of Marcion's gospel...but doesn't mention it at all. He mentions Mary by

name, but not the Annunciation. Do I have this right?

This is rather striking. Could it mean that...Marcion *did* mutilate a gospel, one that Tertullian had in his possession, and that basically followed Luke's narrative order, but that...it contained the Matthean nativity material, rather than the Lukan? And that it contained other material that found its way into Matthew, but not into GLuke? So that...*both* the claim that Marcion "mutilated" a gospel, *and* the claim that GLuke was a "mutilation", could be true?

So the sources would work out this way:

pLk(+Mk/dMk)-->GMt

pLk-->GMc

pLk+L-->GLk (& Ac)

(Based on my own theories about stemmatics, this is quite an interesting and exciting idea. I'll have to do some work, but it may explain a lot. I have long suspected that both GMt and GLk depend not on Q, but on a complete gospel containing the Q sayings, as well as a nativity sequence. The question was, did this gospel more closely resemble GMt, or GLk? I wonder if we have our answer...it resembled GLk, in sequence and in the Q language, but it resembled GMt in the nativity sequence, and in certain passages here and there. GMt and GLk are different versions of this Q-gospel, which is equivalent to pLk above.

What's even more interesting is that this would mean GLk may not rely on GMk at all--but the Q-gospel did. Unsure about this, but it's an idea.)

It's also true that P75 does not contain *any* nativity material...correct? Which could be due to decay, but is rather interesting.



07-09-2008, 11:51 AM

#108

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave** >

Quote:

Based on Tertullian, it can now be seen that Marcion mutilated passages found in gMatthew, and/or gMark and gLuke at the same time.

This is quite interesting...could it be possible that Tertullian knew a version of Luke that did not contain the Lukan nativity sequence?

The evidence seems to suggest this...Tertullian, in Adversus Marcionem IV-V, where he is supposedly focusing on a comparison between GLuke and

GMarcion, mentions the visit of the Magi, and the census of Augustus--both details present in GMatthew...but not in GLuke. He has an open opportunity to quote the entirety of GLuke's nativity story when he ridicules the beginning of Marcion's gospel...but doesn't mention it at all. He mentions Mary by name, but not the Annunciation. Do I have this right?

This is rather striking. Could it mean that...Marcion did mutilate a gospel, one that Tertullian had in his possession, and that basically followed Luke's narrative order, but that...it contained the Matthean nativity material, rather than the Lukan? And that it contained other material that found its way into Matthew, but not into GLuke? So that...both the claim that Marcion "mutilated" a gospel, and the claim that GLuke was a "mutilation", could be true?

So the sources would work out this way:

*pLk(+Mk/dMk)-->GMt
pLk-->GMc
pLk+L-->GLk (& Ac)*

(Based on my own theories about stemmatics, this is quite an interesting and exciting idea. I'll have to do some work, but it may explain a lot. I have long suspected that both GMt and GLk depend not on Q, but on a complete gospel containing the Q sayings, as well as a nativity sequence. The question was, did this gospel more closely resemble GMt, or GLk? I wonder if we have our answer...it resembled GLk, in sequence and in the Q language, but it resembled GMt in the nativity sequence, and in certain passages here and there. GMt and GLk are different versions of this Q-gospel, which is equivalent to pLk above.

What's even more interesting is that this would mean GLk may not rely on GMk at all--but the Q-gospel did. Unsure about this, but it's an idea.)

It's also true that P75 does not contain any nativity material...correct? Which could be due to decay, but is rather interesting.

Justin Martyr, at around 150 CE mentioned passages from a text called the "Memoirs of the Apostles". He even mentioned that the Memoirs of the Apostles were read in the churches both in the city and country.

The passages from the Memoirs of the Apostles appear to contain parts of gMatthew, gMark and gLuke, but these Memoirs were not given any specific authorship, just always called Memoirs of the Apostles.

But what is most interesting and very significant is that

Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius never mentioned a text called the Memoirs of the Apostles, even though Justin claimed it was read in the churches.

The Memoirs of the Apostles seems to have just vanished. Not even in Church History by Eusebius did the Memoirs of the Apostles ever get mentioned.



07-09-2008, 02:25 PM

#109

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** >
And authors have been known to tell fabrications about their personal involvement in the events they say are historical. Personal diary genres can be completely fictitious and people can be fooled if they read a genre naively on the basis of its genre.

Agreed. But all of these things are true even if the author names himself as he describes his involvement. IOW, we are in the same boat with Josephus, Porphyry, Thucydides, and many others.

Agreed. The difference with Josephus and Thucydides etc is that we have external controls to give us starting positions with their texts.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >


Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** >
My argument is that the only "we" we know is the "we" in the literary text, and is therefore, by definition, a "literary-textual we" -- not an "historical we".


Is that the case with other historians who use the first person, as well? The question still remains: Does the literary we line up with an historical we? One cannot define this historical question out of existence.

By using the term "historians" here, we are implying we have made an evaluation of certain authors that is, I believe, based not solely on the self-attestation of their works, but of their works as evaluated through external controls. We cannot do this with Acts.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
There is no external control to give us any grounds for assuming anything more than the "literary we".


If this is true, then we are stuck with internal controls. As is the case with other first person historians.

Agreed. C'est la vie. But this does not mean we cannot do any sort of history. We can still study the nature of the texts, and compare them with other texts, and come to some understanding of what they were trying to do, their functions, etc. That's not to be sniffed at.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
But it is arbitrary to assume that this coincides with an historical event outside the text.

No, it is not arbitrary. It is just a first step to assessing the probabilities. Kirby, for example, mentions the alternative, to wit, that the author of Acts was making a false affectation to being a companion of Paul. And he weighs in against it.


I wasn't the best geometer at school but I think the assumption of historicity is circular. 😊

Probabilities need to work with controls. Without them they are really speculative rather than probability assessment. We have no external or objective controls to assess historical probability in the case of Acts.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
But we have no way of deciding if behind the implied narrator is a real person who experienced historically the events described. There is no way that can be determined given the evidence we have to work with. Some questions are beyond any possibility of serious enquiry simply

because there is no evidence to work with.

I think this underestimates the abilities of a critical mind. It may be the case that we do not yet have enough evidence to make an evaluation of Acts (and I know that I myself do not yet have enough; hence this thread!). But I would hate to stifle the inquiry by stating from the outset that some questions are beyond the possibility of serious inquiry. We are not waiting for new manuscript discoveries, though such would be splendid indeed. We are not waiting for time travel. We are striving to invent ever more creative ways to evaluate the evidence that we have on hand.

It may even be that these new tests we devise end up disproving my pro 1 argument. As I said before, some of the materials from the we passages already seem doubtful. But I would rather go the distance and devise the test anyway than sit back and say there is no way we can know.

Unless there are some new tests that can compensate for complete absence of primary evidence and absence of controls on the secondary evidence, then we can only ask the questions that the evidence will allow us to answer. Rules of historical enquiry can't be changed for the sake of finding "at least some answer" to a question we want to ask. I have read so many works by "biblical historians" that break these elemental rules and it is simply embarrassing.


Self-attestation is all we have to work with in the case of Acts if we are asking to what extent any of its narratives are historical. If there were methods to help us break through that monolithic barrier then I suspect we would have a set of rules that would enable nobody to ever be misled by or misunderstand a text again.

But I'm not opposing the possibility of historical enquiry. Only the course it takes. We do have evidence, such as Acts. But it is evidence for some provenance, some matrix that gave it birth. To me that is the fascinating question, because we can work with the evidence according to supported rules of evidence and enquiry. We can attempt to explain this artifact, this book of Acts. And the answers to that will be something we can add to the question of Christian origins. But I don't believe Acts alone can be justifiably used as primary or even secondary evidence for the supposed historicity of the events it narrates. We can study Acts in relation to other literature, such as Paul's letters, but that is a literary/textual/theological comparison. Not a study of historicity. It is easy to fall into downward circular spirals, and many do.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

So here goes my comment on Pro 1:

Is there any reason other than the self-attestation of the narrative to assume its historicity? Is self-attestation the sole reason for assuming historicity?

