

Otto ZWIERLEIN, *Die antihäretischen Evangelienprologe und die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments*. Mainz-Stuttgart, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Franz Steiner Verlag, 2015. 1 vol., 86 p. (AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN UND DER LITERATUR. ABHANDLUNGEN DER GEISTES- UND SOZIALWISSENSCHAFTLICHEN KLASSE, 5). Prix : 15 €. ISBN 978-3-515-11210-9.

In 2009, Otto Zwierlein authored *Petrus in Rom*, recently received, *inter alia*, in an essay on the construction of memories about Peter in Rome, which agrees with his thesis that stories about Peter's sojourn in Rome emerged primarily as a means to contrast Gnosticism (Milton Moreland, *Moving Peter to Rome: Social Memory and Ritualized Space After 70 CE*, in *Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity*, ed. Karl Galinsky, Oxford, OUP, 2015, p. 344-366). In the book under review, Zwierlein studies the so-called "anti-Marcionite" Prologues to the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John preserved in manuscripts from the Vulgate (5th-12th centuries; after the introduction, Zwierlein provides a list of these mss. and a *stemma codicum*). Their anti-Marcionite nature was highlighted by Donatien de Bruyne (*Les plus anciens prologues latins des Évangiles*, RBen 40 [1928], p. 193-214), who also argued for their redaction by a single Christian author. Zwierlein agrees about the latter point, noting that linguistic parallels and the repetition of the same elements of content suggest that the author was the same for the three Prologues. However, Zwierlein deems these Prologues anti-heretical rather than exclusively anti-Marcionite, but he refers to the use of the anti-Marcionite Prologues in recent research into Marcion, especially by Markus Vinzent (*Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, Leuven: Peeters, 2014) and Matthias Klinghardt (see all of these works: *Markion vs. Lukas*, NTS 52 [2006], p. 484-513; *The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion*, NovT 50 [2008], p. 1-27; *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, I-II, Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 2015). But Zwierlein refrains from either supporting or rejecting Vinzent's hypothesis that Marcion's Gospel was the first representative of the εὐαγγέλιον genre and the Gospels that became canonical were a reaction against Marcion's Gospel (5-7). Zwierlein rather focuses on the Prologues, their dating, and their historical value. These Prologues have usually been regarded as composed in Greek, although they are extant in Latin; only the Luke Prologue is extant in Greek, in one single copy and a fragment. All Prologues are available in a shorter and a longer version, the latter being generally deemed by scholars an expanded redaction of the original with the addition of elements drawn from Jerome's *De viris illustribus*. According to Zwierlein, on the contrary, the original version was the longer one, which was shortened later (as is argued in the first part of the book). He notes that the endings of clauses in the longer redaction work well rhythmically, while in the shorter version this pattern is disrupted, which points to the posteriority of the abbreviated version rather than the reversal. Likewise, the fact that anti-Marcionite elements are present in the longer recension, but not in the shorter suggests the same conclusion. Later, the shorter version was translated into Greek. The Greek form, therefore, does not represent the original redaction (as is argued in the second part, based on a minute philological analysis of the Lukan Prologue in both the Greek and the Latin redactions). Zwierlein surmises, in the third part of his monograph, that the anti-Marcionite Prologues

originated from a catalogue of Christian authors from about 300-350 CE, utilized by Jerome in his *De viris illustribus* as well. This common source, probably based on a lost work by Eusebius of Caesarea (as is argued in the fourth part), would explain the striking phrasal similarities between our Prologues and Jerome's work. According to Zwierlein, indeed, both Jerome and the anonymous redactor of the Prologues, independently of one another, used the same Latin catalogue of Christian authors (60). This may derive from Eusebius' descriptive list (πίνακες) of books kept in Pamphilus Martyr's library of Caesarea that Eusebius included in *Vita Pamphili* in 315-320 (*HE* 6.32.3). Pamphilus, a disciple of a disciple of Origen of Alexandria, in his library preserved and expanded the library of Origen, which the latter had brought with himself in his move from Alexandria to Caesarea. In Pamphilus' library, which in turn was inherited by his disciple Eusebius, the Gospels also were preserved and copied, along with Origen's works; thus, Eusebius' *Pinakes*, similar in structure to Callimachus' *Pinakes* of the library of Alexandria, may have contained information concerning the evangelists. Indeed, Origen himself and Clement in Alexandria, based on earlier sources among whom Papias, wrote a lot about the Gospels, their historical circumstances, and their authors (see my *The Birth of the Rome-Alexandria Connection: The Early Sources on Mark and Philo, and the Petrine Tradition*, *StPhilo* 23 [2011], p. 69-95). According to Zwierlein, if the Latin catalogue of Christian authors stems from ca. 330 CE, the Prologues will date to 340 or slightly later; therefore, the Prologues have little historical value for early Christian history and the formation of the New Testament. Of course, however, one should take into account the sources on which the catalogue was based. If this drew on Pamphilus, the sources were likely to be Origen, Clement, and their own sources, such as Papias. Indeed, the Prologue to John does mention Papias as its source. Zwierlein himself acknowledges that at least one part of this Prologue goes back with certainty to Papias, namely, the information that John, while he was still living on earth, circulated his Gospel among many people. But to Zwierlein's mind, the Prologue to John is interested in fourth-century heresies, and not so much in second-century ones; if it mentions Marcion at all, this is because Marcionism was still present in the fourth century (Epiphanius, *AH* 42.1). This is a somewhat circular argument; certainly, Marcionism was alive and strong, and represented a "danger" for the proto-orthodox church to refute and counter, only in the second-third century CE – the time of Origen, who was a strong anti-Marcionite (and anti-Gnostic) all his life long, not only in Alexandria (as supposed for instance by Ronald Heine, *Origen: Scholarship in the Service of the Church*, Oxford, OUP, 2011), but also in Caesarea, as is further demonstrated by his recently discovered Munich Homilies on the Psalms, but also by *Against Celsus* and other works. Indeed, the *Dialogue of Adamantius*, which arguably reflects Origen's authentic thought, was tampered with later, in the extant Greek redaction, but originally targeted the "heresies" that were a source of concern for Origen himself – especially Valentinian Gnosticism and Marcionism – rather than much later "heresies" (see my *The Dialogue of Adamantius: A Document of Origen's Thought? Part One*, in *Studia Patristica* LII, eds. Allen Brent, Markus Vinzent, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, p. 71-98; Eadem, *The Dialogue of Adamantius: A Document of Origen's Thought? Part Two*, in *Studia Patristica* LVI, vol. 4, ed. Markus Vinzent, Leuven, Peeters, 2013, p. 227-273; an Oxford critical edition, a critical study, and a

