

IS MARCION'S GOSPEL ONE OF THE SYNOPTICS? ¹

PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD.

I.

It is well known that Marcion's gospel was used up to the fifth century, in Marcionite churches which had seceded from the Mother Church during the second century. It was not called "the Gospel according to Marcion," but quite simply "the Gospel," and was the only gospel accepted by the Marcionites. It was attributed, not to Marcion, but to Jesus himself, or to Paul, of whom Marcion professed himself the disciple and successor.

This gospel is now lost. But during five centuries it was frequently, largely and scrupulously quoted by orthodox writers, particularly by Tertullian, who follows it, verse by verse, in order to refute its author in the *Adversus Marcionem* (iv.); by Adamantios, who in his anti-Marcionite *Dialogues* introduces two Marcionites, each of whom advocates his own gospel, and thirdly, by Epiphanius, who once possessed a copy of this heretical gospel, and quoted the passages where it differed from that of Luke. By collecting these quotations and allusions, it is possible to reconstruct Marcion's gospel in its entirety, sometimes textually, sometimes only approximately, but with a fair degree of accuracy.

The latest reconstruction is that of Harnack,² but in spite of its great merit it is not perfect. The impartiality of the editor has been influenced by the convictions of the author. Harnack, in opposition to Zahn, wanted to prove that Marcion's gospel had been derived solely from that of Luke

¹ Thesis delivered before the Sixth International Congress on the History of Religions, at Brussels, September, 1935. Translated for the HIBBERT JOURNAL by Joan Ferro.

² Marcion : *Beilage IV.*, 2nd edition. Leipzig, 1924.

with no borrowing from any of the other three orthodox evangelists, Matthew, Mark or John. He was thus compelled to omit certain passages which tended to disprove his theory. Here are three examples :—

(1) Two quotations, independent of each other, from Adamantios (*Dial.*, II., 15) and Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.*, 1, 371), and also allusions from Irenæus (*Hær.*, I., 27, 2), and Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.*, 14, 4), show us that Marcion's gospel recorded one of Jesus' sayings in these words : "Think you I am come to fulfil the Law of the Prophets ? I am come not to fulfil but to destroy." Now there is nothing analogous to this in Luke's gospel, but in that of Matthew (v. 17) we find the exact reverse : "Think not I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I am come not to destroy, but to fulfil." Harnack does not pay due attention to this authenticated fragment of Marcion's gospel.

(2) According to Chrysostom (*in Phil.* vii., cf. ii. 6–8) the followers of Marcion maintained that "Jesus took the likeness of a slave (as Paul said in Philippians ii. 7) when *girt with a linen cloth he washed the feet of his disciples.*" Now the account of the Washing of Feet is only found in John, not in Luke. Harnack, in spite of Chrysostom's testimony, leaves it out of Marcion's gospel.

(3) A text of Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* XXV.) leads us to infer that Marcion's gospel contained the story of the two sons of Zebedee asking Jesus to let them sit one on his right hand and the other on his left in his glory. This incident is not recorded by Luke, only by Mark and Matthew. Harnack does not include it in his reconstruction of Marcion's gospel.

Certain it is that Marcion's gospel consistently corresponds to that of Luke, and only very inconsistently with those of the other three evangelists, in those cases where each gives an individual account. Marcion and Luke are closely connected ; Marcion makes contact with the others only in rare cases. Nevertheless, Zahn was right in refusing to dismiss these latter instances, however exceptional they might be. From them he drew the conclusion that Marcion had employed all four canonical gospels. Harnack showed that it is difficult to accept this conclusion, because if Marcion had in truth employed the Four Gospels that we now possess his work would have a far closer resemblance to a compilation from several gospels—a diatessaron. Harnack endeavoured to simplify the whole question by reconstructing Marcion from Luke alone, a theory which, though very alluring at first sight, comes into conflict with such

facts as those just quoted. The problem must be reconsidered from the beginning.

II.

The chief problem raised by Marcion's gospel is not that of its reconstruction but that of determining the significance of its close affinity with Luke's. Which served as a basis for the other?