No, it stands in a continuum, as I see it. There is self attestation (the we passages); there is genre (the author intends to be taken seriously in an historical sense); and there is the utterly nondescript way of inserting himself into the narrative. In a textual world where first person claims are routinely asserted, all gilded up and with silver linings (the I Peter of the gospel of Peter, for example, or the I James of the infancy gospel of James), one has to wonder why the author is so modest in this case, and why the earliest evaluators of these gospels wound up accepting the modest claim over and against the fantastic ones.

We have nothing in Acts, or the gospel of Luke, to suggest that the name of one of the "we" people was Luke, of course. I know that's not what you are saying here. Hoffmann suggests, iirc, that the Lucan fiction was created from 2 Timothy 4:11 to be the "proto-orthodox" link in the chain of authority from Paul to the "proto-orthodox" church led by the elders.

One very good reason for the more modest claims to have been accepted in the earliest stages of the literature has to do with the status of "innovation" in ancient matters religious. If these stories are too obviously innovative, then they are arguably going to have a harder time becoming widely accepted. A name of authorship up front only advertizes in flashing neon lights the innovative nature of the work. Luke-Acts and John are the first to drop in sly hints of someone close to being in the know as the authors. But before then we had GMark and GMatthew that are as anonymous as the narratives of Kings and Chronicles. GMark is also arguably structured around and imitative of the Elijah-Elisha narratives. All gospels tell stories of Moses, Elijah, etc etc disguised and re-written as Jesus tales. I don't buy the assertion that this was because Jesus was so awesome and unique that his followers just couldn't help but believe he was a resurrected god and that they couldn't bring themselves to describe any of his life as it really happened, but could only rewrite Elijah type stories about him. Rather, what makes sense to me is that the gospel authors are justifying their innovation by disguising it -- so it appears as a continuation and transvaluation of the old, the known. Hence the Elijah-like John the Baptist to introduce Jesus, and the words from the Law and Prophets etc. This was all to give the new story the legitimacy of the old. To add a name of a contemporary author to it would have undermined this

intent.

Later, once the story became accepted and took on an independent authority, then we see the rivalry for different narratives under the guise of pseudonyms like Peter and James. But before that level of boldness was possible, we have the in-between sly hints of authorship we see in John and Luke-Acts.

According to Bernard Levinson this was the technique used by the author/s of Deuteronomy and how he/they introduced the literature to underpin their radical religious reform agenda.

Neil



07-10-2008, 12:55 AM

#110

JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003

Location: Nazareth

Posts: 2,357

Luukee! Ya Got Sum Splainin Ta Do.

JW:

Continuing from here [Mark's DualCritical Marks. Evidence Of Intentional Fiction In The Original Gospel](#)

Regarding *The Call of the First Disciples* story which clearly is Fictional in "Mark":

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Mark_1

Quote:

1:14 Now after John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God,

1:15 and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel.

1:16 And passing along by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting a net in the sea; for they were fishers.

1:17 And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.

1:18 And straightway they left the nets, and followed him.

which of our two candidates for succession, Marcion or orthodox "Luke", likely has the earlier *The Call of the First Disciples* story?

Let's see what's behind D'var number One:

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Luke_4

Quote:

4:38 And he rose up from the synagogue, and

entered into the house of Simon. And Simon`s wife`s mother was holden with a great fever; and they besought him for her.

4:39 And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she rose up and ministered unto them.

JW:

Note that in orthodox "Luke" Simon and Jesus have not been properly introduced at the Text level at this point (no preceding equivalent of "Mark" 1:16-18). Why did "ohLuke" (orthodox "Luke") exorcise it? Because it sounded like Fiction. How can "ohLuke" have an implication at the Sub-text level (Reader) that Jesus already knows Simon at this point if the Text does not indicate it? Because "ohLuke's" **source** ("Mark") does. A likely sign that "ohLuke" is Editing. The orthodox portray "Mark" as an unsophisticated author and "Luke" as sophisticated but the above observation is representative of the relative literary skills of the two. The fish story comes *later* in "ohLuke":

Quote:

5:1 Now it came to pass, while the multitude pressed upon him and heard the word of God, that he was standing by the lake of Gennesaret;

5:2 and he saw two boats standing by the lake: but the fishermen had gone out of them, and were washing their nets.

5:3 And he entered into one of the boats, which was Simon`s, and asked him to put out a little from the land. And he sat down and taught the multitudes out of the boat.

5:4 And when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.

5:5 And Simon answered and said, Master, we toiled all night, and took nothing: but at thy word I will let down the nets.

5:6 And when they had done this, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes; and their nets were breaking;

5:7 and they beckoned unto their partners in the other boat, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink.

5:8 But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus` knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.

5:9 For he was amazed, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had

taken;

5:10 and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.

JW:

The above has mixed information regarding whether Jesus knew Simon at this point in the narrative but generally favors "not". So for the supposed first meeting of Jesus and Simon in "ohLuke" the text implies they had already met

and for the supposed second meeting of Jesus and Simon in "ohLuke" the text implies they had not already met. The likely explanation is "ohLuke" simply **switched** the first two such stories in her source.

Again, probably the most objective determination of which was likely first, "ohLuke" or Marcion "Luke", is which is closer to the original source "Mark". On a Macro level Marcion "Luke" is much closer. On a Micro level, for the story above, "ohLuke" is a long way from "Mark". We can not be sure what exactly Marcion had corresponding to "ohLuke's" excerpts above. It is speculative but, to have "ohLuke's" first meetings between Jesus and Simon be so out of whack suggests even more distance between "ohLuke" and "Mark", such as Marcion "Luke".

Joseph

STORY, n.

A narrative, commonly untrue. The truth of the stories here following has, however, not been successfully impeached.

http://errancywiki.com/index.php?title=Main_Page



Page 11 of 16 << [First](#) < [9](#) [10](#) **[11](#)** [12](#) [13](#) > [Last](#) >>

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:10 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 12 of 16 [« First](#) [≤](#) [2](#) [10](#) [11](#) **12** [13](#) [14](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-10-2008, 06:05 AM

#111

[andrewcriddle](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: Sep 2004

Location: Birmingham UK

Posts: 4,876



Quote:

Originally Posted by [the_cave](#)

Quote:

Based on Tertullian, it can now be seen that Marcion mutilated passages found in gMatthew, and/or gMark and gLuke at the same time.

This is quite interesting...could it be possible that Tertullian knew a version of Luke that did not contain the Lukan nativity sequence?

I'm not sure exactly what you mean here.

IF you are suggesting that Tertullian's Luke did not contain

the Lukan nativity, ie that Tertullian did not know the Nativity story as we have it in Luke, then I think you are clearly wrong

<http://www.tertullian.org/anf/anf04/anf04-09.htm>

Quote:

I recognise, too, the angel Gabriel as having been sent to "a virgin." But when he is blessing her, it is "among women," not among virgins, that he ranks her: "Blessed (be) thou among women."

http://www.tertullian.org/articles/e...raxeas_eng.htm

Quote:

it is enough that he who was
to be born of the virgin was by the angel
messenger himself defined
as the Son of God: The Spirit of God shall come
upon thee and
the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee,
wherefore that
which shall be born of thee shall be called holy,
the Son of God.

Quote:

Yet they will be refuted also in another way in
that text. " Behold", they say, " it was announced
by the angel,
Therefore that which shall be born of thee shall be
called holy, the
Son of God : and so it was flesh that was born,
and so the flesh
will be the Son of God."

<http://www.tertullian.org/anf/anf03/anf03-31.htm>


Quote:

These facts he had also received from the angel,
according to our Gospel: "Wherefore that which
shall be born of thee shall be called the Holy One,
the Son of God; "

This last reference actually comes from *Against Marcion*.

IF you are suggesting that as well as canonical Luke Tertullian knew of another version of Luke which was intermediate between canonical Luke and Marcion's Luke then this is possible but IMO unlikely.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave** 
It's also true that P75 does not contain any nativity material...correct? Which could be due to decay, but is rather interesting.

P75 is a single quire manuscript which now lacks the beginning of Luke and the end of John. It probably

originally had both.

