

JUSTIN MARTYR AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF LUKE'S GOSPEL

Michael Kok

Morling College, Australian College of Theology, Bentley, WA, Australia

Introduction

Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV (P75) is the oldest manuscript to contain the full title ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ ('Gospel according to Luke').¹ Irenaeus of Lyon judged this Luke to be Paul's inseparable companion, for

1. See Simon Gathercole, 'The Titles of the Gospels in the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts', *ZNW* 104 (2013), pp. 33-76 (37-38). However, Brent Nongbri ('Reconsidering the Place of Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV [P75] in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament', *JBL* 135 [2016], pp. 405-37) has contested the dating of Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV around 175–225 CE on paleographical and codicological grounds and re-dated it to the fourth century. As for the historical priority of the longer form of the Gospel titles, see Theo K. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (WUNT, 120; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), pp. 207-8; David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 38, 126 n. 142; Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 2000), pp. 48, 238 n. 195; Silke Petersen, 'Die Evangelienüberschriften und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons', *ZNW* 97 (2006), pp. 250-74 (254-55, 268); David E. Aune, *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity* (WUNT, 303; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), pp. 16-17; Gathercole, 'Titles', pp. 62-71; contra Theodore Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Erster Band: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes: Erste Hälfte* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1888), pp. 164-67 and Adolf Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament: And the Most Important Consequence of the New Creation* (trans. J. R. Wilkinson; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004), pp. 68-70.

the presence of the first-person plural pronoun in the sequel to the third canonical Gospel may be implying that the evangelist had joined Paul on his missionary travels (cf. Acts 16.10-17; 20.5-15; 21.1-18; 27.1-37; 28.1-16) and Col. 4.14 and 2 Tim. 4.11 commended Luke as Paul's beloved physician and faithful co-worker (*Haer.* 3.14.1).² It is uncertain how much earlier this authorial tradition about the Third Gospel can be traced back before the late second century CE. The focus of this article will be on whether Justin Martyr was acquainted with this authorial tradition. Justin's literary output is widely regarded as marking a transition away from privileging the oral over the written medium for transmitting Jesus' sayings and deeds.³ Although his literary dependence on the Third Gospel is probable, I will argue that the belief in its Lukan authorship postdated Justin's lifetime (c. 100–165 CE) and that Justin simply assumed its apostolic origins.

2. In this paper, I will refer to the Gospel writers by their traditional names (i.e. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John) and the text of the 'Gospel according to Luke' as the Third Gospel as a matter of convenience. This title is based on the canonical ordering and does not presuppose any solution to the Synoptic Problem.

3. See Arthur J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (NovTSup, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1967), p. 4; L. W. Bernard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 53; Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (BHT, 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), pp. 124-25; Donald A. Hagner, 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr', in David Wenham (ed.), *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels* (Gospel Perspectives, 5; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp. 233-68 (251); Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM Press, 1990), p. 40; Luise Abramowski, 'The "Memoirs of the Apostles" in Justin', in Peter Stuhlmacher (ed.), *The Gospel and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 323-35 (329-30); Graham Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 104; Oskar Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', in Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), pp. 53-76 (73-74); Radka Fiolová, '"Scripture" and the "Memoirs of the Apostles": Justin Martyr and His Bible', in Jan Dušek and Jan Roskovec (eds.), *The Process of Authority: The Dynamics in Transmission and Reception of Canonical Texts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), pp. 165-78 (171).

The Gospel Titles before Justin Martyr

Despite Justin's preference for labeling certain books about Jesus as ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ('memoirs of the apostles'), he was aware that most Christians labelled them as εὐαγγέλια or 'gospels' (*1 Apol.* 66.3; cf. *Dial.* 10.2; 100.1). Eric Francis Osborn regards the relative clause ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια ('which are called gospels') in *1 Apol.* 66.3 as a scribal interpolation. It looks like a parenthetical gloss and Justin does not bring up the Gospels when he discusses the Eucharist at other points (cf. *Dial.* 41.1-3; 70.4; 117.1),⁴ but Luise Abramowski's rebuttal that this is not the only clarifying gloss in Justin's writings (e.g. οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῶν διάκονοι or 'the ones who are called by us deacons' in *1 Apol.* 65.5) and that Justin was clarifying the idiomatic literary meaning assigned to the rare noun εὐαγγέλιον ('gospel') is more persuasive.⁵ Justin's interlocutor Trypho studied the ethical precepts ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ εὐαγγέλιῳ ('in the so-called gospel'), too, revealing that the titular usage of εὐαγγέλιον was well-established in Justin's time (*Dial.* 10.2).⁶

Scholars have combed through ancient Christian writings to pinpoint when the shift from defining εὐαγγέλιον as a cipher for the κήρυγμα ('proclamation') about the Christ event to a distinct genre of literature occurred for Justin to take the latter meaning for granted.⁷ Perhaps this shift was prompted

4. Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, p. 124.

5. Abramowski, "'Memoirs'", p. 323; cf. Stanton, *Jesus*, p. 99; Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus* (WUNT, 2.169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), p. 223.

6. I am not persuaded by Otto Piper's case that Justin was hesitant to use the term εὐαγγέλιον because he defined it in reference to God's ongoing saving activity and judged an indeterminate number of writings to be consistent with the message of the εὐαγγέλιον (see Otto Piper, 'The Nature of the Gospel according to Justin Martyr', *JR* 41 [1961], pp. 155-68 [162-66]). Rather, Justin likely avoided the term because it was rarely found in pre-Christian literature, and it may have been difficult for outsiders to grasp its Christian connotations.

7. See Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 1-43; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 61-65, 131, 133-35; Robert Gundry, 'ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ: How Soon a Book?', *JBL* 115 (1996), pp. 321-25; James A. Kelhoffer, "'How Soon a Book" Revisited: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ as a Reference to "Gospel" Materials in the First Half of the Second

by the Markan incipit. Martin Hengel infers that the opening line in Mk 1.1 concerning the ‘beginning of the gospel’ (ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) inspired a scribal copyist to dub Mark’s entire book as a εὐαγγέλιον.⁸ Graham Stanton reckons that Matthew exerted a greater influence than Mark on the development of the titular usage of εὐαγγέλιον. He reasons that the redactional insertion of the demonstrative pronoun before εὐαγγέλιον in Mt. 24.14 (cf. Mk 13.10) and 26.13 (cf. Mk 14.9) signaled to readers that ‘this gospel’ (τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) summed up Matthew’s whole story of Jesus.⁹ Hengel’s guess that Theophilus appended the title ‘Gospel according to Luke’ to the Third Gospel when he disseminated it for a wider readership does not accord with Luke’s description of his own work as a διήγησις (‘account’) of the fulfilment of salvation history in the dedication to Theophilus (cf. Lk. 1.1).¹⁰

Other scholars look to the *Didache* (cf. *Did.* 8.2b; 11.3b; 15.3-4) as providing the earliest evidence for the literary meaning of εὐαγγέλιον, though this may be complicated by the composite nature of the *Didache* and the possibility that these verses were part of a later redactional layer.¹¹ For example, the Lord’s prayer in *Did.* 8.2 mostly agrees with the wording of Mt. 6.9-13 and is introduced as what ‘the Lord commanded in his gospel’ (ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ). One option is that the Didachist copied Mt. 6.9-13 and designated the source as a εὐαγγέλιον.¹² Alternatively, εὐαγγέλιον could

Century’, *ZNW* 95 (2004), pp. 1-34; Petersen, ‘Evangelienüberschriften’, pp. 260-67; Aune, *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul*, pp. 3-14.

8. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 90-96, 97.

9. Stanton, *Jesus*, pp. 56-58.

10. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 100-103.

11. For a recent case that all the references to the εὐαγγέλιον belong to a late redactional stratum, see Alan Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache* (JSNTSup, 254; London: T. & T. Clark, 2004), pp. 129-41.

12. Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before St. Irenaeus* (3 vols.; ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni; trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hechte; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990), III, pp. 145, 154-55; Wolf-Dietrich Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), pp. 30-36; Clayton N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Leiden: Brill, 1989), pp. 137-38; Christopher M. Tuckett, ‘Synoptic Tradition in the Didache’, in Jean-Marie

have been employed as a shorthand for the preaching of Jesus contained within Matthew's narrative.¹³ Another option is that the Didachist had independent access to the liturgical tradition underlying Mt. 6.9-13 and defined εὐαγγέλιον in its older kerygmatic sense.¹⁴ Viewing the *Didache* as setting the *terminus ad quem* for when Matthew's text was called a εὐαγγέλιον, James A. Kelhoffer conjectures that an earlier copyist read Mark's and Matthew's texts together and construed the Markan incipit as a title covering both works.¹⁵

The last theory championed by Hans von Campenhausen and Helmut Koester is that Marcion was the first to hail a Jesus book as a εὐαγγέλιον due to his interpretation of Paul's proprietary claims on "my gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου; cf. Rom. 2.16).¹⁶ The Patristic consensus that Marcion edited the canonical version of the Third Gospel (e.g. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.2; Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.1.4-5; 4.2-6; Epiphanius, *Haer.* 42.9.1) continues to have

Sevrin (ed.), *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), pp. 197-230 (198-99); Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 63-64, 252 n. 270; Kelhoffer, "'How Soon a Book" Revisited', pp. 17-22; Petersen, 'Evangelienüberschriften', p. 262 n. 40.

13. Gundry, 'ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ', pp. 322-23; Aune, *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul*, p. 11.

14. Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TU, 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), pp. 10, 103-9, 203; Richard Glover, 'The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels', *NTS* 5 (1958), pp. 12-29 (19, 28); Hagner, 'Sayings', p. 241; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 16; Jonathan A. Draper, 'The Jesus Tradition in the *Didache*', in Jonathan A. Draper (ed.), *The Didache in Modern Research* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 72-91 (85-86); Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), pp. 50, 294-95; Aaron Milavec, 'Synoptic Tradition in the *Didache* Revisited', *J ECS* 11 (2003), pp. 443-80 (452).

15. Kelhoffer, "'How Soon a Book" Revisited', pp. 31, 33-34.

16. Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), pp. 147-63; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 35-36.

able defenders,¹⁷ but the hypotheses that Marcion's Gospel was derived from a different *Vorlage* than the canonical text or was an *Urlukas* or *Urevangelium* have been revived, too.¹⁸ Markus Vinzent and Matthias

17. See, for instance, the reconstructions of Theodore Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Zweiter Band: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band: Zweite Hälfte* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1892), pp. 455-94 and Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (TU, 45; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 2nd and exp. edn, 1924), pp. 52-73, 177-240. The most recent defense of this position is found in Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT, 250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 89-102. Dieter T. Roth (*The Text of Marcion's Gospel* [NTTSD, 40; Leiden: Brill, 2015], pp. 437-38) contends that Marcion had the redactional Lukan phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται ('the kingdom of god is proclaimed') at Lk. 4:43 and 16:16 in his Gospel.

18. See R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity. An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (AAR, 46; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984), pp. 113-45; Gregory, *Reception*, pp. 173-209; Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), pp. 38-47, 79-117; Matthias Klinghardt, 'Markion vs. Lukas: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falles', *NTS* 52 (2006), pp. 484-513; Klinghardt, 'The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion', *NovT* 50 (2008), pp. 1-27; Markus Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection in Early Christianity and the Making of the New Testament* (Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 88-90; Jason D. BeDuhn, 'The Myth of Marcion as Redactor: The Evidence of "Marcion's" Gospel against an Assumed Marcionite Redaction', *ASE* 29 (2012), pp. 21-48; BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2013), pp. 99-200; Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (StPatrSup, 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2014); Vinzent, 'Marcion's Gospel and the Beginnings of Early Christianity', *ASE* 32 (2015), pp. 55-87; Judith Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 183-233; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien* (2 vols.; TANZ, 60; Tübingen: Francke, 2015); Daniel A. Smith, 'Marcion's Gospel and the Resurrected Jesus of Canonical Luke 24', *ZAC* 21 (2017), pp. 41-62; Smith, 'Marcion's Gospel and the Synoptics: Proposals and Problems', in Jens Schröter et al. (eds.), *Gospels and Gospel Traditions in the Second Century:*

Klinghardt advance the bold thesis that Marcion was the progenitor of the original Gospel. Vinzent translates the descriptor *evangelizator* that Tertullian applied to Marcion as ‘gospel-author/maker’.¹⁹ But the literary contexts in which this term is found indicate that Tertullian had the proclamation rather than the recording of the ‘good news’ in mind (cf. *Marc.* 4.4.5; 5.5.1; 5.7.11; 5.19.5).²⁰ Likewise, the complaint that Tertullian imputes to Marcion was not that opposing Christians appropriated his Gospel and placed it in their canon alongside the Law and the Prophets,²¹ but that they altered the Gospel’s contents to align them with these Hebrew Scriptures (cf. 4.4.4).²² A simpler solution is that Marcion picked a Gospel that was already in circulation in Pontus.²³ Further, he did not link the Gospel that he inherited to a named author (cf. 4.2.3; 4.3.4-5).

In the end, there may have not been a single catalyst behind the emergence of the new definition supplied for *εὐαγγέλιον*. Christians at different times and places may have reached the conclusion that the term that summarized the oral proclamation of the Christ event could be extended to cover the written records of the Christ event. The supposition that the literary meaning of *εὐαγγέλιον* rapidly or gradually supplanted its older kerygmatic meaning in a

Experiments in Reception (BZNW, 235; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), pp. 129-73; Shelly Matthews, ‘Does Dating Luke–Acts into the Second Century Affect the Q Hypothesis?’, in Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu (eds.), *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis* (LNTS, 573; London: T. & T. Clark, 2018), pp. 253-64.

19. Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection*, p. 87; Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 91; Vinzent, ‘Marcion’s Gospel’, p. 73.

20. Dieter T. Roth, ‘Marcion’s Gospel and the Synoptic Problem in Recent Scholarship’, in Müller and Omerzu (eds.), *Gospel Interpretation*, p. 272. In *Marc.* 4.4.5, Tertullian alludes to Gal. 1.8 to anathematize Marcion as a false gospel preacher.

21. Contra Klinghardt, ‘Markion vs. Lukas’, pp. 494-95; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 35-36.

22. Christopher M. Hays, ‘Marcion vs. Luke: A Response to the Plädoyer of Matthias Klinghardt’, *ZNW* 99 (2008), pp. 213-32 (218-19).

23. Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 42; Campenhausen, *Formation*, p. 259 n. 42; Gregory, *Reception*, p. 205; Tyson, *Marcion and Luke–Acts*, p. 79; Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, p. 90; BeDuhn, ‘Myth’, p. 41.

linear model of development may be somewhat artificial as well. In fact, Annette Yoshiko Reed observes that Irenaeus alternated between the kerygmatic and literary meanings of εὐαγγέλιον (e.g. *Haer.* 3.1.1; 5.18.2; 10.5; 11.8-9; 12.12; 14.1; 16.8).²⁴ Hence, David Aune offers the consistent definition of εὐαγγέλιον as ‘an authoritative complex of traditional teachings and activities of Jesus with an implicit indifference toward the issue of whether this complex was transmitted in oral or written form’.²⁵ The evolution of εὐαγγέλιον terminology, however, is part of the larger debate over the formation of the traditional Gospel titles.

In spite of their late manuscript and Patristic attestation, Hengel is impressed by the uniformity of the Gospel headings, especially since they did not conform to the convention in antiquity to put the author’s name in the genitive case before the title.²⁶ Since there was no centralized ecclesiastical governing body to standardize the Gospel titles for all Christians, he insists that there would have been competing titles and authorial attributions unless the standard titles were affixed to the Gospels soon after they were published.²⁷ As multiple copies of Gospels were stored in Christian book cupboards in major urban centers, it became a practical necessity to attach titles to the Gospels disclosing their authors.²⁸ Similarly, Silke Petersen surmises

24. A. Y. Reed, ‘EΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ: Orality, Textuality, and the Christian Truth in Irenaeus’ *Adversus Haereses*’, *VC* 56 (2002), pp. 11-46.