commentary are underway). Although some interpretations might appear questionable to some readers, nevertheless, for the accurate analysis and the many interesting insights on a number of points, this volume is a masterful contribution, precious to academic scholarship on the first Christian centuries. Ilaria L.E. RAMELLI

Robert DODARO, Cornelius MAYER & Christof MÜLLER (Ed.), *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. 4, fasc. 5/6 (« Pelagius, Pelagiani – Prouerbium, Prouerbia (Prv) »). Bâle, Schwabe, 2016. 1 vol. broché 27 x 19,7 cm, 320 p. Prix : 65 €. ISBN 978-3-7965-3504-8.

L'*Augustinus-Lexikon* est une entreprise amorcée en 1979, qui a déjà abouti à la publication de trois volumes parus entre 1986 et 2010. Son objectif est de constituer une encyclopédie recensant les ouvrages de l'évêque d'Hippone, les personnes (correspondants, amis ou adversaires) ayant tenu un rôle significatif dans son existence, ainsi que les notions essentielles de sa pensée. Elle offre, pour chaque entrée, un état de la recherche, une mise au point bibliographique ainsi qu'une synthèse complète qui aborde les points les plus sensibles de la doctrine augustinienne. Il est à l'évidence impossible de proposer un compte rendu exhaustif de l'ensemble des entrées de ce fascicule, et l'aperçu nécessairement partiel que nous en proposons ne remet bien sûr pas en cause l'éminente qualité des articles que nous ne citons pas. Grâce à un heureux hasard de l'ordre alphabétique, le fascicule offre au lecteur une précieuse mise au point sur l'influence qu'eurent sur la pensée d'Augustin la philosophie profane et les auteurs néo-platoniciens. Dans l'article *philosophia* (c. 719-742), G. Catapano évoque brièvement l'héritage classique d'Augustin, en soulignant l'importance de deux sources essentielles, Cicéron et le néo-platonisme ; la confrontation de ces sources avec, entre autres passages du Nouveau Testament, le prologue de Jean, engagea Augustin à comparer les philosophes profanes à des voyageurs qui, quoiqu'ils aient aperçu le terme de leur voyage depuis le sommet d'une montagne, refusent de parcourir le chemin qui les en sépare. Cette comparaison, jointe à l'évocation de la conversion d'Augustin et à l'étude des ouvrages composés pendant le séjour à Cassiciacum, permettent de réfuter comme anachronique la tentation de distinguer, au sein de l'œuvre augustinienne, un pan philosophique et un autre théologique (c. 726-728). Il ne faut pas considérer séparément la philosophie (*id est sapientiae studium*) et la religion : les néo-platoniciens ont compris des vérités fondamentales, mais n'ont pas voulu faire l'effort de reconnaître le Christ comme seul médiateur. Cela amène naturellement le lecteur aux articles consacrés à Platon et aux *libri platoniorum* (M. Erler, c. 755-764), ainsi qu'à Plotin et à Porphyre (A. Smith, c. 772-774 ; 705-804). Ce dernier propose tout d'abord une mise au point sur la connaissance, directe ou indirecte, qu'Augustin avait de Plotin, et rappelle (à partir de deux passages du *De ciuitate Dei*, c. 772-3) qu'il ne le connaissait probablement pas uniquement par l'intermédiaire de Porphyre, comme cela a pu être supposé. Si une médiation de Porphyre est indéniable, Augustin a également disposé de textes de Plotin, probablement en traduction latine, qui lui ont permis de préciser sa conception de vérités aussi essentielles que celle de l'éternité divine ou de l'impossibilité de penser le mal comme une substance. Porphyre est, quant à lui, l'auteur néo-platonicien le