Andrew Criddle



07-10-2008, 08:50 AM

#112

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



I'm not sure if aa is mischievously trying to bait others with word games when he says Marcion "rejected Paul" but for the sake of the record, Marcion was early identified by all as a claimant to the authority of Paul:

Irenaeus (H 3.13.1):

Quote:

With regard to those (the Marcionites) who allege that Paul alone knew the truth, and that to him the mystery was manifested by revelation, let Paul himself convict them, when he says, that one and the same God wrought in Peter for the apostolate of the circumcision, and in himself for the Gentiles. Peter, therefore, was an apostle of that very God whose was also Paul; and Him whom Peter preached as God among those of the circumcision, and likewise the Son of God, did Paul [declare] also among the Gentiles. **For our Lord never came to save Paul alone, nor is God so limited in means, that He should have but one apostle who knew the dispensation of His Son.** And again, when Paul says, "How beautiful are the feet of those bringing glad tidings of good things, and preaching the Gospel of peace," he shows clearly that it was not merely one, but there were many who used to preach the truth. And again, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, when he had recounted all those who had seen God after the resurrection, he says in continuation, "But whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed," acknowledging as one and the same, the preaching of all those who saw God after the resurrection from the dead.

Tertullian (AM 1.15.1; 5.1.2, 6f): (okay, these quotes or some of them may already be discussed, but included here for completion)

Quote:

we come to discuss even your own apostle

Wherefore, O shipmaster of Pontus, if you have never taken on board your small craft any contraband goods or smuggler's cargo, if you have never thrown overboard or tampered with a freight, you are still more careful and conscientious, I doubt not, in divine things; and so I should be glad if you would inform us under what bill of lading **you admitted the Apostle Paul on**

board, who ticketed him, what owner forwarded him, who handed him to you, that so you may land him without any misgiving, lest he should turn out to belong to him, who can substantiate his claim to him by producing all his apostolic writings.

Thence I demonstrate that from a persecutor he became "an apostle, not of men, neither by man;" thence am I led to believe the Apostle himself; thence do **I find reason for rejecting your defence of him**, and for bearing fearlessly **your taunt. "Then you deny the Apostle Paul."** I do not calumniate him whom I defend.

[Tertullian is saying that it was Marcion here who taunted the "orthodox" that they, the orthodox, denied the Apostle Paul.]

[Tertullian then complains that Marcion believed Paul was an apostle of the Alien God, not the biblical Creator God]:

even an apostle who is said not to belong to the Creator----nay, is displayed as in actual hostility to the Creator-

Origen (in Luc.hom.25) says that some Marcionites believed **Paul and Marcion stood in heaven on right and left hand of Christ.**

Neil



07-10-2008, 09:46 AM

#113


aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 
I'm not sure if aa is mischievously trying to bait others with word games when he says Marcion "rejected Paul" but for the sake of the record, Marcion was early identified by all as a claimant to the authority of Paul.

Well, all you need to do is to show me why Marcion would not reject the Paul of Romans 1.

Romans 1.1-4

Quote:

Paul a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he had prophesied by his prophets in the holy scriptures, concerning his son Jesus Christ, **which was made of the SEED OF DAVID according TO THE FLESH.** And declared to be the son of God

with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead.

And this is Tertullian in Against Marcion 5.2

Quote:

Now since the Acts of the Apostles thus AGREE with Paul, it becomes apparent why you REJECT them.

It is because they declare no other God than the Creator, and prove Christ to belong to no other God than the Creator...

Tertullian again in Against Marcion 5.21

Quote:

.....His aim was, I suppose, to carry out his **interpolating process** even to the number of (St. Paul's) epistles.

Marcion rejected and mutilated Paul's epistles, or in other words, Marcion had to mutilate Paul's epistles before he could accept them.



07-10-2008, 10:03 AM

#114


[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by [aa5874](#) 
... or in other words, Marcion had to mutilate Paul's epistles before he could accept them.

which is what everyone else has been saying or understood all along



07-10-2008, 11:05 AM

#115


[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by [JoeWallack](#) 
*The above has mixed information regarding whether Jesus knew Simon at this point in the narrative but generally favors "not". So for the supposed first meeting of Jesus and Simon in "ohLuke" the text implies they had already met and for the supposed second meeting of Jesus and Simon in "ohLuke" the text implies they had not already met. The likely explanation is "ohLuke" simply **switched** the first two such stories in her source.*

Again, probably the most objective determination

of which was likely first, "ohLuke" or Marcion "Luke", is which is closer to the original source "Mark". On a Macro level Marcion "Luke" is much closer. On a Micro level, for the story above, "ohLuke" is a long way from "Mark". We can not be sure what exactly Marcion had corresponding to "ohLuke's" excerpts above. It is speculative but, to have "ohLuke's" first meetings between Jesus and Simon be so out of whack suggests even more distance between "ohLuke" and "Mark", such as Marcion "Luke".

When we look at the apparent reason for the switch in order of Luke's narrative and other differences then we arguably have another piece in the mosaic that shows up canonical Luke as a reaction against Marcionism.

Firstly, Talbert suggests that canonical Luke has attempted to show that the disciples were commissioned in response to the growing need for help giving the escalating success of Jesus' ministry. The commissioning by the lake occurs just after Jesus is said to have attracted multitudes pressing around him. He uses the same trope in Acts.

Secondly, the Luke 5 lake scene is not a calling of the disciples as it is in Mark's gospel. Canonical Luke does not narrate the calling of the disciples but their commissioning. It is a real commissioning (From now on you will catch men!), unlike the contingent Markan hope (Follow me and I will make you fishers of men).

Both these points combined -- the need for the disciples on Jesus' part, and the commissioning of the disciples -- are not found in Mark, yet are consistent with canonical Luke's interest elsewhere in establishing the authority of the disciples as commissioned witnesses and coworkers of Jesus.

Canonical Luke would thus appear to be making changes that reflect his agenda to strengthen the foundational place of the disciples in the Church. If so, this may be seen as one more of many other arguably anti-Marcionite agendas in canonical Luke-Acts. Another gram on the side of the scale that represents canonical Luke as post-Marcion.

Incidentally, it also appears that Luke has melded the commissioning scene found at the end of John's gospel with the call of the disciples found in Mark's. John's account, of course, is also a clear commissioning. (But I know few are prepared to accept Luke edited John et al.)

Neil Godfrey



07-10-2008, 02:47 PM

#116


[aa5874](#)

Contributor



Quote:

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 

. . . or in other words, Marcion had to mutilate Paul's epistles before he could accept them.

which is what everyone else has been saying or understood all along

So, Marcion rejected the Pauline Epistles all along.



07-10-2008, 03:33 PM

#117

neilgodfrey

Senior Member


Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

which is what everyone else has been saying or understood all along

So, Marcion rejected the Pauline Epistles all along.

as you wish. but unless you use words in the same sense as the broader community you are only going to end up talking to no-one but yourself and uselessly wasting time arguing with others.



07-10-2008, 04:45 PM

#118


aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** 

So, Marcion rejected the Pauline Epistles all along.

as you wish. but unless you use words in the same sense as the broader community you are only going to end up talking to no-one but yourself and uselessly wasting time arguing with others.

I do not argue. I present my position using my own words.

My position is clear. Marcion rejected Paul.



07-10-2008, 10:54 PM

#119

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Another facet to this question could be the waning influence of Paul pre-Marcion. -- And again it is moving away from the textual one

If we are going to treat canonical Luke as part of the Luke-Acts duo, and date this pre-Marcion, then I think we might have a bit of an anomaly. Does not a pre-Marcionite date for Luke-Acts, lets say late first century, coincide at a time when interest in and the influence of Paul was on the wane? How to explain the production of a double volume that praised Paul to the highest in such a matrix?

Sure we can speculate reasons, but beyond speculation the question might maybe remain as another gram weight on the scales tipping against canonical Luke being pre-Marcionite.

The evidence that is used to point to a decline in influence of Paul among the "proto-orthodox" before Marcion seems to fall into 3 categories:

1. non-existent -- the absence of Pauline refs from those we might expect to find them
2. rejectionist -- such as James and the Johannine lit
3. modified and subsumed -- such as in the Pastorals

I've listed the evidence in more detail in the box below.

Where does Luke-Acts fit in here? Does the account of Paul in Acts seem low-key enough to really qualify to fit in with 3. Sure Acts modifies and subordinates Paul, but does its other side of the picture show a Paul too dominant and overpowering an influence from Jerusalem to Rome -- one that does not fit in comfortably with the other evidence we find in 3.?

So the question is, does Luke-Acts really fit the tenor of the rest of the pre-Marcionite (proto-orthodox) treatment of Paul? I don't know. I know this is not going to be the strongest argument either way whatever conclusions drawn -- but how many dynamic superhero arguments do we have anywhere re this?