Is Marcion's gospel (as Tertullian in the third, and Epiphanius in the fifth century both affirm), drawn from that of Luke, with certain omissions and variations due to Marcion's heretical beliefs? Alternatively, is Luke's merely an edition of Marcion's corrected and amplified in accordance with the orthodoxy of the Roman Church, as Christian Baur¹ thought in 1847?

It was not possible to give a positive answer to this question when it was broached in the middle of the nineteenth century, owing to the scant progress made in solving the problem of the synoptics. The arbitrary conclusions reached by Hilgenfeld and Volkmar² led Baur to revise his opinions. An early essay of W. Sanday³ added nothing conclusive to the discussion, because he treated the subject too broadly.

In order to reach an incontrovertible conclusion, one must obviously begin by comparing those parts of the gospel common to both Luke and Marcion with the sections peculiar to each. It is almost invariably the sections peculiar to Luke which come under discussion, as those peculiar to Marcion consist solely (with the exception of the two incidents already quoted) of occasional isolated words.

This has in itself a certain striking significance. When an author wishes to re-model a text so as to conform to a given doctrine it is not often that he can accomplish his task with nothing but a pair of scissors to help him. It is much easier for him to use the glue-pot and stick additions into the text which he is at perfect liberty to compose for his own purpose. But this is a mere assumption.

Let us begin with the two incidents peculiar to Marcion, that is, those which are not found in Luke. Are they consistent with the main part of the gospel?

The arrogant and much-resented request of the sons of Zebedee (the account of which shows these two apostles in a

¹ *Kritische Untersuchungen*, pp. 305, 424.

² *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 1850.

³ *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876, pp. 222-230.

somewhat unfavourable light), has an exact parallel in an incident common to both Luke (ix. 52–55) and Marcion, where Zebedee's sons ask Jesus for permission to bring down fire from Heaven on the inhospitable Samaritan village, and receive from Jesus a severe rebuke. These two rebukes to James and John are both written in the same style and spirit. It is, therefore, very unlikely that Marcion made an addition.

The washing of feet is not found in Luke, but, curiously enough, the text common to Marcion and Luke contains an allusion to it. Actually, Jesus says (Luke xxii. 26–27 D.): “He that is chief let him be as he that doth serve, for whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth? . . . But I am amongst you *as he that serveth*.” From this it would appear that Luke has omitted the episode but retained the moral. There is, therefore, no evidence even here of any addition by Marcion.

Let us now consider some of the sections peculiar to Luke. Let us see if they are equally consistent with the main part of the gospel.

By far the largest, and the one which best lends itself to examination, is the whole romantic and delightful beginning of Luke's gospel.

Marcion begins with these impressive words:—

“In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, during the government of Pontius Pilate, Jesus Christ, Son of God, descended from Heaven, and appeared at Capernaum, a town of Galilee.”

In Luke the names Tiberius and Pilate are followed by those of the three tetrarchs, Herod, Philip, and Lysanias, and the high priest Annas (iii. 1) while the fifteenth year of Tiberius' reign marks the beginning not of Jesus' ministry, but of John the Baptist's. Above all, the first appearance of Jesus in public, which took place at Nazareth, not at Capernaum, is preceded by a long, elaborate history of the miraculous births of both John and Jesus, and Jesus' boyhood, baptism, and temptations (i–iv. 15).

This fine narrative, the painters' paradise, is in a distinctive style, pseudo-Biblical, brim-full of allusions and quotations from the Scriptures, interspersed with verses from the Psalms, which are themselves treasures of Biblical poetry. This style, with its somewhat artificial charm, is not found again in the main part of the gospel, save in a few short isolated passages which are precisely those also absent

from Marcion's rendering. Moreover, the characters are not shown in the same light here as in the other part of the gospel. John the Baptist is treated almost as Jesus' equal—as a great prophet, sent from God, filled with the Holy Ghost, the mediator of salvation; his halo almost merges with that of Jesus, whereas in the main part of the gospel, Jesus himself praises John, only to add that "he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he" (vii. 28)—a very different attitude. Mary is honoured as the Virgin who conceived by an act of God, and as the Mother who kept in her heart the secret of the birth and boyhood of Jesus, whereas elsewhere in the gospel, Jesus himself says that his mother and brethren are all those who hear the Word of God (vii. 21)—there, again, the attitude is entirely different. Jesus himself is represented as the national Messiah of the Jews who "shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever (i. 33), whereas in the main part of the gospel, he is the Christ of Paul's teaching, who suffers and dies in order to save mankind—a further difference in the representation.