25. Aune, *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul*, p. 13.

26. See Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 48, 239 n. 198 and n. 200, 240 n. 201. The closest parallel is when Christian theologians referred to different translations of the Scriptures κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβδαμήκοντα or κατὰ Θεωδοσίωνα, κατὰ Ἀκύλαν, or κατὰ Σύμμαχον. Matthew D. C. Larsen (‘Correcting the Gospel: Putting the Titles of the Gospel in Historical Context’, in A. J. Berkovitz and Mark Letteney [eds.], *Rethinking ‘Authority’ in Late Antiquity: Authorship, Law, and Transmission in Jewish and Christian Tradition* [New York: Routledge, 2018], pp. 78-103 [85-86, 95-96 n. 3, 96 n. 5]) disputes the relevance of some other suggested parallels. For instance, he interprets 2 Macc. 2.13 as meaning that Nehemiah owned and preserved, rather than penned, the documents in his possession.

27. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 50-56; cf. Petersen, ‘Evangelienüberschriften’, pp. 259-60.

28. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 53-55, 121-27, 130, 136-40.

that the titles were created in the early second century to help readers differentiate between the Gospels.²⁹ The problem with dating the titles this early is that, apart from the testimonies from Papias of Hierapolis about a few evangelists, it was not until Theophilus of Antioch (c. 170 CE) that a direct quotation from a Gospel was attributed to a named individual (cf. *Autol.* 2.22).³⁰ Beforehand, the first verse in each Gospel may have functioned as a title and served to distinguish one Gospel from another.³¹

The combination of the singular εὐαγγέλιον and the preposition κατά may presuppose the theological standpoint that the message of 'good news' could be presented 'according to' diverse vantage points. It may mirror the theology undergirding the collection of four Gospels as four valid windows into the life of Jesus.³² David Trobisch goes further by positing that the editors who formulated these titles compiled the New Testament in its entirety in the mid-second century CE in response to both Marcion and the controversy over the date of Easter.³³ He enlists the adoption of the codex and the *nomina sacra*, alongside other textual and non-textual data, in support of his inference that the same editorial hand was responsible for the final redaction of the Christian canon.³⁴ Trobisch's case, however, fails to account for the greater representation of the Gospels of Matthew and John than Mark in the oldest papyri, the

29. Petersen, 'Evangelienüberschriften', pp. 271-73.

30. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 27 n. 1.

31. Gregory, *Reception*, p. 51; Michael J. Kok, *The Gospel on the Margins: The Reception of Mark in the Second Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), pp. 67-68.

32. See Zahn, *Das Neue Testament vor Origenes: Erste Hälfte*, pp. 166-67; Harnack, *Origin*, pp. 70-71; Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus*, pp. 208-10; Trobisch, *First Edition*, pp. 38, 43, 47-56; Aune, *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul*, pp. 14, 24; Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, p. 68. The derivative nature of the scribal titles added to various 'apocryphal' Gospels can be seen, for instance, in Koester's survey of the Nag Hammadi Library (cf. *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 20-23). Petersen ('Evangelienüberschriften', pp. 267, 271-74) objects to the canonical bias entailed by this theory, but he accepts that the title of the *Gospel of Judas* was formulated in opposition to the canonical Gospels (274).

33. Trobisch, *First Edition*, pp. 105-6.

34. Trobisch, *First Edition*, pp. 8-77.

different orderings of the canonical Gospels in Patristic lists, and the inclusion of textual features such as the *nomina sacra* in both canonical and non-canonical Gospel manuscripts.³⁵ The likelihood is greater that the ‘fourfold Gospel’ (τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον) emerged in the second half of the second century CE.³⁶ The harmonization of the four Gospels in Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, the strained numerological argumentation of Irenaeus (cf. *Haer.* 3.11.8), and the notices about the ‘third’ and ‘fourth’ Gospels in the Muratorian Canon (I.2, 9) point in this direction. I will dispute the efforts to date the four-Gospel canon before Papias or Justin below. The Christians who received codices of the four Gospels together were unlikely to reject the titles that were affixed to the individual documents. However, we have too little textual data to go along with Hengel’s far-reaching judgment about the universal acceptance of the titles from Christians across the Roman Empire.

The Traditions about the Evangelists before Justin Martyr

While the titles may date to the latter half of the second century, Papias declared that Mark was Peter’s ‘interpreter’ (ἐρμηνευτής), jotting down what he ‘recalled’ (ἀπεμνημόνευσεν) of Peter’s preaching, and that Matthew ‘ordered together’ (συνετάξατο) the ‘oracles’ (λογία) in the ‘Hebrew language’ (Ἑβραϊδι διαλέκτῳ) before they were ‘interpreted’ (ἡρμήνευσεν) ‘as each was able’ (ὡς ἕν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος) in the early second century (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15-16). Papias’s episcopacy was either during the reigns of Trajan (c. 97–118 CE) or Hadrian (c. 117–38 CE). Eusebius hints that Papias’s fame was at its peak around the time when Evarestus was appointed bishop of Rome in the third year of Trajan’s rule (cf. 3.34.1; 36.1), but a De Boor fragment seems to attribute to Papias a claim that those whom Christ raised from

35. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 46, 243 n. 216; Petersen, ‘Evangelienüberschriften’, pp. 253–60.

36. See Harry Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985), pp. 24–36; Arthur G. Patzia, *The Making of the New Testament: Origin, Collection, Text & Canon* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1995), pp. 64–67; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 53–56; Petersen, ‘Evangelienüberschriften’, pp. 271, 274; Aune, *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul*, pp. 19–24.

the dead lived until the time of Hadrian.³⁷ When Papias commenced his writing activity, most or all of Jesus' disciples were deceased, but he was still able to interview contacts who had lived during the apostolic generation (cf. *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.4, 9). His silence on Basilides, Valentinus and Marcion sug-

37. See Carl de Boor (ed.), *Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius in bisher unbekanntem Excerpten aus der Kirchengeschichte des Philippus Sidetes* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1889), pp. 169-71. Hengel (*Four Gospels*, p. 65) and David G. Deeks ('Papias Revisited', *ExpTim* 88 [1977], pp. 324-39 [324]) rely on the De Boor fragment to date Papias. Enrico Norelli (*Papia di Hierapolis: Esposizione degli oracoli del Signore. I frammenti* [Milan: Paoline, 2005], p. 52) is agnostic about whether or not the De Boor fragment is reliable. Monte A. Shanks (*Papias and the New Testament* [Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013], pp. 53-54, 216-19, 226) accepts both the accuracy of the fragment and a date for Papias's publication around 110 CE on the grounds that the fragment was speaking about Hadrian's lifetime rather than his reign as emperor. Several scholars have disputed the reliability of the fragment and judged that it misattributed a quotation from Quadratus (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.3.2) to Papias. See Vernon Bartlet, 'Papias's "Exposition": Its Date and Content', in Herbert George Wood (ed.), *Amicitiae Corolla* (London: University of London Press, 1933), pp. 15-44 (22); Ulrich H. J. Körtner, *Papias von Hierapolis* (FRLANT, 123; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), p. 91; Robert W. Yarbrough, 'The Date of Papias: A Reassessment', *JETS* 26 (1983), pp. 181-91 (185); William R. Schoedel, 'Papias', in Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW): Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Teil II, Principat. Band 27 (1. Teilband). Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Apostolische Väter und Apologeten)* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), pp. 235-70 (236); Robert H. Gundry, 'The Apostolically Johannine Pre-Papian Tradition Concerning the Gospels of Mark and Matthew', in *The Old Is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations* (WUNT, 178; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), pp. 49-73 (51-52); Dennis MacDonald, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord* (Atlanta: SBL, 2012), p. 46 and n. 5. Finally, it may have been De Boor's editing of the fragment that gave the false impression that Papias, rather than Quadratus, was behind this tradition. See Luke J. Stevens, 'The Origin of the De Boor Fragments Ascribed to Philip of Side', *J ECS* 26 (2008), pp. 631-57 (636).

gests that these influential teachers were not on his radar.³⁸ Most specialists favor a Trajanic date for the publication of Papias's *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord* (Λογίων Κυριακῶν Ἐξήγησις).³⁹ Theo K. Heckel and Charles E. Hill push for a later date in the 120s or 130s CE because they think that Papias was a witness to the four-Gospel canon,⁴⁰ but his familiarity with the Third Gospel is debatable.

