



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClInPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Towards a New Reconstruction of the Text of Marcion's Gospel:  
History of Research, Sources, Methodology,  
and the Testimony of Tertullian

Dieter T. Roth

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. in  
New Testament and Christian Origins

The University of Edinburgh

2009

In fulfillment of regulation 2.5 of the University of Edinburgh Postgraduate (Research) Assessment Regulations, I hereby declare that I have composed the following thesis, that it is my own work, and that it has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Dieter T. Roth

## **Abstract**

This thesis provides the initial and foundational steps for a new reconstruction of the text of Marcion's Gospel. Though Harnack's 1924 magisterial work on Marcion remains valuable and important, shortcomings in his reconstructed text of the Marcionite scriptures, as well as advances in critical methodology, text criticism, and patristic studies have led to the recognition that new reconstructions of Marcion's scriptures are a scholarly desideratum. With the text of Marcion's *Apostolikon* examined and reconstructed in a 1995 work by Ulrich Schmid, this thesis provides the most important elements for a new examination and reconstruction of Marcion's *Euangelion*. Chapter 1 provides an extensive history of research, not only to provide the context and rationale for the present work, but also to provide the first in-depth scholarly survey of work on Marcion's Gospel in 150 years. In addition, since several flaws in earlier studies arose out of a lack of an accurate understanding of the *status quaestionis* at various points in the history of research on Marcion's Gospel, by considering and engaging with previous scholarship such errors can be avoided. Chapter 2 begins with a consideration of the sources for Marcion's Gospel and provides a comprehensive listing of verses attested as present in, verses attested as absent from, and unattested verses of this Gospel. The chapter concludes with a methodological discussion, highlighting the particular importance of understanding the citation customs of the witnesses to Marcion's text and noting the significant citation customs of Tertullian demonstrated by Schmid's and my own research. Chapter 3 begins the analysis of the data found in Tertullian, the most extensive and important source for Marcion's Gospel. This chapter examines all of the verses that Tertullian attests for Marcion's Gospel that are also cited elsewhere in Tertullian's corpus and focuses particularly on how these multiply-cited passages provide insight into Tertullian's testimony to readings in Marcion's text. Chapter 4 continues the analysis of Tertullian's testimony by examining the remaining verses, i.e., those attested for Marcion's Gospel but not multiply-cited in Tertullian's corpus. Chapter 5 provides a reconstruction of the 328 verses in Marcion's Gospel for which Tertullian is the only witness and offers not only readings for Marcion's text, but also the relative certainty for those readings. Chapter 6 summarizes and concludes the thesis, along with brief mention of avenues for future research.

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>XI</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2 HISTORY OF RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.2.1 ANCIENT WITNESSES.....	5
1.2.2 QUESTIONING THE ANCIENT CONSENSUS .....	6
1.2.3 REAFFIRMING THE TRADITIONAL POSITION.....	7
1.2.4 THE PROLIFIC (AND PROBLEMATIC) PERIOD OF THE 1840S AND 1850S.....	8
1.2.4.1 F. C. Albert Schwegler (1843).....	8
1.2.4.2 Albrecht Ritschl (1846) .....	9
1.2.4.3 F. C. Baur (1846–1847).....	10
1.2.4.4 Gustav Volckmar and Adolf Hilgenfeld (1850) .....	10
1.2.4.5 F. C. Baur and Albrecht Ritschl (1851).....	12
1.2.4.6 Gustav Volckmar (1852) .....	13
1.2.4.7 Adolf Hilgenfeld (1853) .....	15
1.2.5 THE LATTER HALF OF THE 19 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY .....	16
1.2.6 THE EARLY 20 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY.....	20
1.2.7 POST-HARNACK STUDIES UP TO 1980 .....	25
1.2.8 1980 TO PRESENT .....	33
<b>CHAPTER 2 .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>2.1 THE SOURCES FOR MARCION’S GOSPEL.....</b>	<b>40</b>
2.1.1 SOURCES FOR RECONSTRUCTING MARCION’S GOSPEL .....	40
2.1.2 THE ATTESTATION OF MARCION’S GOSPEL.....	44
2.1.2.1 Attested Verses (Present).....	47
2.1.2.2 Attested Verses (Absent) .....	60
2.1.2.3 Unattested Verses .....	62
2.1.3 TERTULLIAN’S TESTIMONY TO MARCION’S GOSPEL .....	62
2.1.3.1 Statistical Analysis of Tertullian’s Testimony .....	62
2.1.3.2 Book Four of <i>Adversus Marcionem</i> .....	63