It is hard indeed not to feel the contrast between the first chapter of Luke and the rest of the gospel. It is, therefore, more likely that this lengthy narrative peculiar to Luke has not been omitted by Marcion, but is an addition made by Luke himself.

According to Marcion, Jesus began his ministry at Capernaum; according to Luke, at Nazareth; but, by a curious oversight, Luke, who had thitherto made no mention of Capernaum, describes how Jesus imagines the men of Nazareth saying to Him "Whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country" (iv. 23). Now, up till then, nothing had happened in Capernaum. This negligence on the part of Luke clearly indicates that the order, Capernaum before Nazareth, as found in Marcion, is the original one.

Let us turn to other examples:—

Marcion records two incidents which, appearing at first sight to be analogous, are, in reality, fundamentally different. In the first a lawyer asks Jesus what must be done to obtain life, and Jesus tells him to obey the Law. By "life" however, is meant "life on earth," longevity, which is promised by Jewish law, and the Law does not lie. In the second, a man asks what must he do to obtain *eternal life*. He says he has kept all the commandments of the Law. This time it is not terrestrial, but celestial life which is meant. The young man must do more, he must give up his riches, a much

harder thing to do. In Luke both questions refer to *eternal life* (x. 25 ; xviii. 18), and the two replies of Jesus, one about the Law, and the other about the riches, cannot be reconciled. In my opinion, it is more probable that Marcion's version is the original.

Here is yet another divergence. Marcion records Jesus as saying : " It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of *my words* to fail," while Luke gives " . . . than one tittle of *the Law* to fail " (xvi. 17). Marcion's version is supported by a common passage : " Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away " (xxi. 33). The first quotation from Luke would appear to be a hasty correction, introducing the Law quite irrelevantly.

The same criticism must be made of the following variation. Marcion gives " Who is my mother, who are my brethren, if not those who hear *my words* and do them ? " Luke has " . . . who hear the Word of God and do it " (viii. 21). There again, the phrase " my words " fits better into the context, and is more probably the original text, whereas the phrase " the Word of God " seems to be a correction made like the other, through the influence of the Old Testament.

One finds in Marcion : " Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall I confess *before God* ; but he that denieth me before men shall be denied *before God*," whereas in Luke " . . . him shall the *Son of Man* confess before the *angels of God* . . . shall be denied before the *angels of God* " (xii. 8). In Marcion, " there is joy in the *presence of God* over one sinner who repenteth," and in Luke : " There is joy in the *presence of the angels of God* . . . " (xv. 10). One cannot but feel that Luke's rendering is a correction due to a theological scruple.

In a passage on Martyrdom, Marcion writes : " Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake, but in your patience possess ye your souls," but Luke gives : " . . . for my name's sake, but there shall not be an hair of your head perish. In your patience, etc. . . . " (xxi. 17).

The sentence about the hair must surely have been an addition, introduced in the nature of a promise to reassure faint-hearted martyrs ; more especially since a similar allusion to hair is made again, in order to mitigate another fear-inspiring text. Marcion has the rendering " Fear him which, after he hath killed you, hath power to cast into hell ; yea, I say unto you, fear him," while Luke adds a sentence peculiar to his gospel, " . . . even the very hairs of your

head are all numbered ; fear not, therefore . . . ” (xii. 67). In both cases, the words peculiar to Luke are really inconsistent with the context.

Marcion also writes : “ This generation (or, this people) is evil ; they seek a sign, but there shall no sign be given it.” Luke has : “. . . but there shall no sign be given, but the sign of Jonas the prophet ” (xi. 29). And he infers in two verses peculiar to his gospel, that the sign of Jonas is that of the general resurrection. Here indeed are clear indications of the original text being revised.