There are parallels between Papias and Luke's two volumes. Luke 1.1-4 and Papias (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.4, 15, 16) utilize similar vocabulary (e.g. παρακολουθέω, ἀνατάσσω or συντάσσω, ἀκριβῶς) to impress upon the addressee the value of following reliable sources and arranging their material in an orderly 'narrative' (διήγησις) or 'exposition' (ἐξήγησις). Both Luke and Papias share a memory about the Lord pardoning a sinful woman (cf. Lk. 7.36-50; *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.17), though Luke may have conflated her with the

38. Some scholars contend that Papias did polemicize against Marcion or against Gnostics. For the former view, see Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection*, pp. 96-98; Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 12-26; Vinzent, 'Marcion's Gospel', pp. 61-63. For the latter view, see Joseph Barber Lightfoot, *Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion* (London: Macmillan, 1893), pp. 147-49; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 34. On the contrary, Papias's valorization of the 'living voice' (ζῶσα φωνή) of the 'disciples of the Lord' (τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί) or 'elders' (πρεσβύτεροι) and repudiation of those who 'say many things' (πολλά λέγουσιν) or issue 'foreign commandments' (ἄλλοτριᾶς ἐντολάς) is not specific enough to be directed against Marcion or the Gnostics. Papias does not evince any knowledge of their demiurgical systems of thought. The confused statement that Papias penned John's Gospel at the evangelist's dictation and that John opposed Marcion in the 'Anti-Marcionite Prologue' is historically worthless.

39. See Bartlet, 'Papias's "Exposition"', pp. 16-22; Robert M. Grant, 'Papias and the Gospels', *ATR* 25 (1943), pp. 218-22 (218); Körtner, *Papias*, pp. 236, 261; Yarbrough, 'Date', pp. 186-91; Schoedel, 'Papias', p. 261; Gundry, 'The Apostolically Johannine Pre-Papian Tradition', pp. 50-52; MacDonald, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels*, p. 47; Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, pp. 110-11; Shanks, *Papias*, pp. 91-92; Michael J. Kok, *The Beloved Apostle? The Transformation of the Apostle John into the Fourth Evangelist* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017), pp. 61-62.

40. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus*, p. 222 (cf. pp. 261-65); Charles E. Hill, 'What Papias Said about John (and Luke): A New "Papian" Fragment', *JTS* 49 (1998), pp. 582-629 (617; cf. 616-22).

woman who anointed Jesus (cf. Mk 14.3-9; Mt. 26.6-13; Jn 12.1-8).⁴¹ Both recount the tragic fate of Judas Iscariot (cf. Acts 1.18-19; Apollinaris of Laodicea; contra Mt. 27.3-10),⁴² the connection of Mark to Peter (Acts 12.12; *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15; cf. 1 Pet. 5.13),⁴³ the reputations of Justus Barsabbas and Philip's daughters (Acts 1.23; 21.8-9; *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.9), and the death of a son of Zebedee (Acts 12.1-2; Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae 142; cf. Mk 10.39).⁴⁴ An Armenian translation of Andrew of Caesarea's Commentary on Revelation (34.12) cites a unique logion in Lk. 10.18,⁴⁵ but this may be part of the commentary on the Papiian tradition. Some scholars debate whether

41. For the argument that Luke and Papias had a shared oral tradition about the sinful woman, a tradition that was embellished in its repeated retellings over the centuries until it took the form of the *pericope adulterae* that was interpolated into Jn 7.53–8.11, see Michael J. Kok, 'Did Papias of Hierapolis Use the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* as a Source?', *J ECS* 25 (2017), pp. 29-53 (47-52).

42. There are two distinct versions of the Papiian tradition that Apollinaris of Laodicea may have preserved in *Catena in Evangelium S. Matthaei* and *Catena in Acta SS. Apostolorum*. There are arguments for Papias's dependence on Acts or vice versa. For instance, Shanks (*Papias*, pp. 204-6) is skeptical about how much of the tradition can be attributed to Papias and how much of it reflects the embellishments of Apollinaris or the catena compilers. But he accepts that Papias may have 'preserved a tradition of Judas's death that shares affinities with the account of his death as found in Acts' and that 'it seems reasonable to conclude that Papias was aware of Luke's history of the early church.' For the opposite view, MacDonald (*Two Shipwrecked Gospels*, pp. 30-31, 76-78) argues that the author of Acts redacted Matthew's and Papias's conflicting stories of Judas's demise.

43. For a discussion of the relationship between the Papiian tradition about the evangelist Mark and the portrayal of John Mark in the book of Acts, see Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, pp. 156-58.

44. For the debate over whether Papias claimed that John and James were killed by the Jews as Philip of Side, and later George Hamartolos (*Chronicle* 3.134.1), claim, see Kok, *Beloved Apostle*, pp. 71-73.

45. See Folker Siegert, 'Unbeachtete Papiaszitate bei armenischen Schriftstellern', *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 605-14 (606-7). For skepticism about the preservation of authentic Papiian traditions in the Armenian fragments, see Körtner, *Papias*, pp. 34-36; Schoedel, 'Papias', p. 260; Norelli, *Papia*, pp. 124, 394-411, 492-98.

Papias depended on the Third Gospel and the book of Acts⁴⁶ or Luke on Papias's Exposition.⁴⁷ Then again, the parallels may not demand an intertextual relationship if Papias and Luke were rhetorically trained writers who shared common oral traditions.⁴⁸

To prove that Papias identified all four evangelists, Hill spots an unattributed Papias fragment underlying Eusebius's *Hist. eccl.* 3.24.5-13. The first section is bracketed by 'a record preserves' (κατέχει λόγος) and 'the record is certainly true' (καὶ ἀληθὴς γε ὁ λόγος; 3.24.5, 8a).⁴⁹ It relates that Matthew and John left their 'memoirs' (ὑπομνήματα) for posterity out of 'necessity' (ἐπάναγκες) and that John testified to their truth of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, supplementing them by retelling what Christ did 'at the beginning of the proclamation' (κατ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος). The section in 3.24.11-13 starts with 'they say' (φασί) and elaborates on how John 'was exhorted' (παρακληθέντα) 'to hand down' (παραδοῦναι) in writing what the Synoptics passed over in silence, such as Jesus' miracle at the wedding in Cana before the imprisonment of John the Baptizer (cf. Jn 2.1-11; 3.23-24). Eusebius could preface a source with φασί (e.g. *Hist. eccl.* 1.12.1, 3; 2.2.2; 15.2; 7.12),⁵⁰ but he may have switched to this verb because either he or his source was repeating an oral report, or he was taking liberties in rephrasing his source.⁵¹ Eusebius's interjections in 3.24.8b-10 and 13a marshal proof-

46. See Lightfoot, *Essays*, pp. 150, 176-86; Grant, 'Papias', pp. 219-20; Ralph P. Martin, *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), pp. 81-83; Michael Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), pp. 99-100; Hill, 'What Papias Said', p. 625; Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus*, pp. 262-63.

47. See Rupert Annand, 'Papias and the Four Gospels', *SJT* 9 (1956), pp. 46-62 (50-53); MacDonald, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels*, pp. 43-66, 76-78.

48. See Körtner, *Papias*, pp. 173-76; Norelli, *Papia*, pp. 105-12, 124; Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, pp. 151-53; Kok, *Beloved Apostle*, pp. 60-61.

49. Hill, 'What Papias Said', pp. 589-92; cf. Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2nd edn, 2017), p. 345; T. Scott Manor, 'Papias, Origen, and Eusebius: The Criticisms and Defense of the Gospel of John', *VC* 67 (2013), pp. 1-21 (10).