<b>2.2 THE METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED IN THIS STUDY .....</b>	<b>64</b>
2.2.1 MULTIPLE CITATIONS.....	64
2.2.2 TEXTUAL CRITICISM.....	67
2.2.3 TERTULLIAN’S CITATION CUSTOM.....	68
2.2.3.1 Variations in Conjunctions .....	68
2.2.3.2 Word Order and Altering the Position of Pronouns.....	69
2.2.3.3 Use of Future Tense.....	70
2.2.3.4 General Inclination to Matthean Accounts .....	70
<b>CHAPTER 3 .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>3.1 TERTULLIAN AS A SOURCE: MULTIPLE CITATIONS .....</b>	<b>72</b>
3.1.1 LUKE 4:32 .....	72
3.1.2 LUKE 4:34 .....	73
3.1.3 LUKE 5:11 .....	75
3.1.4 LUKE 5:20–21 .....	75
3.1.5 LUKE 5:31 .....	76
3.1.6 LUKE 5:36–37 .....	77
3.1.7 LUKE 6:5 .....	78
3.1.8 LUKE 6:20 .....	79
3.1.9 LUKE 6:21 .....	80
3.1.10 LUKE 6:22 .....	81
3.1.11 LUKE 6:23 .....	83
3.1.12 LUKE 6:25 .....	84
3.1.13 LUKE 6:27–28 .....	85
3.1.14 LUKE 6:29 .....	87
3.1.15 LUKE 6:30 .....	88
3.1.16 LUKE 6:31 .....	89
3.1.17 LUKE 6:37 .....	90
3.1.18 LUKE 6:39 .....	91
3.1.19 LUKE 6:40 .....	91
3.1.20 LUKE 6:43 .....	92
3.1.21 LUKE 7:2, 9 .....	93
3.1.22 LUKE 7:18–20, 22–23.....	94
3.1.23 LUKE 7:26 .....	95

3.1.24 LUKE 7:27 .....	95
3.1.25 LUKE 7:28 .....	96
3.1.26 LUKE 8:17 .....	97
3.1.27 LUKE 8:18 .....	98
3.1.28 LUKE 8:20 .....	99
3.1.29 LUKE 8:21 .....	100
3.1.30 LUKE 9:22 .....	102
3.1.31 LUKE 9:24 .....	102
3.1.32 LUKE 9:26 .....	104
3.1.33 LUKE 9:28 .....	106
3.1.34 LUKE 9:29 .....	106
3.1.35 LUKE 9:30-32.....	107
3.1.36 LUKE 9:35 .....	108
3.1.37 LUKE 9:57-62 .....	109
3.1.38 LUKE 10:5 .....	111
3.1.39 LUKE 10:19 .....	111
3.1.40 LUKE 10:21 .....	112
3.1.41 LUKE 10:22 .....	115
3.1.42 LUKE 10:25 .....	117
3.1.43 LUKE 10:27 .....	117
3.1.44 LUKE 11:1 .....	119
3.1.45 LUKE 11:2 .....	120
3.1.46 LUKE 11:3 .....	123
3.1.47 LUKE 11:4 .....	124
3.1.48 LUKE 11:5 .....	126
3.1.49 LUKE 11:9 .....	126
3.1.50 LUKE 11:11-13 .....	127
3.1.51 LUKE 11:15 .....	128
3.1.52 LUKE 11:21-22.....	128
3.1.53 LUKE 11:27-28 .....	129
3.1.54 LUKE 11:29 .....	130
3.1.55 LUKE 11:33 .....	130
3.1.56 LUKE 11:52 .....	131
3.1.57 LUKE 12:2 .....	132
3.1.58 LUKE 12:3 .....	132

3.1.59 LUKE 12:4–5 .....	133
3.1.60 LUKE 12:8–9 .....	135
3.1.61 LUKE 12:10 .....	138
3.1.62 LUKE 12:16, 19–20.....	139
3.1.63 LUKE 12:24 .....	140
3.1.64 LUKE 12:27–28 .....	141
3.1.65 LUKE 12:31 .....	142
3.1.66 LUKE 12:57 .....	143
3.1.67 LUKE 12:58–59 .....	144
3.1.68 LUKE 13:28 .....	144
3.1.69 LUKE 14:14 .....	145
3.1.70 LUKE 15:3–10 .....	146
3.1.71 LUKE 16:9 .....	146
3.1.72 LUKE 16:13 .....	147
3.1.73 LUKE 16:16 .....	148
3.1.74 LUKE 16:22 .....	149
3.1.75 LUKE 16:29 .....	150
3.1.76 LUKE 17:4 .....	150
3.1.77 LUKE 18:10–14 .....	151
3.1.78 LUKE 18:22 .....	151
3.1.79 LUKE 18:38 .....	152
3.1.80 LUKE 18:42 .....	153
3.1.81 LUKE 19:10 .....	153
3.1.82 LUKE 20:1, 4 .....	154
3.1.83 LUKE 20:25 .....	155
3.1.84 LUKE 20:35–36 .....	156
3.1.85 LUKE 21:7 .....	159
3.1.86 LUKE 21:8 .....	160
3.1.87 LUKE 21:9–11 .....	160
3.1.88 LUKE 21:25–26 .....	161
3.1.89 LUKE 21:27–28 .....	162
3.1.90 LUKE 21:31 .....	164
3.1.91 LUKE 21:33 .....	165
3.1.92 LUKE 22:15 .....	166
3.1.93 LUKE 22:19 .....	166