Quote:

Evidence for the a-Pauline or anti-Pauline ambience before Marcion:

The ignoring types:

The silence of so-called epistle of Barnabas and

Didache re Paul's activities

Justin's Martyr negligible use of Paul's letters -- though Justin was a contemporary, assuming here he also reflects an earlier time too (Paul's popularity with heretical groups was a main reason for this according to Bauer)

The rejectionist types

James 2.24, 2.18ff - replace the Pauline idea of faith with a belief in a doctrine; Christian liberty is replaced with "law" of freedom (2.12).

Ignatius' Eph.9.1 points to the success of heretics in Ephesus before the later(?) Johannine literature.

The eclipse of Paul's influence as per Rev 2.2, 9, 14-15, 20-24; 3.9; 21.14; 2 Ptr 3.16; Jas 2.17

The Johanne literature does not mention Paul, but there does appear to be a polemic against his teachings in Rev.2.14, 20, 24ff; 3.14 -- Was heretical Paulinism riddling Asia Minor?

The behave-and-fit-in types

Early disciples of Paul moderated severity of his theology in favour of edification - e.g. Luke and Pastorals; Or they subsumed it under a new theme, as in Ephesians.

In 1 Clement and Polycarp Paul's message is changed to a simple church piety

2 Ptr 3.16 suggests his teachings unintelligible by mid-2nd century, while reference to "twisting" his words = Irenaeus judgment of Marcion. The same passage subordinates Paul to Peter.



07-11-2008, 03:01 PM

#120

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874

The Prologue of Luke as evidence that canonical Luke post-dated Marcion's gospel?

The Prologue to Luke's gospel (assuming it is original to canonical Luke) would seem to establish the authority of the gospel. It sets things "in order" so that the one "might know the certainty", draws on tradition and a good knowledge, etc.

If Marcion used this gospel this prologue would have been the first thing he'd have to delete. Maybe he did. But Marcionites, it seems from Irenaeus and Tertullian, did not see the gospel they used as an authoritative document at all. These Fathers both indicated that Marcion/Marcionites were continually editing Luke. "Mutilation" was an ongoing

process.

Irenaeus, Haer. 3.2.1

Quote:

When, however, they are confuted from the Scriptures, **they turn round and accuse these same Scriptures, as if they were not correct, nor of authority**, and [assert] that they are ambiguous, **and that the truth cannot be extracted from them by those who are ignorant of tradition**. For [they allege] that the **truth was not delivered by means of written documents, but vivâ voce**

Tertullian AM 4.5.7

Quote:

I will therefore advise his followers, that they either change these Gospels, however late to do so, into a conformity with their own, whereby they may seem to be in agreement with the apostolic writings (**for they are daily retouching their work**, as daily they are convicted by us); or else that they blush for their master, who stands self-condemned either way----when once he hands on the truth of the gospel conscience smitten, or **again subverts it by shameless tampering**.

Tertullian AM 4.4.5

Quote:

But for all that, heresy, which is **for ever mending the Gospels**, and corrupting them in the act

Tertullian AM 4.5.4

Quote:

And it may well seem that the works which disciples publish belong to their masters. Well, then, Marcion ought to be called to a strict account concerning these (other Gospels) also, for having omitted them, and insisted in preference on Luke .
 . .

From these references we can understand that Marcion's real authority was Paul, and the gospel he used could only be rightly interpreted through Paul's teaching.

If so, this would run counter to the Prologue, surely.

So why would Marcion choose a gospel that began with a header that would seem directly to imply he was not allowed to do what he was about to do?

Okay, we can surmise that the command not to tamper provoked in him the desire to tamper, for he had not known tampering until the law said, 'thou shalt not

tamper.'

But it is clear that the prologue was composed as a reaction to "many" variable preceding texts or accounts, and that what follows was to be a "final edition".

Would not this imply some other "free to tamper gospel" was likely available to Marcion -- and his followers over time? Does this make it more or less plausible that Marcion would choose a gospel with this prologue?

Does the prologue of Luke make a stronger suggestion that it (canonical Luke) is a response to ever changing and variable gospel accounts, of which Marcion would have been one?

But perhaps against this is the apparent fact that Marcion was the only one to radically edit a gospel in the way he did:

Irenaeus Haer 1.27.4

Quote:

But since this man is the only one who has dared openly to mutilate the Scriptures

But since the editing was not a once-only business, but an ongoing process by his disciples, too, in the light of their understanding of Paul's gospel, then how valid is it to attempt to compare canonical Luke with reconstructions of M's gospel from writings of a generation or two after Marcion? How can we be sure Tertullian and co are not using later Marcionite revisions of Marcion's gospel?

Neil Godfrey



Page 12 of 16 << First < 2 10 11 12 13 14 > Last >>

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:10 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, **neilgodfrey**.

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 13 of 16 [« First](#) [≤ 3](#) [11](#) [12](#) **13** [14](#) [15](#) [≥ Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-11-2008, 03:34 PM

#121

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

The Prologue to Luke's gospel (assuming it is original to canonical Luke) would seem to establish the authority of the gospel. It sets things "in order" so that the one "might know the certainty", draws on tradition and a good knowledge, etc.

I think the prologue in Luke is to set up the reader to make him think the same author also wrote Acts. The author of gLuke could have given his/her name instead of Theophilus, and likewise the author of Acts, instead of mentioning Theophilus.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

If Marcion used this gospel this prologue would have been the first thing he'd have to delete. Maybe he did. But Marcionites, it seems from Irenaeus and Tertullian, did not see the gospel they used as an authoritative document at all. These Fathers both indicated that Marcion/Marcionites were continually editing Luke. "Mutilation" was an ongoing process.

But, there seems to be some fundamental problems here. If Marcion is already dead, by the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, this would mean that his Gospel, the Antithesis, or whatever Marcion wrote is finished and all his writings can be addressed with respect to mutilation or rejection.

Are the Church writers implying that Marcion followers, after Marcion died, are also publishing continuously amended works of Marcion?

But, Tertullian has already declared that Marcion gospel has NO author. And I just can't find the word "Paul" in the reconstructed Marcion gospel.

The more I read Tertullian's Against Marcion, it is appearing more and more that the information from these Church writers are full of errors and misleading information.



07-11-2008, 05:45 PM

#122

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** [▶](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**
If Marcion used this gospel this prologue would have been the first thing he'd have to delete. Maybe he did. But Marcionites, it seems from Irenaeus and Tertullian, did not see the gospel they used as an authoritative document at all. These Fathers both indicated that Marcion/Marcionites were continually editing Luke. "Mutilation" was an ongoing process.

But, there seems to be some fundamental problems here. If Marcion is already dead, by the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, this would mean that his Gospel, the Antithesis, or whatever Marcion wrote is finished and all his writings can be addressed with respect to mutilation or rejection.

Are the Church writers implying that Marcion followers, after Marcion died, are also publishing

continuously amended works of Marcion?

But, Tertullian has already declared that Marcion gospel has NO author. And I just can't find the word "Paul" in the reconstructed Marcion gospel.

Marcion was said to have edited/deleted sections from an existing anonymous gospel. Later Fathers said that the gospel he "mutilated" in this way was their Gospel of Luke. No one has said Paul appears in the gospel, not even Marcion's. Marcion and his followers appear to have not regarded their gospel as authoritative at all. It was subject to revision. It could only be interpreted through what they believed was the message of Paul. Yes, the followers of Marcion continued to revise this written gospel after Marcion's death.

(I might have been misleading when I used the expression "gospel of Paul", sorry. I meant in that context for "gospel" to mean the central message of Paul. Not the written gospel some attributed to Luke.)



07-12-2008, 03:37 AM

#123

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

But, there seems to be some fundamental problems here. If Marcion is already dead, by the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian, this would mean that his Gospel, the Antithesis, or whatever Marcion wrote is finished and all his writings can be addressed with respect to mutilation or rejection.

Are the Church writers implying that Marcion followers, after Marcion died, are also publishing continuously amended works of Marcion?

But, Tertullian has already declared that Marcion gospel has NO author. And I just can't find the word "Paul" in the reconstructed Marcion gospel.