50. Hill, 'What Papias Said', p. 591 n. 25.

51. Bauckham, *Jesus and Eyewitnesses*, pp. 345, 347; Manor, 'Papias', p. 11.

texts to show that the Gospels do not ‘disagree’ (διαφωνεῖν) with one another because the Synoptics recap Jesus’ actions after the Baptizer’s imprisonment (cf. Mt. 4.12; Mk 1.14; Lk. 3.19-20).⁵² Hill outlines how each element in 3.24.5-13—the requests for the evangelists to write, the affirmations that the Gospels were rooted in the apostles’ recollections and preaching, the divergent ordering of the material in each Gospel, and the endorsements from an apostle for each Gospel—has parallels in Papias’s undisputed fragments or in writers who built on the foundation laid by Papias.⁵³

Clement and Origen of Alexandria may have been Eusebius’s sources for 3.24.5-13 instead of Papias. In Eusebius’s loose paraphrases of the sixth book of Clement’s *Outlines* (Ἰποτυπώσεις) in 2.15.1-2 and 6.14.5-7, Clement underscores that the evangelists Mark and John were urged by others to write their Gospels, that Mark’s Gospel was equivalent to a ὑπόμνημα or notebook of Peter’s teachings, and that John supplemented the ‘bodily facts’ (τὰ σωματικά) in the Synoptic Gospels with a ‘spiritual’ (πνευματικός) account. Thus, 3.24.5-8a could be another paraphrase of Clement; the new information that Matthew was compelled to write, too, and that John supplemented the Synoptics at the beginning of the narrative is not inconsistent with the other paraphrases. Eusebius states that Papias agreed with Clement in 2.15.2, but the extent of their agreement may have just been on the relationship between Mark and Peter and the use of 1 Pet. 5.13 to support this inference (cf. 3.39.15, 17).⁵⁴

As for the harmonization of the Gospels in 3.24.8b-13, it contradicts Papias’s denial that Mark put his Gospel in ‘order’ (3.39.15).⁵⁵ Hill suspects

52. Hill, ‘What Papias Said’, pp. 593-94; Charles Hill, ‘The “Orthodox Gospel”’: The Reception of John in the Great Church Prior to Irenaeus’, in Tuomas Rasimus (ed.), *The Legacy of John: Second-Century Reception of the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 233-300 (288); cf. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, p. 346.

53. Hill, ‘What Papias Said’, pp. 592-606, 616-17; Hill, ‘“Orthodox Gospel”’, p. 287. Dean Furlong (‘Theodore of Mopsuestia: New Evidence for the Proposed Papian Fragment in *Hist. eccl.* 3.24.5-13’, *JSNT* 39 [2016], pp. 209-29 [219-24]) adds Theodore of Mopsuestia to the list.

54. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, p. 238 n. 192; Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, pp. 196-97; Kok, *Beloved Apostle*, pp. 78-79.

55. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, pp. 435-36.

that Papias's faulted Mark's rhetorical 'order' (τάξις), more specifically the incompleteness of Mark's narrative and Mark's omissions of what happened at the start of Jesus' ministry.⁵⁶ If the interjections that Hill highlights are removed from 3.25.8b-13, the focus is on the superiority of John's fuller account of Jesus' ministry.⁵⁷ But if Eusebius's source was not Papias, then the contrast in the undisputed Papian fragment is between Mark's unordered account and Matthew's carefully-arranged narrative from Jesus' birth to his resurrection (cf. 3.39.15-16). It is more likely that 3.24.8b-13 reflects Eusebius's efforts to harmonize John's Gospel with the Synoptics as a reaction against Origen's objection that the Gospels should not be treated as works of 'history' (ἱστορία) due to their irreconcilable differences (*Comm. Jo.* 10.2), including whether Jesus attended a wedding (cf. Jn 2.1-11) or was tested in the wilderness after his baptism (cf. Mk 1.12-13; Mt. 4.1-11; Lk. 4.1-13).⁵⁸ Perhaps the φασί in 3.24.11 alluded to the popular sentiment that John handed down what the Synoptics omitted, while Eusebius was responsible for the rest of the exegesis about how the Synoptics narrated the events after the Baptizer's incarceration.⁵⁹ It is doubtful that Papias invented this argument, for Origen was unaware of this answer to his objection.⁶⁰

Discounting *Hist. eccl.* 3.24.5-13, no undisputed Papian fragment preserves a memory about the evangelist Luke. Granted, arguments from silence may be fallacious. Joseph Barber Lightfoot stressed that Eusebius did not bother repeating Papias's answers to questions about the identities of each evangelist, for these questions had been settled in the fourth century, but was just passing along fascinating anecdotes from Papias about Mark and Matthew.⁶¹ More recently, Luke J. Stevens has raised the possibility that Eusebius only had second-hand access to extracts of Papias's *Exposition* from an intermediary source, so he may have been as much in the dark as modern

56. Hill, "Orthodox Gospel", p. 291; Furlong, 'Theodore of Mopsuestia', pp. 215-18.

57. Furlong, 'Theodore of Mopsuestia', p. 215.

58. Manor, 'Papias', pp. 13-15

59. Manor, 'Papias', p. 12.

60. Manor, 'Papias', p. 7.

61. Lightfoot, *Essays*, pp. 32-58.

scholars about what Papias may have written about the other evangelists.⁶² Be that as it may, unless we recover Papias's lost *Exposition*, we lack positive evidence that he was the originator of the tradition about the evangelist Luke.

Marcion was also active in Rome before Justin published his apologetic treatises. Tertullian's remark that one hundred fifteen years and six and a half months separated Christ from Marcion (*Marc.* 1.19) has been interpreted in light of the sentence of excommunication that Marcion allegedly received in Rome in 144 CE.⁶³ Yet Justin's anxiety about how Marcion's influence had spread to a variety of people groups and how he was teaching 'even until now' (*καὶ νῦν ἔτι*) has been taken by some scholars as insinuating that Marcion began promulgating his ideas at a much earlier date (cf. *I Apol.* 26.5; 58.1-2).⁶⁴ However, Justin's lament about the worldwide impact of Marcion's demonic blasphemies is more than a little hyperbolic, and he was comparing Marcion, his living contemporary in Rome, to the long-dead teachers Simon, the original heresiarch who opposed the apostles, and Menander.⁶⁵ Whenever Marcion began expounding on the Gospel that his Patristic critics noticed bore resemblances to the Third Gospel, neither his initial choice nor his ongoing defense of his Gospel was due to its purported Lukan authorship.⁶⁶ His Gospel was kept anonymous according to Tertullian (cf. *Marc.* 4.2.3; 4.3.4-5) and the Marcionite Megethius credited Christ and Paul as its co-authors (*Adam. Dial.* 1.8).⁶⁷ Sebastian Moll doubts that

62. Luke J. Stevens, 'Did Eusebius Read Papias?', *JTS* 70 (2019), pp. 163-83.

63. Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 26.

64. Hoffmann, *Marcion*, p. 45; Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, p. 29.

65. Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, p. 39; Lieu, *Marcion*, p. 15 n. 2.

66. Contra Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, p. 32; Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, p. 90.

67. Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 39; Campenhausen, *Formation*, p. 155-56; Hoffmann, *Marcion*, p. 140-41; Gregory, *Reception*, p. 190-91; Andrew Gregory, 'Looking for Luke in the Second Century: A Dialogue with François Bovon', in Craig G. Bartholomew et al. (eds.), *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), pp. 401-13 (409); Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection*, p. 82 and n. 50; BeDuhn, 'Myth', p. 28; Lieu, *Marcion*, pp. 212-13; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 31-32. The charge that the canonical version of the Third Gospel was forged in Luke's name may not go back to Marcion but may reflect

Marcion was naïve enough to imagine that his Gospel ‘dropped from heaven’ or had a divine author. Moll maintains that since Marcion selected only one Gospel, he did not need to attach a name to it to distinguish it from other Gospels.⁶⁸ Whoever Marcion believed the author of his Gospel to be, he would not have appealed to the key proof-text in 2 Tim. 4:11 about how Luke was Paul’s loyal supporter because the Pastorals were absent from his canon of Pauline Epistles.⁶⁹ Therefore, the tradition of Lukan authorship does not seem to have roots prior to Justin.

The Authorship of the Third Gospel in the Writings of Justin Martyr

Justin was cognizant of the titular usage of εὐαγγέλιον, but, with the exception of *Dial.* 106.3, he was not interested in the individual authors of the εὐαγγελία. Instead, he grouped them together under the label ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, and occasionally did not qualify the ἀπομνημονεύματα with a *genitivus auctoris*, in *I Apol.* 66.3, 67.3, *Dial.* 100.4, 101.3, 102.5, 103.6, 103.8, 104.1, 105.1, 105.5, 105.6, 106.1, 106.3, 106.4 and 107.1. Theodor Zahn supposed that Justin’s choice of terminology signaled to educated readers that the Gospels belonged to a known genre of literature.⁷⁰ For an alternative explanation, Richard Heard believed that

Tertullian’s own assumption that Marcion’s silence on the traditional authorship must mean that he suppressed it (contra Harnack, *Marcion*, p. 41 and Campenhausen, *Formation*, pp. 157-59).