3.1.94 LUKE 22:69 .....	167
3.1.95 LUKE 23:44-45 .....	168
3.1.96 LUKE 23:46 .....	168
3.1.97 LUKE 24:37-39 .....	169
<b>3.2 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 .....</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>4.1 TERTULLIAN AS A SOURCE: SINGLE CITATIONS .....</b>	<b>171</b>
4.1.1 LUKE 3:1 .....	171
4.1.2 LUKE 4:16, 23, 27, 29-30 .....	171
4.1.3 LUKE 4:31 .....	173
4.1.4 LUKE 4:35 .....	174
4.1.5 LUKE 4:40-41 .....	174
4.1.6 LUKE 4:42-43 .....	175
4.1.7 LUKE 5:2, 9-10 .....	176
4.1.8 LUKE 5:12-14 .....	177
4.1.9 LUKE 5:17-18, 24, 26.....	178
4.1.10 LUKE 5:27, 30 .....	178
4.1.11 LUKE 5:33-35 .....	179
4.1.12 LUKE 6:1-4 .....	180
4.1.13 LUKE 6:6-7, 9 .....	181
4.1.14 LUKE 6:12-14, 16.....	182
4.1.15 LUKE 6:17 .....	183
4.1.16 LUKE 6:24 .....	184
4.1.17 LUKE 6:26 .....	184
4.1.18 LUKE 6:34 .....	185
4.1.19 LUKE 6:35 .....	186
4.1.20 LUKE 6:36 .....	186
4.1.21 LUKE 6:38 .....	187
4.1.22 LUKE 6:41-42.....	188
4.1.23 LUKE 6:45 .....	188
4.1.24 LUKE 6:46 .....	188
4.1.25 LUKE 7:12, 14-16.....	189
4.1.26 LUKE 7:24 .....	190

4.1.27 LUKE 7:37–38, 47–48, 50.....	190
4.1.28 LUKE 8:2-3 .....	191
4.1.29 LUKE 8:4, 8 .....	192
4.1.30 LUKE 8:16 .....	192
4.1.31 LUKE 8:22–25 .....	193
4.1.32 LUKE 8:27–28, 30–32.....	194
4.1.33 LUKE 8:43–46, 48.....	195
4.1.34 LUKE 9:2–3, 5 .....	196
4.1.35 LUKE 9:7–8 .....	197
4.1.36 LUKE 9:12–14, 17.....	197
4.1.37 LUKE 9:20–21 .....	198
4.1.38 LUKE 9:33–34 .....	198
4.1.39 LUKE 9:41 .....	199
4.1.40 LUKE 9:46–48 .....	200
4.1.41 LUKE 9:54–55 .....	200
4.1.42 LUKE 10:1, 4, 7–11.....	201
4.1.43 LUKE 10:16 .....	203
4.1.44 LUKE 10:23–24 .....	203
4.1.45 LUKE 11:7–8 .....	203
4.1.46 LUKE 11:14, 18–20.....	204
4.1.47 LUKE 11:37–43 .....	205
4.1.48 LUKE 11:46–48 .....	208
4.1.49 LUKE 12:1 .....	209
4.1.50 LUKE 12:11–12 .....	209
4.1.51 LUKE 12:13–14 .....	210
4.1.52 LUKE 12:22–23 .....	211
4.1.53 LUKE 12:30 .....	212
4.1.54 LUKE 12:35–37 .....	212
4.1.55 LUKE 12:39–48 .....	213
4.1.56 LUKE 12:49, 51, 53.....	215
4.1.57 LUKE 12:56 .....	217
4.1.58 LUKE 13:14–15 .....	218
4.1.59 LUKE 13:19 .....	219
4.1.60 LUKE 13:20–21 .....	220
4.1.61 LUKE 13:25–27 .....	220

4.1.62 LUKE 14:12 .....	222
4.1.63 LUKE 14:16–24 .....	222
4.1.64 LUKE 16:2, 4–7.....	223
4.1.65 LUKE 16:11–12 .....	224
4.1.66 LUKE 16:14–15 .....	225
4.1.67 LUKE 16:17 .....	225
4.1.68 LUKE 16:18 .....	226
4.1.69 LUKE 16:23, 26.....	227
4.1.70 LUKE 17:1–3 .....	228
4.1.71 LUKE 17:11–12A, 14–19 .....	229
4.1.72 LUKE 17:20–21 .....	230
4.1.73 LUKE 17:25–26, 28, 32.....	231
4.1.74 LUKE 18:1–3, 5, 7.....	232
4.1.75 LUKE 18:18–21, 23.....	233
4.1.76 LUKE 18:35, 37, 39, 43 .....	234
4.1.77 LUKE 19:2, 6, 8–9.....	235
4.1.78 LUKE 19:11, 13, 22–23, 26.....	235
4.1.79 LUKE 20: 5–6, 7–8.....	236
4.1.80 LUKE 20:24 .....	237
4.1.81 LUKE 20:27–31, 33–34, 39.....	237
4.1.82 LUKE 20:41, 44.....	239
4.1.83 LUKE 21:12–17, 19.....	239
4.1.84 LUKE 21:20 .....	241
4.1.85 LUKE 21:29–30, 32.....	242
4.1.86 LUKE 21:34–35A.....	243
4.1.87 LUKE 21:37–38 .....	244
4.1.88 LUKE 22:1 .....	244
4.1.89 LUKE 22:3–5 .....	245
4.1.90 LUKE 22:20, 22.....	245
4.1.91 LUKE 22:33–34 .....	246
4.1.92 LUKE 22:48 .....	247
4.1.93 LUKE 22:66–67, 70–71.....	247
4.1.94 LUKE 23:1–3 .....	248
4.1.95 LUKE 23:7–9 .....	249
4.1.96 LUKE 23:18–19, 22–23, 25.....	250