I could give other instances but they would take too long to enumerate. I have reached the conclusion that a methodical and thorough comparison of the gospels of Marcion and Luke would show that the former is the original, and the latter a corrected and considerably amplified version of the former.

This conclusion does not in any way contradict the latest researches on Luke's gospel. Streeter¹ and later Taylor² both conclude solely from their study of canonical texts and with no thought at all of Marcion, that behind Luke's Gospel there must have been some source other than Mark, and one more comprehensive than the source usually known as “ Q.” They call it “ Proto-Luke.” In their opinion Luke drew from both Proto-Luke and Mark. Those passages taken directly from Mark are clearly secondary, as though they had been fitted into the main story. On the other hand, those which come from Proto-Luke seem to have furnished the original design.

I am not trying to prove that Marcion's gospel agrees in every respect with the reconstruction of Proto-Luke that Streeter and Taylor have attempted to make. But it is noteworthy that many of the passages in Luke which they consider to be second-hand, that is, taken direct, and often word by word from Mark, are precisely those omitted from Marcion for no reason, doctrinal or otherwise, that can be discovered. For instance, take the account of the Purification of the Temple as recorded by Luke. According to Taylor (p. 95), this account is only a servile abstract of Mark's (out of twenty-five words, twenty-two of Luke's occur in Mark). Epiphanius (42 sc. 53) rightly commented on the absence of this particular passage from Marcion's gospel. Luke would therefore appear to have amplified Marcion by inserting this passage from Mark.

¹ *The Four Gospels*, 1924 ; Chapter VIII.

² *Behind the Third Gospel*, 1926.

The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen is treated in the same way. This parable is peculiar to Mark, who makes of it a vehicle to express his own particular belief in Jesus as the well-beloved Son, Heir of God his Father, probably as an answer to a parable of Hermas.¹ It has leapt straight from the pages of Mark into those of Luke, but does not appear in Marcion's, although it is in accordance with Paul's teaching, and Marcion would have had more reason to include it in his gospel than to leave it out.

The priority of Marcion to Luke does not therefore disturb the exegesis. Whenever the Oxford commentators say "St Luke had Proto-Luke for his principal, and St Mark for his supplementary source," the reply is simply this: "As his principal source St Luke used Marcion's gospel, and St Mark's as his supplementary one." In other words, an authenticated text is substituted for a hypothetical one. I do not say that this can be done without a considerable readjustment, but at least the framework, so laboriously built up, retains its usefulness.

It is hardly surprising that an orthodox evangelist should have undertaken the task of re-editing, correcting and completing Marcion's gospel. The anonymous author of the Gospel which we call Luke's, alludes to his predecessors, who were fairly numerous (*πολλοί*) and he sets himself the task of determining how much can be safely believed (*τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*). Marcion's gospel was not attributed to Marcion, its origins are veiled in mystery. It comprised a restrained, majestic account of sublime, truly divine utterances. Why should it have been lost? The essential was first to delete every saying which could provide a weapon for heterodox writers, second, to imbue it with a wholesome religious atmosphere, and third, to supplement it with whatever was required by sound religious principles, as well as with the best passages from the other gospels. The skill of this author lies in the subtle way in which he blends two different doctrines into one whole, and at the same time impresses his own personality even on passages copied almost verbatim.

Luke's gospel should be considered as the Catholic edition of Marcion's. I have endeavoured to show elsewhere² that a Catholic edition of Paul's Epistles has been substituted in like manner for the Marcionite version, and that the Acts of the Apostles may possibly be the Catholic version of a

¹ See the HIBBERT JOURNAL: *Quels livres Marc a-t-il lus?* April, 1932.

² *Premiers écrits du Christianisme*. Paris: Rieder, 1930.

book, the *Acts of the Apostle* (Paul) originating from, or inspired by, some text of Marcion. By an act of high religious policy, the Roman Church succeeded in assuring the future of Christianity by setting aside every indication of the uncompromising author Marcion, and by retaining, in annexing it for her own use, that author's New Testament.

III.