68. Moll, *Arch-Heretic Marcion*, p. 90.

69. Hoffmann, *Marcion*, pp. 140-41; Tyson, *Marcion and Luke–Acts*, p. 40.

70. Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Erster Band: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Zweite Hälfte* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1889), p. 471-76. Koester (*Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 38) and Gabriella Aragione (‘Justin, “philosophe” chrétien, et les “Mémoires des Apôtres qui sont appelés Évangiles”’, *Apocrypha* 15 [2004], pp. 41-56 [43]) wrongly credit E. Köpke (‘Über die Gattung ἀπομνημονεύματα in der griechischen Litteratur’, in E. Köpke (ed.), *Zu der am 15. Oktober 1857 Vormittags 11 1/2 Uhr im Festsale der Ritter-Akademie stattfindenden Feier des Allerhöchsten Geburtstages Seiner Majestät des Königs ladet ehrerbietigst und ergebenst ein der Director Dr. Ernst Köpke* [Brandenburg: Adolf Müller, 1857], pp. 1-30) as the first to arrive at this insight, but this error is corrected in Wally

Justin's terminology and conception of how the apostles 'recalled' (*ἀπομνημονεύσαντες*) what the Savior taught (cf. *1 Apol.* 33.5) echoed Papias's emphasis that Mark 'remembered' (*ἀπεμνημόνευσεν*) Peter's preaching (cf. *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15).⁷¹

In support of Zahn, the title *ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων* is similar to Xenophon's *Ἀπομνημονεύματα Σωκράτους* ('Memoirs of Socrates') and, like Xenophon, Justin retold the tale of Hercules at the crossroads (cf. *2 Apol.* 11.2) and admired Socrates (cf. *1 Apol.* 5.3; 10.5, 8).⁷² Justin differs from Xenophon inasmuch as the apostles were the authors rather than the subject of his memoirs,⁷³ but, for Justin, the Gospels may have conformed to the *Gattung* of philosophical memoirs.⁷⁴ Koester was not convinced that the plural *ἀπομνημονεύματα* took on the connotations of a philosopher's memorabilia until the Second Sophistic⁷⁵ and added that it was only applied to

V. Cirafesi and Gregory P. Fewster, 'Justin's *Ἀπομνημονεύματα* and Ancient Greco-Roman Memoirs', *EC* 7 (2016), pp. 186-212 (189 n. 10).

71. Richard Heard, 'The *Apomnēmonēumata* in Papias, Justin and Irenaeus', *NTS* 1 (1954), pp. 122-29 (125-26); cf. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 39-40.

72. N. Hydahl, 'Hegesipps Hypomnemata', *ST* 14 (1960), pp. 70-113 (77-83); Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), p. 25; Bernard, *Justin Martyr*, p. 56; George Kennedy, 'Classical and Christian Source Criticism', in William O. Walker Jr (ed.), *The Relationship among the Gospels: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1978), pp. 125-55 (136-37); Abramowski, "'Memoirs'", pp. 327-28; David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem* (Doubleday: New York, 1999), pp. 31-33; Aragione, 'Justin', pp. 47-52.

73. Heard, 'Apomnēmonēumata', p. 125.

74. Hydahl, 'Hegesipps Hypomnemata', p. 79; Abramowski, "'Memoirs'", p. 329.

75. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 39; cf. Heard, 'Apomnēmonēumata', p. 125. Both Heard and Koester point to how *ἀπομνημονεύματα* in Plutarch's writings may be translated as an anecdote that is written down (e.g. Plutarch, *Pomp.* 2; *Cat. Maj.* 9). Dungan (*History of the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 31-32) and Aragione ('Justin', pp. 48-49) respond by noting that Diogenes Laertius, the third-century author of the *Lives*, lists the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Diodorus Siculus, a first-century BCE Greek

Xenophon's work in late manuscripts and a pseudepigraphical letter ascribed to him, while the equivalent Latin term *commentarii* was used by Aulus Gellius for Xenophon's text (*Noct. att.* 14.3.5).⁷⁶ Gabriella Aragione refutes Koester by showing that, while the title was not original to Xenophon, ἀπομνημονεύματα was seen as a fitting descriptor for Xenophon's work as early as Aelius Theon (cf. *Prog.* 66.15; 126.34) as well as by other second- and third-century writers.⁷⁷ It is a mistake to view Zahn's and Heard's theories as incompatible. After all, Clement of Alexandria categorized Mark's Gospel as a ὑπόμνημα when elaborating on the Papias tradition (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.15.2).⁷⁸ In their recent survey of the lexical data, Wally V. Cirafesi and Gregory P. Fewster deconstruct Koester's distinction between ἀπομνημονεύματα and ὑπομνήματα.⁷⁹ Moreover, they move beyond the narrow focus on the memoirs about philosophers, insisting that 'a broader set of Greco-Roman memoir material—indicated by ἀπομνημονεύματα, ὑπομνήματα and commentarii—becomes relevant as *comparanda* for both the Papias tradition and Justin'.⁸⁰

Scholars have wrestled with whether Justin's memoirs were identical to the Synoptics in the form that we have them and why his citations diverge from them. Indeed, Osborn dubs this 'the Homeric question of the canon'.⁸¹ This issue is complicated by the fact that there was no requirement for ancient writers to copy quotations verbatim, if their utilization of sources was acknowledged at all, and they could purposefully deviate from their source ma-

historian, and Favorinus of Arelate, the court philosopher of the Roman emperor Antonius Pius (*Lives* 4.2; 3.48).

76. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 39.

77. Aragione, 'Justin', pp. 47-48.

78. Cirafesi and Fewster, 'Justin's Ἀπομνημονεύματα', p. 194. They err in attributing this fragment to Papias, for Eusebius was paraphrasing Clement and brought up Papias only insofar as Papias agreed that 1 Pet. 5.13 corroborated the relationship between Peter and Mark. See Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, p. 196.

79. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 38 n. 5, 39 n. 4, 40 n. 1. However, Cirafesi and Fewster ('Justin's Ἀπομνημονεύματα', p. 195) point out that Plutarch could use ὑπομνήματα and ἀπομνημονεύματα interchangeably (e.g. *Brut.* 13.2, 27.3).

80. Cirafesi and Fewster, 'Justin's Ἀπομνημονεύματα', p. 195.

81. Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, p. 120.

material in didactic or polemical contexts.⁸² Another complicating factor is the admission in the Lukan prologue that the evangelist was indebted to numerous predecessors (cf. Lk. 1.1), so their accounts may have not disappeared after they were incorporated into the Third Gospel and could have been available to Justin.⁸³ Fortunately, there has been extensive scholarly discussion about the criteria for discerning intertextual references to the Gospels.⁸⁴

On the question of Justin's literary relationship with the Synoptics, Arthur J. Bellinzoni outlines the main contours of the scholarly debate.⁸⁵ The op-

82. Hagner, 'Sayings', p. 257; Köhler, *Rezeption*, pp. 535-36; Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 'Reflections on Method: What Constitutes the Use of Writings that Later Formed the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers', in Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 61-82 (67); John S. Kloppenborg, 'Conflated Citations of the Synoptic Gospels: The Beginning of Christian Doxological Tradition', in Jens Schröter and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), *Gospels and Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Experiments in Reception* (BZNW, 235; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), pp. 45-80 (76-79).

83. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, p. 337; Koester, 'Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?', *JBL* 113 (1994), pp. 293-97; Gregory, *Rezeption*, pp. 15-20; François Bovon, 'The Reception and Use of the Gospel of Luke in the Second Century', in Craig G. Bartholomew et al. (eds.), *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), pp. 379-400 (382-83); Gregory, 'Looking for Luke', pp. 402-3, 405; Gregory and Tuckett, 'Reflections', pp. 74-75.