4.1.97 LUKE 23:32–34 .....	250
4.1.98 LUKE 23:50–53, 55.....	251
4.1.99 LUKE 24:1, 3–4, 6–7, 9, 11 .....	251
4.1.100 LUKE 24:13, 15–16, 19, 21A, 25 .....	253
4.1.101 LUKE 24:41 .....	254
4.1.102 LUKE 24:47 .....	254
<b>4.2 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>254</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5 .....</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>5.1 MARCION’S GOSPEL ACCORDING TO TERTULLIAN .....</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>5.2 RECONSTRUCTION OF MARCION’S TEXT .....</b>	<b>257</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6 .....</b>	<b>274</b>
<b>6.1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>274</b>
<b>6.2 AVENUES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>276</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>277</b>

## Abbreviations

This thesis uses the standard abbreviations found in Patrick H. Alexander et al., *The SBL Handbook of Style For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). In addition, the following abbreviations are employed.

AARAS	AAR Academy Series
<i>Adam.</i>	Pseudo-Origen <i>Adamantius Dialogue</i> ( <i>ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ</i> ).
ANatG	Aus Natur und Geisteswelt
CCER	<i>Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan</i>
CCERChs	Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan [Cahier hors-série]
CEA	Collection des Études Augustiniennes
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
<i>ComTh</i>	<i>Commentationes Theologicae</i>
ECTT	Eastern Christian Texts in Translation
EH	Europäische Hochschulschriften
<i>ELit</i>	<i>Ephemerides Liturgicae</i>
<i>FN</i>	<i>Filologia Neotestamentaria</i>
FonCh	Fontes Christiani
<i>FR</i>	<i>Fortnightly Review</i>
IGNTP	<i>The Gospel According to St. Luke</i> (ed. American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project; 2 vols.; The New Testament in Greek 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984–1987).
<i>Itala</i>	<i>Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung</i> , vol. 1–3 (ed. Adolf Jülicher, Walter Matzkow, and Kurt Aland; 2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970–1976).
JSSSup	Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement
<i>MREK</i>	<i>Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte</i>
NAb	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NHMS	Nag Hammadi & Manichean Studies
<i>NiTT</i>	<i>Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
OECS	Oxford Early Christian Studies
PaMS	Patristic Monograph Series
<i>NTTRU</i>	<i>New Testament Textual Research Update</i>

<i>SKPAW</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i>
<i>SKPAWB</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin</i>
<i>SSLC</i>	Latinitas christianorum primaeva: Studia ad sermonem latinum christianum pertinentia
<i>STA</i>	Studia et Testimonia Antiqua
<i>SVSL</i>	Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societen i Lund
<i>TDSA</i>	Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' antichità
<i>ThJ</i>	<i>Theologische Jahrbücher</i>
<i>VCSup</i>	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
<i>VIGMRgs</i>	Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für europäische Geschichte Mainz: Abteilung für abendländische Religionsgeschichte

Further, the following sigla, employed by Sources chrétiennes for the manuscripts and editions of Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*, are utilized.

<i>M</i>	<i>Codex Montepessulanus</i>
<i>F</i>	<i>Codex Florentinus Magliabechianus</i>
<i>X</i>	<i>Codex Luxemburgensis</i>
<i>G</i>	<i>Codex Gorziensis</i>
<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub>	<i>Beati Rhenani edition princeps, Basileae, 1521</i>
<i>R</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>Beati Rhenani edition princeps, Basileae, 1528</i>
<i>R</i> <sub>3</sub>	<i>Beati Rhenani edition princeps, Basileae, 1539</i>
$\theta$	<i>consensus codicum M F X et Rhenani editionum</i>
$\beta$	<i>consensus codicum F X et Rhenani editionum</i>
$\gamma$	<i>consensus codicum F X</i>

# Chapter 1

## 1.1 Introduction

Any serious discussion of the NT text and canon in the second century must at some point interact with Marcion's **ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ** and **ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ**, for Marcion's scriptures—one Gospel and ten Pauline letters—rightly figure prominently in text-critical and canon-formation studies. More specifically, Marcion's Gospel plays an especially important role in the discussions concerning the state, use, and collection of the canonical Gospels in the second century.<sup>1</sup> As such, there are several elements of contemporary research that are directly dependent upon our knowledge of Marcion's Gospel text. First, and most obviously, there is the on-going debate concerning the relationship between and relative priority of Marcion's Gospel and Luke.<sup>2</sup> Second, the related question of the existence of redactional stages of Luke, including debates about the existence of any type of *Ur-Lukas*, is also directly related to scholarly knowledge of Marcion's text. Third, since Marcion's Gospel represents a text that is clearly in some manner related to Luke *and* prior to the middle of the second century, Marcion's Gospel figures prominently in scholarly knowledge of the textual history of Luke.<sup>3</sup> Finally, understanding Marcion's place in the history of the formation of the Fourfold Gospel could be advanced with a firmer basis for evaluating whether the content and readings of his text reflect a historical context prior or subsequent to the existence of this collection.