Marcion was said to have edited/deleted sections from an existing anonymous gospel. Later Fathers said that the gospel he "mutilated" in this way was their Gospel of Luke. No one has said Paul appears in the gospel, not even Marcion's. Marcion and his followers appear to have not regarded their gospel

as authoritative at all. It was subject to revision. It could only be interpreted through what they believed was the message of Paul. Yes, the followers of Marcion continued to revise this written gospel after Marcion's death.

(I might have been misleading when I used the expression "gospel of Paul", sorry. I meant in that context for "gospel" to mean the central message of Paul. Not the written gospel some attributed to Luke.)

So, where can I find what Marcion wrote about Paul independent of Church writers?

I am having serious fundamental queries about Tertullian's Against Marcion.

Against Marcion 1.1

Quote:

What Pontic mouse ever had such gnawing powers as he who has gnawed the Gospels to pieces?

Today we have a unique parallell situation, we have those who are called HJers, who believe Jesus was entirely human, so like Marcion, it can be said they too have mutilated the Gospels, indeed the entire NT.

Any passage in the NT that declares that Jesus of Nazareth was indeed a God or equal in characteristic to God, the HJers reject. This would mean rejecting passages from the entire NT, not only from gLuke, Romans or Revelation, but from the entire NT.

HJers reject gMatthew's and gLuke's Holy Ghost conception. They reject gMark's, Matthew's and Luke's transfiguration. They reject gJohn's depiction of Jesus as pre-existing before the world was created. They reject Paul's claim that Jesus ROSE from the dead.

In effect, HJers mutilate and reject as necessary, they do not concentrate on or isolate any book from their hands of rejection.

But, even though they reject passages from the NT, they accept or need the NT to get the name of their human only character, where he lived and preached, and how he died.

Oddly, Marcion, as the Church writers would have us believe, was aware of gMatthew, gMark, gLuke, gJohn, the Pauline Epistles and Revelation, very similar to the canonised NT.

I would then expect Marcion to reject and mutilate as necessary, just like HJers, and not to concentrate or isolate any book from his hands of rejection.

I find it NOTcredible that Marcion would isolate gLuke, if he was aware of the other Gospels, since all the Gospels as we have today all declare that Jesus was the Son of the God of the Jews, and that the God of the Jews is the Creator.

Against Marcion by Tertullian appears to be propoganda to distort the true history of Marcion, the authors of Luke and the Pauline Epistles.



07-12-2008, 03:50 AM

#124

Casper

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2004
Location: Texas
Posts: 430



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** >

. . . or in other words, Marcion had to mutilate Paul's epistles before he could accept them.

which is what everyone else has been saying or understood all along

Could it have been the other way round, and Tertulian is creating a straw man?

[Tertullian_as_blogtroll]"Yeah, Marcion used what we have right here, but he conveniently removed the part about yadayadayada which we all know is central. Thus he is a heretic!"[/Tertullian_as_blogtroll]



07-12-2008, 05:52 AM

#125

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003
Location: Earth
Posts: 1,443



Here's a riddle:

If Luke used GMc as a source, then there is no need for GLk to depend on any version of GMk or GMt. Is there?

But if that's so...then why does GLk include a genealogy and nativity story, just like GMt?



07-12-2008, 06:45 AM

#126

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave** >

Here's a riddle:

If Luke used GMc as a source, then there is no

need for GLk to depend on any version of GMk or GMt. Is there?

But if that's so...then why does GLk include a genealogy and nativity story, just like GMT?

To solve the riddle, these words must be deciphered.

Tertullan Against Marcion 1.1

Quote:

Whatever in times past we have wrought in opposition to Marcion, is from the present moment no longer to be accounted of.

Who wrote those words and what was said of Marcion before?



07-12-2008, 07:33 AM

#127

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003
Location: Earth
Posts: 1,443



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave**

Here's a riddle:

If Luke used GMc as a source, then there is no need for GLk to depend on any version of GMk or GMt. Is there?

But if that's so...then why does GLk include a genealogy and nativity story, just like GMT?

To solve the riddle, these words must be deciphered.

Tertullan Against Marcion 1.1

Quote:

Whatever in times past we have wrought in opposition to Marcion, is from the present moment no longer to be accounted of.

Who wrote those words and what was said of Marcion before?

You don't think it was Tertullian?

What's interesting is, if Tertullian is being accurate, there were two different versions of Against Marcion circulating during the third century. What happened to them? Is there

no record of them at all?

However, I have to say I don't see that this is relevant. It tells us nothing about what might have prompted the author of GLk to include the genealogy and nativity sequence.

Although it is interesting to wonder what the addition was that Tertullian made to his treatise. How interesting that the last two books are basically an analysis of Marcion's canon...



07-12-2008, 09:40 AM

#128

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

To solve the riddle, these words must be deciphered.

Tertullan Against Marcion 1.1

Who wrote those words and what was said of Marcion before?

You don't think it was Tertullian?

What's interesting is, if Tertullian is being accurate, there were two different versions of Against Marcion circulating during the third century. What happened to them? Is there no record of them at all?

However, I have to say I don't see that this is relevant. It tells us nothing about what might have prompted the author of GLk to include the genealogy and nativity sequence.

Although it is interesting to wonder what the addition was that Tertullian made to his treatise. How interesting that the last two books are basically an analysis of Marcion's canon...

It is not simply an addition.

Tertullian in Against Marcion 1.1

Quote:

It is a NEW work which we are undertaking in lieu of the old one.

Did the **old** work say anything about Luke or Paul?



07-12-2008, 12:58 PM

#129

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
 Location: Darwin, Australia
 Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

So, where can I find what Marcion wrote about Paul independent of Church writers?

Probably nowhere. I don't know of any claim that Marcion wrote anything about Paul?



07-12-2008, 01:10 PM

#130

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
 Location: Darwin, Australia
 Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

which is what everyone else has been saying or understood all along

Could it have been the other way round, and Tertulian is creating a straw man?

[Tertullian_as_blogtroll]"Yeah, Marcion used what we have right here, but he conveniently removed the part about yadayadayada which we all know is central. Thus he is a heretic!"
[/Tertullian_as_blogtroll]

If you are suggesting the possibility that it was the "orthodox" who added to the gospel rather than Marcion taking passages out of it, I used to think this was a possibility. Wasn't rewriting and expansion the more usual method for "correcting" texts, rather than omissions?

But against that, we have Irenaeus's assertion that Marcion was the only one to have treated a gospel text this way:

Irenaeus Haer 1.27.4

Quote:

But since this man is the only one who has dared openly to mutilate the Scriptures . . .

If it were really a debate about which teachings were supported by original established texts then I would have expected there would be others in addition to Marcion who would have created issues. Irenaeus's claim seems to point to Marcion really having edited some form of a

gospel like Luke's. Yes? No?



Page 13 of 16 << First < 3 11 12 13 14 15 > Last >>

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 09:10 AM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 14 of 16 [« First](#) [≤ 4](#) [12](#) [13](#) **14** [15](#) [16](#) [>](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-12-2008, 02:57 PM

#131

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by [neilgodfrey](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by [aa5874](#)

So, where can I find what Marcion wrote about Paul independent of Church writers?

Probably nowhere. I don't know of any claim that Marcion wrote anything about Paul?

And then when you take into consideration that Tertullian also claim that Marcion's Gospel had no author, how can anything about Marcion with respect to Paul and Luke be verified unless we accept the words of those who opposed and disliked Marcion with a vengeance.

Tertullian hated Marcion to such a degree that even those who lived in the region of the Euxine Sea (Black Sea) were characterised as uncivilised, CANNIBALS and PROSTITUTES.

Against Marcion 1.1

Quote:

....They have no fixed abode, their life has no germ of **civilisation**; they indulge their libidinous desires without restraint, and for the most part naked.

Mowever, when they gratify their secret lust, they hang up their quivers on their car-yokes, to warn off curious and rash observers. Thus without a blush they prostitute their weapons of war.

The dead bodies of their parents they cut up with their sheep, and devour at their feasts...

Did anyone from Pontus or the region about the Euxine Sea ever read this vile attack from Tertullian in Against Marcion?

I don't think so.



07-13-2008, 04:45 AM

#132

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003

Location: Earth

Posts: 1,443



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

It is not simply an addition.

Tertullian in Against Marcion 1.1

Quote:

It is a NEW work which we are undertaking in lieu of the old one.

Yes, I agree--but it did include an addition.