To make a comparison of Marcion's gospel with that of Matthew, Mark, and John would require a lengthy statement, which I cannot undertake here. I shall only try to show how, by including Marcion's among the gospels known as the Synoptics, the need for the evangelical source which has been postulated by all critics in the last half century, under the letter "Q," is thus abolished.

This letter stands, as is well known, for the evangelical writing common both to Matthew and Luke, but which is not found in Mark. It has been presumed that it derived from a book now lost a collection of "Logia" which must have been the source used by Luke and Matthew to supplement Mark. But with regard to the precise nature of this book, whether Matthew or Luke kept the more closely to it, and whether Mark himself knew and used it, on these questions critics have not been able to agree.

As soon as one takes Marcion's gospel into proper consideration, one realises that the book of "Logia" is a figment of the imagination, which never really existed. Its contents must instead be attributed partly to Marcion and partly to Matthew. The passages common to Matthew and Luke are not homogeneous; they are divided into two groups, each with widely divergent philological characteristics.

The first group, containing the majority of passages, comprises texts, which, in Matthew as in Luke, are derived from Marcion's gospel, Luke, as was his wont, transcribing them almost word for word, making only a few small alterations on points of doctrine. Matthew, in the literal sense of the word, rethought them from the Jewish standpoint, giving them the wording of Hebrew poetry. These passages, therefore, have two characteristics: (1) They occur in Marcion's gospels; and (2) they are handed down to us in two versions clearly differing from each other.

The second group comprises those passages not found in Marcion. Of these Matthew is the chief author. He composed them with great care, making them scan, and, without

forcing, giving them that Hebraic symmetry so dear to him. Luke borrowed them from him, and, as usual, transcribed them almost literally. They have, therefore, these characteristics: (1) They are not found in Marcion; (2) they possess a very marked Hebraic turn of expression; and (3) they have come down to us in two versions so similar that they appear to be but one.

For brevity's sake, I will only quote two examples from each group.

For the first, the choice is so large as to be embarrassing. If one glances down the two columns in which Harnack reconstructed "Q," one following Luke and the other Matthew, one finds that in the majority of instances, the text, whilst substantially the same, introduces constant and unmistakable variations in the editing.

Let us take, almost at random, one sentence in the Parable of the Talents. Luke gives the following:—

ἐφοβούμην γὰρ σε ὅτι ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς εἶ
αἶρεις ἃ οὐκ ἔθηκας
καὶ θερίζεις ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρας

(xix. 21).

We know from Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.*, iv. 37) that Marcion's gospel gave the same rendering (" . . . *Austerum, tollentem quod non posuerit, et metentem quod non severit*"). Here is Matthew's version:—

ἔγνων σε ὅτι σκληρὸς εἶ ἄνθρωπος
θερίζων ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρας
καὶ συγάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόπισας

(xxv. 24).

The uncommon and picturesque *αὐστηρός*, "acid" or "harsh," is replaced by the more ordinary term *σκληρός* hard. And the proverbial expression, already used by Solon¹: "*thou takest up that thou layedst not down*" is replaced by the Hebraic "*gathering where thou hast not strawed*," which is a mere redundancy of "*reaping where thou hast not sown*." Compared with the Greek as given by Luke, which is that of Marcion, Matthew's version is unquestionably derivative.

Another instance occurs in the indictment of the Pharisees. Luke gives:—

τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτερίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε
τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας

(xi. 39).

¹ *Diogenes Laertes X.*, 29.

This is also Marcion's version as recorded by Tertullian (iv. 27) (*exteriora calicis lavatis, interiora autem vestra non emundastis*). Matthew gives :—

καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος,
ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας

(xxiii. 25).

By placing this verb in the plural (*γέμουσιν*) it is the cup and platter, and not the heart, which are full of extortion and excess, wording obviously more forced. The original is Luke's and Marcion's.

There are many instances of well-authenticated texts in Marcion, in the rendering of which Luke and Matthew differ notably, and in these cases Matthew's version is clearly dependent.

Here, on the other hand, are two examples of the second group.