Over the past eighty years the trajectory of most scholarly work on Marcion and Marcion's texts has been set by the monumental work of Adolf von Harnack.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> François Bovon observes, "An understanding of the life and fate of the Gospels during the second century is decisive for a better knowledge not only of the patristic period, but also of the text of the Gospels themselves," and that "from a New Testament point of view, the quarrel between Marcion and Tertullian over the Gospel of Luke is extremely relevant" ("Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect," *HTR* 85 [1992]: 176, 177).

<sup>2</sup> Whenever "Luke" is used in this work without qualification it refers to the text of canonical Luke as we know it.

<sup>3</sup> J. K. Elliott advocates that "we ought to work more systematically on the writings of Marcion and Irenaeus to learn what they can reveal about the Biblical texts and specifically the New Testament text-types which they were using and quoting" ("The New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century," *NTTRU* 8 [2000]: 12).

<sup>4</sup> Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (TU 45; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1921; 2d ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996 [hereafter *Marcion*<sup>1</sup> refers to the 1<sup>st</sup> ed. and *Marcion* to the 2d ed.]). In the preface to *Marcion und seine*

Despite its tremendous value, shortcomings in Harnack's reconstructed text of the Marcionite scriptures, as well as advances in critical methodology, text criticism, and patristic studies have led to the recognition that new reconstructions of Marcion's scriptures are a scholarly desideratum. For example, Barbara Aland expresses the sentiment, "Wichtiges Forschungsdesiderat ist eine neue Gesamtrekonstruktion der marcionitischen Bibel."<sup>5</sup> Confirming Aland's view is Gerhard May's comment "die Aufgabe der Rekonstruktion von Markions Bibel [ist] bis heute nicht befriedigend gelöst,"<sup>6</sup> as well as Karlmann Beyschlag's contention that the reconstruction of Marcion's scriptures "die Hauptaufgabe der heutigen Marcionforschung bildet."<sup>7</sup>

In recognition of this lacuna, recent monographs arising from doctoral theses have focused on critically establishing Marcion's *Apostolikon* and have brought much light to this "half" of Marcion's canon.<sup>8</sup> Unfortunately, the most recent works

---

*kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Marcion and His Impact on Church History* (ed. Gerhard May, Katharina Greschat, and Martin Meiser; TU 150; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), V, May and Greschat observe, "Das Erscheinen von Harnacks Buch hatte, weil er das Thema nahezu erschöpfend zu behandeln schien, die Marcionforschung zeitweilig fast zum Stillstand gebracht. Seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg ist das Interesse an Marcion zunehmend gewachsen." Harnack is still invaluable for Marcion studies, and some truth remains in Helmut Koester's statement "All further research is based on Harnack's work" (*History and Literature of Early Christianity* [vol. 2 of *Introduction to the New Testament*; trans. Helmut Köster; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982], 329). At the same time, scholars are advancing beyond Harnack's portrait of Marcion. See, for example, David L. Balás, "Marcion Revisited: A 'Post-Harnack' Perspective," in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers* (ed. W. Eugene March; San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980), 95–108 and Gerhard May, "Marcion ohne Harnack," in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, 1–7.

<sup>5</sup> Barbara Aland, "Marcion (ca. 85–160)/Marcioniten," *TRE* 22:1 (1992): 90. Kurt and Barbara Aland had previously expressed the sentiment: "Although past generations have produced a whole range of studies on the text of the New Testament used by various Church Fathers, there is not one of them which would not be worth doing over, beginning with Marcion and continuing with Justin and Irenaeus. For Marcion, Adolf Harnack's collection would still be the basis, but it could be improved and developed throughout" (*The Text of the New Testament* [trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989], 172). Similar thoughts are expressed by J. Neville Birdsall, "The Western Text in the Second Century," in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (ed. William L. Petersen; CJA 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 9–10; Matthias Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Lukas: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falles," *NTS* 52 (2006): 491; and Gilles Quispel, "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament," *VC* 52 (1998): 349.

<sup>6</sup> Gerhard May, "Markion in seiner Zeit" in *Gerhard May: Markion: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. Katharina Greschat and Martin Meiser; VIGMRgs 68; Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2005), 8. Although appearing here for the first time in print, May notes that the article was written in 1992. See also Gerhard May, "Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions," *SecCent* 6 (1987–1988): 133.

<sup>7</sup> Karlmann Beyschlag, "Marcion von Sinope," in *Alte Kirche I* (vol. 1 of *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Martin Greschat; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984), 71.

<sup>8</sup> See especially Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe* (ANTF 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995). An attempt to reconstruct the pre-Marcion Pauline text was set forth in John J. Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition*



engaging the text of Marcion's *Euangelion* by David S. Williams and Kenji Tsutsui, and to some extent Joseph B. Tyson and Matthias Klinghardt, have not been nearly as helpful and are quite limited in their usefulness for critically reconstructing Marcion's Gospel text or drawing any firm conclusions concerning that text.<sup>9</sup> This regrettable reality is due either to the works ultimately focusing on issues other than the reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel text or to problematic approaches employed in their studies when they do consider elements related to such a reconstruction. Thus, a need for a new critically and methodologically controlled reconstruction of Marcion's *Euangelion* remains; it is this task that will be initiated in the present work.