Quote:

The necessity thus arose for an amended work; and the occasion of the new edition induced me to make a considerable addition to the treatise.

Quote:

Did the **old** work say anything about Luke or Paul?

No idea--that's what I'm asking. All that material is in

books IV and V.

If you're saying we can't trust anything Tertullian says about Marcion, well alright then--in that case, this discussion is completely pointless.

Is there a record of Marcion's canon earlier than Tertullian?



07-13-2008, 07:30 AM

#133

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874** >
It is not simply an addition.

Tertullian in Against Marcion 1.1

Yes, I agree--but it did include an addition.

Quote:

Did the **old** work say anything about Luke or Paul?

No idea--that's what I'm asking. All that material is in books IV and V.

If you're saying we can't trust anything Tertullian says about Marcion, well alright then--in that case, this discussion is completely pointless.

Is there a record of Marcion's canon earlier than Tertullian?

How do you know all the material is in book 4 and 5?

I thought you just wrote that you have no idea if Paul or Luke was in the "old" work.

Whether we can trust Tertullian or not, a discussion is always worthwhile. If you trust Tertullian you can always state why you do and perhaps that can lead to a fruitful discussion.

And I have not read everything that it is claimed Tertullian wrote.



07-13-2008, 07:44 AM

#134

the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003

Location: Earth

Posts: 1,443



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

How do you know all the material is in book 4 and 5?

Because I can't find any of it in the earlier books? Are you aware of any material that addresses Marcion's canon in books I-III of *Against Marcion*?

Quote:

I thought you just wrote that you have no idea if Paul or Luke was in the "old" work.

I don't.

Quote:

Whether we can trust Tertullian or not, a discussion is always worthwhile. If you trust Tertullian you can always state why you do and perhaps that can lead to a fruitful discussion.

Marcion's gospel was apparently available during Tertullian's time. It could easily be cross-checked with Tertullian's claims about it. Tertullian would want to avoid embarrassment.



07-13-2008, 08:29 AM

#135

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: the fringe of the caribbean

Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave**

Quote:

Whether we can trust Tertullian or not, a discussion is always worthwhile. If you trust Tertullian you can always state why you do and perhaps that can lead to a fruitful discussion.

Marcion's gospel was apparently available during Tertullian's time. It could easily be cross-checked with Tertullian's claims about it. Tertullian would want to avoid embarrassment.

Now, if you read the first chapter of *Against Marcion*, you will see that Tertullian is already warning the readers that he, Tertullian, did write and "old work hurriedly" and **there is also another one, full of mistakes, which was done without his permission, by a "brother"** so he is writing a third, a "new work".

Now, who is going to tell us about Marcion's writings, about the problems with forgeries and people who falsely claim Marcion wrote certain writings that he never did, just like they did to Tertullian?

Marcion was dead when Tertullian wrote about him.

And Tertullian claimed that Marcion's gospel had no author.

Now Tertullian also claimed Luke wrote a Gospel, and today **we know Luke did not.**

Do you see the problem I am having with Tertullian?



07-13-2008, 08:32 AM

#136

andrewcriddle

Veteran Member

Join Date: Sep 2004
Location: Birmingham UK
Posts: 4,876



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave** [▶](#)

.....
Is there a record of Marcion's canon earlier than Tertullian?

Irenaeus writing a little earlier than Tertullian says http://www.tertullian.org/fathers2/A...#P6155_1380364

Quote:

Marcion of Pontus succeeded him, and developed his doctrine. In so doing, he advanced the most daring blasphemy against Him who is proclaimed as God by the law and the prophets, declaring Him to be the author of evils, to take delight in war, to be infirm of purpose, and even to be contrary to Himself. But Jesus being derived from that father who is above the God that made the world, and coming into Judaea in the times of Pontius Pilate the governor, who was the procurator of Tiberius Caesar, was manifested in the form of a man to those who were in Judaea, abolishing the prophets and the law, and all the works of that God who made the world, whom also he calls Cosmocrator. **Besides this, he mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke, removing all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most dearly confessing that the Maker of this universe is His Father. He likewise persuaded his disciples that he himself was more worthy of credit than are those apostles who have handed down the Gospel to us, furnishing them not with the Gospel, but merely a fragment of it. In like manner, too, he dismembered the Epistles of Paul, removing all that is said by the apostle respecting that God who made the world, to**

the effect that He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also those passages from the prophetic writings which the apostle quotes, in order to teach us that they announced beforehand the coming of the Lord.

Andrew Criddle



07-13-2008, 09:10 AM

#137

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of
the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **andrewcriddle**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the_cave**

.....
Is there a record of Marcion's canon earlier than Tertullian?

*Irenaeus writing a little earlier than Tertullian says
http://www.tertullian.org/fathers2/A...#P6155_1380364*

Quote:

Marcion of Pontus succeeded him, and developed his doctrine. In so doing, he advanced the most daring blasphemy against Him who is proclaimed as God by the law and the prophets, declaring Him to be the author of evils, to take delight in war, to be infirm of purpose, and even to be contrary to Himself. But Jesus being derived from that father who is above the God that made the world, and coming into Judaea in the times of Pontius Pilate the governor, who was the procurator of Tiberius Caesar, was manifested in the form of a man to those who were in Judaea, abolishing the prophets and the law, and all the works of that God who made the world, whom also he calls Cosmocrator. **Besides this, he mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke, removing all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most dearly confessing that the Maker of this universe is His Father. He likewise persuaded his disciples that he himself was more worthy of credit than are those apostles who have handed down the Gospel to us, furnishing them not with the Gospel, but merely a fragment of it. In like manner, too, he dismembered the Epistles of Paul, removing all that is said by the apostle respecting that God who made the world, to the effect that He is**

the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also those passages from the prophetic writings which the apostle quotes, in order to teach us that they announced beforehand the coming of the Lord.

Andrew Criddle

The problems I am having with Irenaeus is that he claimed **Luke wrote a Gospel, but today we know Luke did not.**

Irenaeus claimed an apostle named Matthew wrote a Gospel, but today we know **Matthew did not.**

Irenaeus claimed Mark wrote a Gospel, but today we know **Mark did not**

Irenaeus claimed an apostle named John wrote a Gospel, but today we **John did not.**

And Tertullian writing after Irenaeus claimed **Marcion's Gospel had no author.**

Who told Irenaeus what Marcion wrote? Was it the same person who told Irenaeus that Luke, Matthew, Mark and John wrote the Gospels when they did not.?

Who told Irenaeus what Marcion wrote? The same person who told Irenaeus that Jesus was **over fifty years old** when he, Jesus died?

Irenaeus doesn't seem to know a lot.



07-13-2008, 10:43 AM

#138

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005
Location: Darwin, Australia
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by [aa5874](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by [neilgodfrey](#)

Probably nowhere. I don't know of any claim that Marcion wrote anything about Paul?

And then when you take into consideration that Tertullian also claim that Marcion's Gospel had no author, how can anything about Marcion with respect to Paul and Luke be verified unless we accept the words of those who opposed and disliked Marcion with a vengeance.

Very little can be "verified". That's why we speak in terms

of degrees of probabilities and plausibilities. But even false and hostile witnesses can, if we use sense and care in evaluating both their claims and the context in which they are making them, give us some sense of what appears to have happened.



07-20-2008, 09:09 AM

#139

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

I think this underestimates the abilities of a critical mind. It may be the case that we do not yet have enough evidence to make an evaluation of Acts (and I know that I myself do not yet have enough; hence this thread!). But I would hate to stifle the inquiry by stating from the outset that some questions are beyond the possibility of serious inquiry. We are not waiting for new manuscript discoveries, though such would be splendid indeed. We are not waiting for time travel. We are striving to invent ever more creative ways to evaluate the evidence that we have on hand.

It may even be that these new tests we devise end up disproving my pro 1 argument. As I said before, some of the materials from the we passages already seem doubtful. But I would rather go the distance and devise the test anyway than sit back and say there is no way we can know.

Unless there are some new tests that can compensate for complete absence of primary evidence and absence of controls on the secondary evidence, then we can only ask the questions that the evidence will allow us to answer. Rules of historical enquiry can't be changed for the sake of finding "at least some answer" to a question we want to ask.