84. See Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 3; Massaux, *Influence*, I, pp. xxi-xxii, xviii; Köhler, *Rezeption*, pp. 2-17; Koester, 'Written Gospels', p. 297; Gregory, *Rezeption*, pp. 5-20; Gregory, 'Looking for Luke', pp. 402-7; Kelhoffer, "'How Soon a Book" Revisited', pp. 7-10; Gregory and Tuckett, 'Reflections', pp. 61-82; Stephen E. Young, *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers: Their Explicit Appeals to the Words of Jesus in Light of Orality Studies* (WUNT, 2.311; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 36-106; Kok, *Gospels on the Margins*, pp. 230-36.

85. Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, pp. 1-2. See also the helpful review of scholarship in Joseph Verheyden, 'Justin's Text of the Gospels: Another Look at the Citations in *1 Apol.* 15.1-8', in Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 313-35 (313-20).

tions are that Justin recited the Synoptics from memory,⁸⁶ consulted a harmony or multiple harmonies of the Synoptics⁸⁷ or drew on pre-Synoptic material⁸⁸ or non-canonical Gospels.⁸⁹ Joseph Verheyden is right that these explanations may not be mutually exclusive, though some account for Justin's citation habits better than others, and there may be no overarching pattern for how Justin conflated or harmonized his sources.⁹⁰ Likewise, Oskar Skarsaune surmises that sometimes Justin relied on catechetical compendiums of Jesus' teaching (e.g. *I Apol.* 15-17) and other times directly relied on Gospel manuscripts (e.g. *Dial.* 97-107).⁹¹

86. Karl Gottlob Semisch, *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus* (Hamburg: Friedrich und Andreas Berthes, 1848), pp. 389-92; Zahn, *Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Zweite Hälfte*, pp. 463-585.

87. William Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London: Macmillan, 1876), pp. 88-138; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, pp. 121-34; Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, pp. 8-130, 140-42; Helmut Koester, 'The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), pp. 19-37 (28-33); Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 360-402.

88. Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1891).

89. For instance, for the debate over whether Justin relied on the Gospel of Peter, see Karl August Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1832), I, pp. 92-267; Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's* (Halle: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1850), pp. 128-38; Peter Pilhofer, 'Justin und das Petrus-evangelium', *ZNW* 81 (1990), pp. 60-78 (69-75); Paul Foster, 'The Writings of Justin Martyr and the So-Called *Gospel of Peter*', in Parvis and Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr*, pp. 104-12 (108-11); Charles E. Hill, 'Was John's Gospel among the Apostolic Memoirs?', in Parvis and Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr*, pp. 88-94 (91-93); Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 118, 325-27; Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), pp. 379-80.

90. Verheyden, 'Justin's Text', pp. 318-19; cf. Kloppenborg, 'Conflated Citations', p. 72.

91. Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', pp. 64-67.

Édouard Massaux's landmark volumes on the reception of Matthew's Gospel were guided by his methodological starting point that 'sufficiently striking verbal concurrence', along with 'the use of typically Matthean vocabulary, themes, and ideas', was enough to discern literary contact between Matthew's Gospel and a subsequent Christian writer.⁹² Wolf-Dieter Köhler refines Massaux's methodology, allowing that literary contact cannot be ruled *wahrscheinlich* ('probable') unless there is close verbal agreement between two texts, the potential parallels with other known writings are more distant, and any variations in wording can be accounted for on the basis of plausible editorial procedures.⁹³ The replication of Matthean *Sondergut* in a later text increases the probability of literary dependence on Matthew's Gospel, especially if its author was not located in the same social context as the Matthean evangelist where he or she might have independent access to the special traditions incorporated into Matthew's Gospel.⁹⁴ Koester devised a more rigorous criterion for verifying when a writer was relying on one of the canonical Gospels, instead of another oral or written source, by isolating traces of a particular evangelist's *Redaktionsarbeit* (redactional work) in the later source.⁹⁵ The drawbacks with Koester's approach is that it may only be possible to detect Matthew's and Luke's editorial handiwork, since their source text is extant on the presupposition of Markan priority while other hypothetical sources (e.g. Q, M, L and the signs source) are not, and it produces minimalistic results that exclude potential parallels that do not feature redactional elements from the Gospels.⁹⁶

92. Massaux, *Influence*, I, pp. xxi-xxii.

93. Köhler, *Rezeption*, pp. 12-14. For a critical appraisal of Köhler's method, see Gregory, *Rezeption*, pp. 10-12, 16-20; Gregory and Tuckett, 'Reflections', pp. 71-75.

94. Köhler, *Rezeption*, p. 14.

95. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, p. 3; Koester, 'Written Gospels', p. 297. For a sample of studies that endorse or refine Koester's method, see Tuckett, 'Didache', pp. 199-200; Gregory, *Rezeption*, pp. 13-14; Gregory and Tuckett, 'Reflections', pp. 71, 75; Foster, 'Writings', pp. 105-6.

96. Köhler, *Rezeption*, pp. 2-5; Gregory, *Rezeption*, pp. 13-14; Gregory, 'Looking for Luke', p. 404; Kelhoffer, "'How Soon a Book" Revisited', p. 9; Gregory and Tuckett, 'Reflections', pp. 71-72, 75-78.

Justin's dependence on the Third Gospel can be established on the basis of Massaux's and Köhler's criteria. One of Justin's apostolic memoirs (cf. *Dial.* 105.5) has a verbatim quotation of Jesus' dying prayer, 'Father, into your hands I commit my spirit' (Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου). Jesus' recitation of Ps. 30.6 LXX is unique to Lk. 23.46 and Justin's present verb παρατίθεμαι ('I commit') rather than the psalm's future παραθήσομαι ('I will commit') agrees with Lk. 23.46.⁹⁷ Due to his strict application of Koester's criterion, Andrew Gregory locates fewer instances where literary dependence on the Third Gospel is demonstrable. Regarding *Dial.* 105.5, Gregory allows that Justin could have drawn on a testimony collection that linked Ps. 30.6 LXX to a Christological reading of Ps. 22 and it may have not been influenced by Lk. 23.46 if Luke had a source for this saying from the cross that had already changed the tense of the verb.⁹⁸ Gregory's cautious verdict is that '[s]ome, if not a great deal, of Lukan redaction is clearly present in the writings of Justin, and therefore Justin must be considered to depend on *Luke*, either directly or indirectly, in at least those instances where Lukan redaction is present.'⁹⁹ For example, the quotation of Jesus' aphorism in *I Apol.* 19.6 is virtually identical in wording and order to Lk. 18.27, which abbreviated the lengthier saying in Mk 10.27 (cf. Mt. 19.26).¹⁰⁰

There is no reason to doubt Justin's knowledge of the Third Gospel. But since he attributed the Gospels to the apostles as a collective group, it is uncertain who Justin deemed the Third Gospel's apostolic author to be. One passage (i.e. *Dial.* 103.8) specifies that the memoirs were written 'by his [i.e. Jesus'] apostles and their followers' (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν

97. Sanday, *Gospels*, pp. 116, 124; Massaux, *Influence*, III, p. 92; Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, p. 120; Köhler, *Rezeption*, p. 254; Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition. Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), p. 103.

98. Gregory, *Rezeption*, p. 229.

99. Gregory, *Rezeption*, p. 291.

100. Gregory, *Rezeption*, p. 261. In comparing the wording of *I Apol.* 19.6 (τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ θεῶν) to Lk. 18.27, Bellinzoni (*Sayings*, pp. 107-8) notices that Justin made stylistic improvements in dropping the article before θεός, for it is usually omitted after a preposition (i.e. παρὰ) and deleting the verb to be (i.e. ἔστιν) in order to create a stylistically balanced gnomic saying.

ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων). It may be an echo of the third evangelist's insistence that, 'having followed' (παρηκολουθηκότι) everything that was passed down by the 'eyewitnesses and assistants of the word' (αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρεταὶ γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου), he decided 'to compile' (ἀνατάξασθαι) an account.¹⁰¹ The Greek wording, however, might require that at least two or more memoirs were written by apostles, and two or more by their followers. This corresponds with the ecclesiastical tradition that two of the evangelists were the Apostles Matthew and John, and two were the assistants of the Apostles Peter and Paul.¹⁰² Additionally, the evangelist Luke may be the 'follower' that Justin was thinking of when he followed this statement by noting how Jesus' perspiration became like drops of blood, which alludes to a textually uncertain detail in Lk. 22.44,¹⁰³ but it is not certain that this textual variant was inserted in manuscripts of the Third Gospel by Justin's time.¹⁰⁴ Finally, the liturgical reading of the four memoirs alongside the Hebrew prophets in Christian worship services may reveal that they had attained a scriptural status (cf. *I Apol.* 67.3).¹⁰⁵ It may be anachronistic to date Irenaeus's τετράμορφον εὐαγγέλιον back into Justin's lifetime, however, for Justin may have valued the memoirs as historical records of the fulfilment of prophecy and proof of the literacy of the apostles and the Christian assemblies.¹⁰⁶

101. Campenhausen, *Formation*, p. 128 n. 99; Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus*, pp. 92 n. 242, 328 n. 332.