This study provides the foundational and most important steps in revisiting the question of the content and readings of Marcion's Gospel; yet, for three primary reasons, it cannot provide a comprehensive study in the allotted space. First, before actually reconstructing the text, it is necessary to consider the sources for such a reconstruction, and especially the methodology employed in utilizing those sources. These important issues are addressed in chapter two, where an overview of the data found in the sources is provided along with the methodology used in this study. Second, this overview of the sources reveals the large amount of data that must be analyzed for a full reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel text. The data include 438 verses referenced by Tertullian, 104 verses referenced in 78 scholia in Epiphanius, at least 56 verses in *Adam.*, and 29 verses from eleven other sources. By means of comparison, Ulrich Schmid's work on the *Apostolikon* revealed the need to analyze 260 citations and allusions in Tertullian, 40 scholia in Epiphanius, 35 citations in *Adam.*, 9 citations in Origen, and 7 citations in Jerome in order to reconstruct that text.<sup>10</sup> Thus, there is nearly twice as much data for Marcion's Gospel text that must be sifted before a new reconstruction of this document can be attempted. Unfortunately, it is not possible to consider all the data within the confines of this

---

*of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion* (CBQMS 21; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989).

<sup>9</sup> See David S. Williams, "Marcion's Gospel: Reconsidered" (M.A. thesis, The University of Georgia, 1982), with the most salient aspects of his thesis found in his article "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," *JBL* 108 (1989): 477–96; Kenji Tsutsui, "Das Evangelium Marcions: Ein neuer Versuch der Textrekonstruktion," *AJBI* 18 (1992): 67–132; Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006); and Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Lukas," 484–513. The reasons for this negative evaluation are discussed in greater detail below.

<sup>10</sup> See Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 115n30, 210–35, 237–39, and 240–42.

thesis. At the same time, however, in chapters three and four the present study takes the most significant step towards a new reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel by providing an analysis of the testimony of Tertullian, whose work *Adversus Marcionem* overwhelmingly provides the most extensive and important testimony to Marcion's Gospel. Chapter five then provides a reconstruction of all the verses for which Tertullian is the only witness.

Third, before embarking on a new reconstruction of Marcion's text, understanding the history of previous studies of Marcion's Gospel is, from several vantage points, absolutely essential.<sup>11</sup> The strengths, and particularly the weaknesses, of the methods employed in previous attempts to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel must be highlighted as part of the rationale for attempting a new reconstruction. Further, an accurate overview of the full range of prior work has become particularly necessary since there has been no extensive history of research in works dealing with Marcion's Gospel in nearly 150 years.<sup>12</sup> Finally, since several flaws in earlier studies are due to a lack of an accurate understanding of the *status quaestionis* at various

---

<sup>11</sup> Previous overviews of research on Marcion's Gospel in works focusing on his *Euangelion* can be found in August Hahn, *Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt, nebst dem vollständigsten Beweise dargestellt, daß es nicht selbstständig, sondern ein verstümmeltes und verfälschtes Lukas-Evangelium war, den Freunden des Neuen Testaments und den Kritikern insbesondere, namentlich Herrn Hofrath, Ritter und Professor Dr. Eichhorn zur strengen Prüfung vorgelegt* (Königsberg: Universitäts Buchhandlung, 1823), 245–83; Albrecht Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas* (Tübingen: Osiander'sche Buchhandlung, 1846), 5–20; Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ältesten Evangelien-Literatur* (Halle: C. A. Schwetschke, 1850), 391–94; Gustav Volckmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions: Text und Kritik mit Rücksicht auf die Evangelien des Märtyrers Justin, der Clementinen und der apostolischen Väter: Eine Revision der neuern Untersuchungen nach den Quellen selbst zur Textesbestimmung und Erklärung des Lucas-Evangeliums* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1852), 1–24; Adolf von Harnack, *Adolf Harnack, Marcion: der moderne Gläubige des 2. Jahrhunderts, der erste Reformator, die Dorpater Preisschrift (1870): kritische Edition des handschriftlichen Exemplars mit einem Anhang* (ed. Friedemann Steck; TU 149; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 121–26. Though helpful in some respects, the more recent summaries by John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), 78–83; Williams, "Marcion's Gospel: Reconsidered," 3–14; R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity, An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (AARAS 46; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1984), xi–xiii; Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 83–85; and Matthias Klinghardt, "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion," *NovT* 50 (2008): 5–7 and idem, "Markion vs. Lukas," 485–91, because of some significant inaccuracies, must be used with caution (see n. 13).

<sup>12</sup> In many ways Harnack's recently rediscovered *Dorpater Preisschrift (1870)* was the last work to provide an extensive interaction with previous scholarship on Marcion's Gospel. Significant, though not exhaustive, bibliographies of works dealing with Marcion more generally can be found in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, 313–22 and especially Harnack, *Marcion: L'évangile du Dieu étranger: Contribution à l'histoire de la foundation de l'Église catholique* (trans. Bernard Laurent; Patrimoine christianisme; Paris: Cerf, 2003), 488–561.

points in the history of research on Marcion's Gospel, it is only by engaging previous scholarship on Marcion's Gospel that those errors can be avoided.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, this first chapter is devoted to the history of research, not only to make available a comprehensive survey for contemporary scholarship engaged in various questions relating to Marcion and to his Gospel, but also to provide the proper context in which a new reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel must be undertaken.