We are certainly bound by the (nature of the) extant evidence to a great degree; nevertheless, it is precisely the development of new hypotheses, almost as if they were new tests or methods, that I was referring to.

Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources*, page 77:

Although it is a simple process to think up

hypotheses, it is no simple task to formulate hypotheses that actually link the observed pieces of evidence—that can explain the facts available, not those that the scholar might wish to have. Often, it takes many tries before the scholar can formulate a hypothesis that really works—one that satisfactorily accounts for the known evidence. There is no formula for success in this difficult venture.

Ibidem, page 78:

The difficulties of applying the so-called scientific method to historical research means that historians must often satisfy themselves with rules of logic that appear less watertight, making statements that seem probable, not "proved" in any "scientific" sense.

Ben.



07-21-2008, 07:29 AM

#140

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

Unless there are some new tests that can compensate for complete absence of primary evidence and absence of controls on the secondary evidence, then we can only ask the questions that the evidence will allow us to answer. Rules of historical enquiry can't be changed for the sake of finding "at least some answer" to a question we want to ask.

We are certainly bound by the (nature of the) extant evidence to a great degree; nevertheless, it is precisely the development of new hypotheses, almost as if they were new tests or methods, that I was referring to.

Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, From Reliable Sources, page 77:

Although it is a simple process to think up hypotheses, it is no simple task to formulate hypotheses that actually link the observed pieces of evidence—that can explain the facts available, not those that the scholar might wish to have. Often, it takes many tries before the scholar can formulate a hypothesis that really works—one that

satisfactorily accounts for the known evidence. There is no formula for success in this difficult venture.

Ibidem, page 78:

The difficulties of applying the so-called scientific method to historical research means that historians must often satisfy themselves with rules of logic that appear less watertight, making statements that seem probable, not "proved" in any "scientific" sense.

Ben.

Fully agreed. I might be missing something in your argument, however, because the conclusion I draw from Howell and Prevenier is that the sorts of questions we can ask are limited by "facts available", "the known evidence".

I'm not looking so much at new hypotheses as at what probabilities the nature of primary and secondary evidence respectively can tell us, and upon which hypotheses can then be built.

Neil



Page 14 of 16 << [First](#) < [4](#) [12](#) [13](#) **14** [15](#) [16](#) >

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



All times are GMT +11. The time now is [09:10 AM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 15 of 16 [« First](#) [<](#) [5](#) [13](#) [14](#) **15** [16](#) [>](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-21-2008, 04:04 PM

#141

Casper

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2004
Location: Texas
Posts: 430



Quote:

Originally Posted by [neilgodfrey](#)

If it were really a debate about which teachings were supported by original established texts then I would have expected there would be others in addition to Marcion who would have created issues. Irenaeus's claim seems to point to Marcion really having edited some form of a gospel like Luke's. Yes? No?

I'm not aware of any others, but I guess I am guilty of simply assuming there were. That is a good point Neil.

07-22-2008, 12:51 AM

#142

Solo

Veteran Member

Join Date: Oct 2004
Location: Ottawa, Canada
Posts: 2,579



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Casper**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**
If it were really a debate about which teachings were supported by original established texts then I would have expected there would be others in addition to Marcion who would have created issues. Irenaeus's claim seems to point to Marcion really having edited some form of a gospel like Luke's. Yes? No?

I'm not aware of any others, but I guess I am guilty of simply assuming there were. That is a good point Neil.

I, on the other hand, don't see this mental operation establishes or "argues for" anything except a belief of the bishop that Marcion edited a gospel which, he Irenaeus, knew in a form he considered authoritative. IOW, Irenaeus could have very well compared Marcion's text to that of the later, "expanded", Luke and on finding differences, decided they were due to Marcion's deliberately "mutilating" a text, which in fact used him as a principal source.

Please, assure yourself also, that if Marcion really was the author, or major editor, of a proto-Lukan gospel, from which the orthodox version was compiled, then indeed he could have been **the only one** who appeared to Irenaeus to have altered the text which was copied in the orthodox church.

Jiri



07-22-2008, 01:39 AM

#143

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**
We are certainly bound by the (nature of the) extant evidence to a great degree; nevertheless, it is precisely the development of new hypotheses, almost as if they were new tests or methods, that I was referring to.

Martha Howell and Walter Prevenier, From Reliable Sources, page 77:

Although it is a simple process to think up hypotheses, it is no simple task to formulate hypotheses that actually link the observed pieces of evidence—that can explain the facts available, not those that the scholar might wish to have. Often, it takes many tries before the scholar can formulate a hypothesis that really works—one that satisfactorily accounts for the known evidence. There is no formula for success in this difficult venture.

Ibidem, page 78:

The difficulties of applying the so-called scientific method to historical research means that historians must often satisfy themselves with rules of logic that appear less watertight, making statements that seem probable, not "proved" in any "scientific" sense.

Ben.

Fully agreed. I might be missing something in your argument, however, because the conclusion I draw from Howell and Prevenier is that the sorts of questions we can ask are limited by "facts available", "the known evidence".

I wrote before:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben**
We are certainly bound by the (nature of the) extant evidence to a great degree....

Perhaps you could give an example of the sort of question we cannot ask; in my view, we can ask virtually any question, but the answer to many of them may not be forthcoming, and we have to formulate other questions whose answers are more forthcoming. IOW, just because questions 1-99 yielded no significant results does not mean that question 100, or 1000, or 10000, will yield no results.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**
I'm not looking so much at new hypotheses as at what probabilities the nature of primary and secondary evidence respectively can tell us, and upon which hypotheses can then be built.

I, OTOH, am looking precisely at the formulation of new hypotheses that cover the extant evidence better than the old hypotheses. *Often, it takes many tries before the scholar can formulate a hypothesis that really works* (Howell and Prevenier).

Ben.

07-22-2008, 11:34 AM

#144

Petergdi

Regular Member

Join Date: Apr 2008
Location: Toronto, Canada
Posts: 354



Hi Ben,

One piece of data that seems important to me is that bishops and elders are synonyms in Acts 20. The people who are introduced as elders in verse 17 are called bishops by Paul in verse 28. This suggests that the presbyter / episkopos distinction did not yet exist when Acts was written. The proto-orthodox appear to have had a clear distinction between bishops and elders by the time they reacted against Marcion.

Peter.

07-22-2008, 11:38 AM

#145

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Petergdi** >

Hi Ben,

One piece of data that seems important to me is that bishops and elders are synonyms in Acts 20. The people who are introduced as elders in verse 17 are called bishops by Paul in verse 28. This suggests that the presbyter / episkopos distinction did not yet exist when Acts was written. The proto-orthodox appear to have had a clear distinction between bishops and elders by the time they reacted against Marcion.

Peter.

Good point. In fact, the entire NT seems to equate bishops with elders wherever the point comes up, as do several of the apostolic fathers.

Ben.

07-22-2008, 02:36 PM

#146

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
 Location: the fringe of the
 caribbean
 Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Petergdi**

Hi Ben,

One piece of data that seems important to me is that bishops and elders are synonyms in Acts 20. The people who are introduced as elders in verse 17 are called bishops by Paul in verse 28. This suggests that the presbyter / episkopos distinction did not yet exist when Acts was written. The proto-orthodox appear to have had a clear distinction between bishops and elders by the time they reacted against Marcion.

Peter.

But, didn't the author of Acts want the readers to think that Acts was written in the 1st century before the death of Paul and Peter as stated in Church History by Eusebius?

It would seem that the author of gLuke used material from gMark written at about or beyond 70CE. GLuke was written sometime after gMark, and Acts was written sometime after gLuke.

And, it cannot be determined with any degree of certainty that any event with respect to the disciples and Paul actually occurred as stated in Acts.



07-22-2008, 04:34 PM

#147

Petergdi

Regular Member

Join Date: Apr 2008
 Location: Toronto, Canada
 Posts: 354



Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Petergdi**

Hi Ben,

One piece of data that seems important to me is that bishops and elders are synonyms in Acts 20. The people who are introduced as elders in verse 17 are called bishops by Paul in verse 28. This suggests that the presbyter / episkopos distinction did not yet exist when Acts was written. The proto-orthodox appear to have had a clear distinction between bishops and elders by the time they reacted against Marcion.

Peter.

But, didn't the author of Acts want the readers to think that Acts was written in the 1st century before the death of Paul and Peter as stated in Church History by Eusebius?.