102. See, for example, Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 20, 44; Stanton, *Jesus*, pp. 100-101; Hill, "'Orthodox Gospel'", p. 263; Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', p. 72; Michael J. Kruger, *The Question of Canon: Challenging the Status Quo in the New Testament Debate* (Nottingham: IVP, 2013), pp. 169-70.

103. Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', p. 72.

104. Gregory, *Reception*, pp. 281-82.

105. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), p. 145; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, pp. 116, 162-63, 279 n. 472; Stanton, *Jesus*, pp. 99-100, 105; Kruger, *Question of Canon*, p. 172; Fiolová, 'Scripture', p. 174.

106. See Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 28; Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, p. 29 and n. 18; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, pp. 41-42; Cirafesi and Fewster, 'Justin's Ἀπομνημονεύματα', pp. 14-26.

Conversely, the wording of *Dial.* 103.8 may not require a minimum of four memoirs, let alone the four canonical Gospels. Justin may not be contrasting memoirs that were either directly or indirectly apostolic, for the conjunction *καί* ('and') rather than *ἢ* ('or') might signal that every memoir was jointly composed by the apostles and their followers.¹⁰⁷ Justin's reading of Papias may have been that Mark, as Peter's 'interpreter' (*ἐρμηνευτής*), translated what the apostle dictated to him, while qualified translators 'interpreted' (*ἡρμήνευσεν*), or better 'translated', Matthew's 'oracles' from a Semitic language into Greek (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15-16).¹⁰⁸ This is substantiated by the reference to Peter's memoirs in *Dial.* 106.3. In this passage, Justin communicates how Jesus changed the name of one of the apostles to Peter in the *ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ* ('memoirs of him') and, in the same memoir, how Jesus christened Zebedee's sons as *βοανεργές* or 'sons of thunder'. The *αὐτοῦ* may be a possessive genitive in line with the other instances when it follows *ἀπομνημονεύματα* and can be taken in reference to Peter as its nearest antecedent, while the nickname *βοανεργές* reproduces the singly attested transliteration of the Aramaic epithet in Mk 3.17.¹⁰⁹

Justin might have pictured an apostle working with an amanuensis in producing the Third Gospel, but he does not name them. Paul's protestations notwithstanding, Justin may have not held Paul to be an apostle and limited the circle of apostles to the 'twelve' who went out from Jerusalem to the nations

107. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, p. 476 n. 106; cf. Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, p. 200; Kok, *Beloved Apostle*, p. 82.

108. In support of rendering the noun *ἐρμηνευτής* and the verb *ἐρμηνεύω* in *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15-16 as denoting a translator and the act of translating respectively, see Armin D. Baum, 'Der Presbyter des Papias über einen "Hermeneuten" des Petrus: Zu Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,39,15', *TZ* 56 (2000), pp. 21-35 (22-24); Baum, 'Ein aramäische Urmatthäus im kleinasiatischen Gottesdienst: Das Papiaszeugnis zur Entstehung des Matthäusevangeliums', *ZNW* 92 (2001), pp. 257-72 (262-64); cf. Matthew Black, 'The Use of Rhetorical Terminology in Papias on Mark and Matthew', *JSNT* 37 (1989), pp. 31-41 (32-34); Körtner, *Papias*, pp. 203-6; Schoedel, 'Papias', pp. 257, 263; Norelli, *Papia*, pp. 328-29; Shanks, *Papias*, p. 196.

109. Abramowski, "'Memoirs'", pp. 334-35; Stanton, *Jesus*, p. 101; Ehrman, *Forgery*, p. 325; Kok, *Gospel on the Margins*, pp. 114-15. Contra Foster, 'Writings', p. 108.

(e.g. *I Apol.* 39.3; 42.4; 45.5; 50.12; 53.3; *Dial.* 42.1). There may be a parallel in how the book of Acts restricts the epithet ἀπόστολος ('apostle') to the twelve disciples who accompanied Jesus from his baptism to his ascension (cf. Acts 1.15-26), with the exception of Acts 14.14. In fact, Justin's extant writings are silent on Paul and Paul's epistolary correspondence. Andreas Lindemann enumerates four plausible reasons for Justin's silence: (1) he had no knowledge of the Pauline tradition; (2) he suppressed the Pauline Epistles because Marcion approved of them; (3) he chose to not bring up Paul in a discussion with a Jewish dialogue partner who did not recognize Paul as an authority; or (4) he advocated for his version of Pauline theology without naming Paul.¹¹⁰ Paul Foster supports the first option,¹¹¹ but most scholars detect at least some signs of Paul's influence on Justin (e.g. compare Rom. 4.10-12 to *Dial.* 11.5 and 23.4-5, or Gal. 3.8-9 to *Dial.* 119.5-120.1) and it seems improbable that Justin had not heard of Paul, given his stature for Marcion.¹¹² If one grants Justin's awareness of the Pauline Epistles, Justin conceived an apostle to be someone who was trained by Jesus to interpret his sayings and deeds in light of biblical prophecy.¹¹³ Paul does not seem to meet these qualifications. Aside from Paul's sense of his apostolic vocation to minister to the nations and his ability to interpret the Christ event in light of the Scriptures,¹¹⁴ he was not a personal disciple of Jesus, and there are

110. A. Lindemann, *Paulus in ältesten Christentum* (BHT, 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979), p. 353.

111. Paul Foster, 'Justin and Paul', in Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson (eds.), *Paul and the Second Century* (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), pp. 108-25 (124-25).

112. See Massaux, *Influence*, III, pp. 47-49, 96-101; Bernard, *Justin Martyr*, pp. 62-63; Shotwell, *Justin Martyr*, p. 55; Lindemann, *Paulus*, pp. 353-67; Skarsaune, *Proof*, pp. 92-100; R.A. Werline, 'The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho', *HTR* 92 (1999), pp. 79-93.

113. See Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', pp. 68-71.

114. Skarsaune, 'Justin and his Bible', p. 74. Skarsaune also enlists his reading of *Dial.* 103.8 into his argument that Justin regarded Paul as an apostle, writing that '[w]hen Justin seems to have Mark and Luke in mind when he speaks of *Memoirs* written by the followers of the apostles, he would probably have thought of Luke as Paul's follower, thus indirectly characterizing Paul as an apostle' (70).

few reminiscences of Jesus' teachings or deeds in his epistles. Finally, if Gregory is right that, in spite of their common authorship, the Third Gospel and the book of Acts were transmitted separately and that only Justin's knowledge of the former is demonstrable,¹¹⁵ Justin could not have relied on the 'we-statements' in Acts like Irenaeus did in support of Lukan authorship. Justin believed that the apostles authored the memoirs with the help of scribes, but did not clearly attribute a memoir to Paul's amanuensis Luke.

Conclusion

Although the original recipients of the Gospels may have known the identities of the evangelists, the evangelists left their names out of their Gospel texts. Nevertheless, Papias's *Exposition* preserved the oldest traditions about the evangelists Mark and Matthew, but he was silent about the authorship of the Third Gospel, if he even knew it at all. This Gospel continued to circulate without a name, and Marcion kept his version of it anonymous as well. Building on Papias, Justin described the Gospels as co-written by the apostles and their scribal assistants, but he did not have a tradition for the authorship of the Third Gospel and just ascribed it to the apostles as a collective group. Sometime after Justin's lifetime, the scribes who formulated the titles for the canonical Gospels determined that Luke must have been the third evangelist by correlating the 'we-statements' in the book of Acts with the reference to Luke in 2 Tim. 4.11. This line of reasoning is repeated by Irenaeus.

115. Gregory, *Reception*, pp. 317-21; contra Massaux, *Influence*, III, p. 94.