## 1.2 History of Research

### 1.2.1 Ancient Witnesses

As background to the following discussion it is important to note that there are no extant manuscripts of any of Marcion's works and all that is known about his Gospel is found in the writings of his adversaries. The church fathers uniformly agreed that Marcion's Gospel was simply a mutilated version of Luke;<sup>14</sup> however, none of these fathers had an interest in merely compiling or setting forth the differences between the texts.<sup>15</sup> For example, Tertullian and Epiphanius both indicated that they were interacting with Marcion's Gospel in order to refute him on the basis of his own scripture, and were therefore primarily interested in the content of Marcion's text to the extent that it could be used against him.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, in the Pseudo-Origen *Adamantius Dialogue* the claims and comments of the Marcionites Megethius and Marcus, including "citations" from their Gospel, are presented in the context of being refuted by their orthodox opponent.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Perhaps the most obvious example of this phenomenon are the several significant omissions, misunderstandings, and mischaracterizations of the mid-nineteenth century research in Germany as presented in recent, shorter discussions of the history of research on Marcion's Gospel. On this issue in particular see Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate," *JBL* 127 (2008): 513–27. In addition, problems with Tsutsui's methodology (discussed below under 1.2.8 1980 to Present) are directly related to his lack of engagement with the most recent works dealing with the reconstruction of Marcion's scriptures.

<sup>14</sup> This fact has been recognized throughout the history of research. See, among the more prominent of Marcion's opponents: Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.27.2 (similarly, 1.27.4, 3.11.7, 3.12.12, and 3.14.4); Tertullian, *Marc.* 1.1.4–5 and 4.2–6, *Praescr.* 38; and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.9.1 (similarly, 42.10.2 and 42.11.3). Hippolytus's comment apparently calling Marcion's Gospel "Mark" in *Haer.* 7.30.1 is generally recognized as an error (see Harnack, *Marcion*, 240\*n1).

<sup>15</sup> Tertullian only rarely made explicit reference to variations in Marcion's Gospel from Luke (see, for example, *Marc.* 4.22.16; 4.25.14; 4.29.13; and 4.38.7), though Epiphanius's list of 78 scholia on Marcion's Gospel do sometimes explicitly comment on what Marcion παρέκοψε or ἀπέκοψε (see *Pan.* 42.11.6).

<sup>16</sup> See Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.1.2 and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.10.1–3.

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, *Adam.* 1.10 (811b); 1.12 (812d); 1.15 (814a); and 1.17 (815c–d).

### 1.2.2 Questioning the Ancient Consensus

The first attempts to reassemble Marcion's text came in the context of challenges to the traditional view that Marcion had edited Luke to create his Gospel. As early as 1689 Richard Simon raised questions about the reliability of some elements in Tertullian's testimony concerning Marcion's Gospel,<sup>18</sup> though it is generally agreed that J. S. Semler was the first scholar to question the consensus of the early church that Marcion had mutilated Luke. He initially did so in the notes to his 1776 German translation of Simon's *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament*, but addressed the issue more expansively several years later in the preface of another translated volume.<sup>19</sup> Following Semler, J. F. C. Loeffler and Heinrich Corrodi supported the rejection of the traditional position, and in the ensuing decades several other scholars, with their own nuances, followed this new line of thinking.<sup>20</sup> At the beginning of the nineteenth century J. G. Eichhorn provided

---

<sup>18</sup> See Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament, où l'on établit la vérité des actes sur lesquels la religion Chrétienne est fondée* (Rotterdam: Reiner Leers, 1689), 127–28. A major component in Simon's discounting the value of Tertullian's testimony was that Tertullian, despite stating that Marcion mutilated Luke, appears to accuse him of excising passages found in Matthew. For discussion of this issue see Dieter T. Roth, "Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*," *JTS* 59 (2008): 580–97.

<sup>19</sup> See Richard Simon, *Richard Simons Kritische Historie des Textes des neuen Testaments* (trans. Heinrich Matthias August Cramer; preface and notes by D. Johann Salomon Semler; Halle: Bey J. J. Gebauers Witwe und Joh. Jacob Gebauer, 1776) and Thomas Townson, *Abhandlungen über die vier Evangelien: Erster Theil mit vielen Zusätzen und einer Vorrede über Markions Evangelium von D. Joh. Salomo Semler* (trans. Joh. Salomo Semler; Leipzig: Weygandschen Buchhandlung, 1783), preface of 62 unnumbered pages. Semler had also addressed the issue in his *Paraphrasis Epistolae ad Galatas cum prolegomenis, notis, et varietate lectionis latinae* (Halle: Carol Hermann Hemmerde, 1779), 13–18.