It isn't at all clear that the author of Acts was interested in providing cues, true or false, about when the book was written. The common surmise that it was written before the death of Paul is based on the fact that the history ends abruptly with Paul in prison. There are other plausible reasons for the book to end where it does.

It is very unlikely for the use of bishop and elder as synonyms to be a crafty misdirection.

For one thing, it appears to have quite quickly become a little known fact after the establishment of the episcopacy as a separate office. Irenaeus thought that the separate office dated from apostolic times and thus misread this portion of Acts.

For another, it doesn't look like a planted piece of historical realism. If it were a misdirection, the writer would draw attention to it, so that it would be hard for a reader to miss what the writer was doing. Many commentators did miss it.

Also, if the purpose of Acts were to make the mid-2nd century proto-orthodoxy look apostolic, then something that shows that the church in apostolic times was organised differently would work against the supposed intentions of the writer.

Peter.



07-23-2008, 02:06 AM

#148

aa5874

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Petergdi**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **aa5874**

But, didn't the author of Acts want the readers to think that Acts was written in the 1st century before the death of Paul and Peter as stated in Church History by Eusebius?.

It isn't at all clear that the author of Acts was interested in providing cues, true or false, about when the book was written. The common surmise that it was written before the death of Paul is based on the fact that the history ends abruptly with Paul in prison. There are other plausible reasons for the book to end where it does.

It is very unlikely for the use of bishop and elder as synonyms to be a crafty misdirection.

For one thing, it appears to have quite quickly become a little known fact after the establishment of the episcopacy as a separate office. Irenaeus thought that the separate office dated from apostolic times and thus misread this portion of Acts.

For another, it doesn't look like a planted piece of historical realism. If it were a misdirection, the writer would draw attention to it, so that it would be hard for a reader to miss what the writer was doing. Many commentators did miss it.

Also, if the purpose of Acts were to make the mid-2nd century proto-orthodoxy look apostolic, then something that shows that the church in apostolic times was organised differently would work against the supposed intentions of the writer.

Peter.

Eusebius in Church History claimed that it was probable that someone named Luke wrote Acts of the Apostles while "Paul" was in prison.

And, if Luke was a companion of Paul and also knew Peter, it would be extremely unusual for the author of Acts not to include their **martyrdom** if Acts of the Apostles was written after their deaths as MARTYRS.

The exclusion of Peter's and Paul's death from Acts of the Apostles is a CLEAR indication that the author wanted the readers to think that he/she wrote before they died, that is, before 68 CE.

And further John Chrysostom made a **startling** statement in his "Homilies on Acts of the Apostles", **late in the 4th century**

Homilies on Acts of the Apostles 1

Quote:

To many persons this book is little known,

both it and its author, that they are NOT EVEN aware that such a book is in EXISTENCE.

How is it that many persons did not know even know that Acts of the Apotles was even written or heard about an author called Luke?

Perhaps this is an indication that either it was written very late, or not circulated when it was written, Luke was not known to be a writer, or no such person actually existed.



07-26-2008, 04:38 PM

#149

neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**
I'm not looking so much at new hypotheses as at what probabilities the nature of primary and secondary evidence respectively can tell us, and upon which hypotheses can then be built.

I, OTOH, am looking precisely at the formulation of new hypotheses that cover the extant evidence better than the old hypotheses. Often, it takes many tries before the scholar can formulate a hypothesis that really works (Howell and Prevenier).

I think we are going around in circles now. Where we differ appears to be over the exact nature of that extant evidence. I have discussed what, say, a book like Acts is (and the same applies to the gospels) as "evidence" in posts #50, #109 and #112. And I've discussed evidence from another perspective [in another thread](#), where I included the following significant 1904 quote from E. Schwartz. It is in direct relation to the evidence of Papias, but the point applies to all ancient documents for which we have nothing but their own "self-attestation".

We have primary and secondary evidence interlocking in ways that enable us to "do history" with Julius Caesar. We have no comparable evidence at all about Jesus.

The texts we have that talk about Jesus are evidence of the authors and social and intellectual matrices of whoever produced them. They are not evidence of the historicity of the narratives within them.

Is there any other area in (nonbiblical) historical studies where historians rely on the narratives within documents whose provenance is unknown and that lack any external

controls? As far as I am aware, studies in biblical history is the only field where this is acceptable. If I am misinformed then I'd welcome being more fully informed.

The sorts of hypotheses we can frame, then, will largely be about the provenances of our texts. That means examining them for clues about their authorship, agendas, relations with other texts, etc. Through that sort of work we can see what evidence we have for Christian origins and where it points for further exploration.

I know of know historical methodological grounds for assuming historicity within the narratives in texts that are themselves without external controls or known provenance.

Neil



07-27-2008, 08:20 AM

#150

Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005
Location: Midwest
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**

I think we are going around in circles now. Where we differ appears to be over the exact nature of that extant evidence. I have discussed what, say, a book like Acts is (and the same applies to the gospels) as "evidence" in posts #50, #109 and #112. And I've discussed evidence from another perspective [in another thread](#), where I included the following significant 1904 quote from E. Schwartz. It is in direct relation to the evidence of Papias, but the point applies to all ancient documents for which we have nothing but their own "self-attestation".

We have primary and secondary evidence interlocking in ways that enable us to "do history" with Julius Caesar. We have no comparable evidence at all about Jesus.

Yes, we *must* be going in circles. I thought we were talking about Acts, and here suddenly we are talking about Jesus. 😊

Quote:

Is there any other area in (nonbiblical) historical studies where historians rely on the narratives within documents whose provenance is unknown and that lack any external controls?

Relying on narratives within documents whose provenance is unknown? Yes, of course historians often have to do that.

Going without external controls? I hope not.

Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History*, page 144, on the process of determining the credibility of the *particulars* of a document:

The historian, however, is frequently obliged to use documents written by persons about whom nothing or relatively little is known. Even the hundreds of biographical dictionaries and encyclopedias already in existence may be of no help because the author's name is unknown or, if known, not to be found in the reference works. The historian must therefore depend upon the document itself to teach him what it can about the author. A single brief document may teach him much if he asks the right questions.

Ben.



Page 15 of 16 << [First](#) < [5](#) [13](#) [14](#) **[15](#)** [16](#) >

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is [09:11 AM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

Which came first, the gospel of Luke or that of Marcion?

Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).

You last visited: Yesterday at 12:14 PM

Search

Notices

FRDB is Closed

FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.

The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 16 of 16 [« First](#) [≤ 6](#) [14](#) [15](#) **16**

Thread Tools Search this Thread

07-27-2008, 09:14 AM

#151

[aa5874](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: the fringe of the caribbean
Posts: 18,988



Quote:

Originally Posted by [Ben C Smith](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by [neilgodfrey](#)
I think we are going around in circles now. Where we differ appears to be over the exact nature of that extant evidence. I have discussed what, say, a book like Acts is (and the same applies to the gospels) as "evidence" in posts #50, #109 and #112. And I've discussed evidence from another perspective in another thread, where I included the following significant 1904 quote from E. Schwartz. It is in direct relation to the evidence of Papias, but the point applies to all ancient documents for

which we have nothing but their own "self-attestation".

We have primary and secondary evidence interlocking in ways that enable us to "do history" with Julius Caesar. We have no comparable evidence at all about Jesus.

Yes, we must be going in circles. I thought we were talking about Acts, and here suddenly we are talking about Jesus. 😊

Quote:

Is there any other area in (nonbiblical) historical studies where historians rely on the narratives within documents whose provenance is unknown and that lack any external controls?

Relying on narratives within documents whose provenance is unknown? Yes, of course historians often have to do that.

Going without external controls? I hope not.

Louis Gottschalk, Understanding History, page 144, on the process of determining the credibility of the particulars of a document:

The historian, however, is frequently obliged to use documents written by persons about whom nothing or relatively little is known. Even the hundreds of biographical dictionaries and encyclopedias already in existence may be of no help because the author's name is unknown or, if known, not to be found in the reference works. The historian must therefore depend upon the document itself to teach him what it can about the author. A single brief document may teach him much if he asks the right questions.

Ben.

But, without oral tradition, physical evidence or other credible written information to support the anonymous writing then its credibility would be near zero.

A single brief anonymous document must be found to be credible by some means before it can be accepted to be of historical value.

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is [09:11 AM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.