From Matthew, let us take this couplet of an unmistakably Jewish lyricism :—

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets,
And stonest them which are sent unto thee,
How often would I have gathered thy children together,
Even as a hen gathereth her chickens, under her wings,
And you would not !

Behold, your house is left unto you desolate,
For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth,
Till you shall say :
Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

(xxiii. 37-39).

We know from Epiphanius that this passage does not occur in Marcion. There is here a sequence of fifty-six Greek words, which are transcribed by Luke (xiii. 34-35) in exactly the same order, but with these alterations :—

A present-infinitive replaced by an aorist infinitive ; two little words omitted, one added. These are the kinds of variations shown by two manuscripts of the same author, the slight changes which are inevitable in every traditional text recorded by hand, since absolutely literal versions have only come into being since the invention of printing. We are therefore dealing with the same text, re-transcribed. Moreover, it is possible to see that in this case it is Luke who is derivative, for in Matthew this passage fits well into its context, whereas it is but clumsily introduced in Luke's version.

AWAY

Again, let us consider two verses from Matthew, written in fine Hebraic style :—

The men of Nineve shall rise in judgment with this generation
And shall condemn it :
Because they repented at the teaching of Jonas ;
And, behold, a greater than Jonas is here.

The Queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this
generation.

And shall condemn it
For she came from the uttermost parts of the earth
To hear the wisdom of Solomon
And, behold, a greater than Solomon is here.

(xii. 41-43.)

Epiphanius (42 sc. 25) tells us that this passage did not occur in Marcion. It is, however, found in Luke (xi. 31-32) with the two strophes in reverse order. If we bear in mind that the passage which in Luke (xi. 24-26) immediately *precedes* this one, is the one which in Matthew follows immediately *after* it, and which at the same time is not found in Marcion at all, we have here one hundred and thirteen Greek words reproduced verbatim. Here again, the context proves that Matthew's version is the original and Luke's transcribed from it.

In Matthew (iii. 7-10) (" O generation of vipers . . . ") we find a sequence of sixty-three Greek words, and in xi. 21-23 (. . . . " Woe unto thee Chorazin . . . ") one of forty nine, both of which are most faithfully reproduced in Luke. Moreover, neither of these passages occurs in Marcion, and there are clear indications that both originated in Matthew.

In conclusion, I would say that it is impossible to find in the source " Q " that homogeneity which would justify a belief in its existence, and that the originality to which it lays claim ought to be divided in unequal proportions between Marcion and Matthew.

The problem of the Synoptics will not be resolved as long as only three gospels are numbered among the Synoptics, Mark, Matthew and Luke. There must be four: Mark, Matthew, Luke and Marcion.

As a result, the date of the composition of the Synoptic Gospels must be placed roughly between A.D. 135 and 145. Marcion went to Rome in A.D. 138, but probably his gospel preceded him there.¹ He died in A.D. 144, as Barnikol²

¹ Jerome tells us (Epis. 133, 4) that Marcion had sent one of the women of his church to Rome before him.

² E. Barnikol: *Die Entstehung der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit. Marcions*, Kiel, 1933.

proved in opposition to Harnack's theory. It is easier to understand the last of the Synoptic Gospels, Luke's, being written after Marcion's death, than during his lifetime, that is, about 145.

The date A.D. 135 to 145 agrees better with two indications drawn from the Gospels themselves : (1) The literal fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy : ("*The abomination of desolation (i.e. a heathen altar) standing in the Holy Place*") to which both Mark (xiii. 14) and Matthew (xxiv. 15) allude, only occurred (after Antiochus Epiphanius' times) during the reign of Hadrian in 135 A.D., when the altar and statue of Jupiter Capitolinus, as well as those of the Emperor, were erected on the site of the Temple, and when the name Jerusalem was changed to that of *Ælia Capitolina*. (2) The Parable of the Vineyard as recorded by Mark (xii. 1-11) is apparently intended to correct the analogous parable of Hermas (Sim. V.)¹ which cannot be dated earlier than 120 A.D.

PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD.

PARIS.

¹ See the article, previously quoted, in the HIBBERT JOURNAL, April, 1932.