<sup>20</sup> See Heinrich Corrodi, *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüdischen und christlichen Bibelkanons* (2 vols.; Halle: Curts Witwe, 1792), esp. 2:169; Josias F. C. Loeffler, "Marcionem Paulli epistolas et Lucae evangelium adulterasse dubitatur," *ComTh* 1 (1794): 180–218; Johann Adrian Bolton, *Der Bericht des Lukas von Jesu dem Messia: Uebersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet* (Altona: Johann Heinrich Kaven, 1796), XXII–XL; Johann E. C. Schmidt, "Ueber das ächte Evangelium des Lucas, eine Vermuthung," *MREK* 5 (1796): 468–520 [where Schmidt advocated that Marcion's Gospel was the original Luke] and Schmidt, *Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (7 vols.; 2d ed.; Giessen: Georg Friedrich Heyer, 1824–1834), 1:257–63, 383 [where Schmidt changed his position to contend that Marcion's Gospel and Luke were redactionally related (p. 262) or perhaps that Marcion's Gospel was based on Matthew (p. 383)]; Leonhard Bertholdt, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des alten und neuen Testaments* (5 vols.; Erlangen: Johann Jacob Palm, 1813), 3:1293–95; Johann K. L. Gieseler, *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1818), 22–25 [N.B., Hahn's arguments convinced Gieseler to change his position; see Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (4 vols.; 4th ed.; Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1844), 1:194]; and Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Einleitung ins neue Testament: Aus Schleiermacher's handschriftlichen Nachlasse und nachgeschriebenen Vorlesungen, mit einer Vorrede von Dr. Friedrich Lücke* (vol. 8 of *Friedrich Schleiermacher's sämtliche Werke: Erste Abtheilung, Zur Theologie*; ed. G. Wolde; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1845), 64–65, 197–98, and 214–15 [Schleiermacher's *Einleitung* is based on lectures he delivered in 1829 and 1831/1832]. One of the earliest references to

an extended discussion on the issue and a summary of the various objections that had been entered against the traditional viewpoint.<sup>21</sup>

### 1.2.3 Reaffirming the Traditional Position

Although some scholars had previously objected to the conclusions of these critics,<sup>22</sup> it was the independent studies by August Hahn and Hermann Olshausen that, for a few decades at least, reestablished the traditional position that Marcion had in fact edited Luke to create his Gospel.<sup>23</sup> Hahn's work was particularly important in that he provided the first attempt to present comprehensively Marcion's Gospel as reconstructed from the available sources. Even those who disagreed with his conclusions recognized his important contribution in correcting Eichhorn's over-reliance on Epiphanius<sup>24</sup> and for the first time more sufficiently compiling the data for reconstructing Marcion's Gospel.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, Schulz's critical review

---

Loeffler's dissertation in support of the rejection of the traditional position in an English language publication is found in Marsh's notes to Johann David Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament: Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German and Considerably Augmented with Notes and a Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of the Three First Gospels* (trans. Herbert Marsh; 4 vols.; London: F. & C. Rivington, 1793–1801), 3:2.159–60.

<sup>21</sup> Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (5 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804), 1:40–78. See also his slightly expanded handling of the issue in *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2d ed.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1820), 1:43–84.

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, Gottlob Christian Storr, *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis* (Tübingen: J. F. Heerbrandt, 1786), 254–65 [his discussion is found unaltered and on the same pages in the 2d ed. of 1810]; Michael Arneht, *Ueber die Bekanntschaft Marcions mit unserem Canon des neuen Bundes, und insbesondere über das Evangelium desselben* (Linz: C. Haslinger, 1809), esp. 41; John Leonhard Hug, *An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament* (trans. Daniel Guildford Wait; 2 vols.; London: C. & J. Rivington, 1827), 1:72–74 [the translation is of the original 1808 German edition]; and Peter Alois Gratz, *Kritische Untersuchungen über Marcions Evangelium* (Tübingen: C. F. Osianderschen Buchhandlung, 1818), esp. 83.

<sup>23</sup> See Hahn, *Das Evangelium Marcions* and Hermann Olshausen, *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien aus der Geschichte der zwei ersten Jahrhunderte erwiesen* (Königsberg: Aug. Wilh. Unzer., 1823), 104–215, 358–77.

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, David Schulz, review of J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* and W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments*, *TSK* 2 (1829): 588.

<sup>25</sup> Albrecht Ritschl, who in 1846 strongly argued against Hahn's conclusions, stated that it is he "deren Verdienst es ist, auf eine vollständig genügende Art die Data zur Herstellung des Marcionitischen Textes zusammengestellt zu haben" (Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 15–16). Hahn provided a continuous Greek text of Marcion's Gospel in Ioannis Caroli Thilo, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti: e libris editis et manuscriptis, maxime gallicanis, germanicis et italicis, collectus, recensitus notisque et prolegomenis illustratus* (Leipzig: Frid. Christ. Guilielmi Vogel, 1832), 1:401–86 [though marked as vol. 1, it appears that it was the only volume published]. See James Hamlyn Hill, *The Gospel of the Lord: An Early Version which was Circulated by Marcion of Sinope as the Original Gospel* (Guernsey: John Whitehead / T. M. Bichard, 1891) for an English translation based primarily on this text.

revealed the major problems with the text offered by Hahn: (1) The citations found embedded in the discourses of the sources were usually assumed to be completely accurate quotations, and (2) Passages of Luke over which Tertullian passes in silence were considered present or absent in Marcion's text based on assumptions of whether the passage would have agreed with or contradicted Marcion's teaching.<sup>26</sup> These problems played a prominent role in the 1840s when the debate about Marcion's Gospel was reignited and then raged with considerable furor into the 1850s.

### **1.2.4 The Prolific (and Problematic) Period of the 1840s and 1850s<sup>27</sup>**

#### 1.2.4.1 F. C. Albert Schwegler (1843)

Schwegler's 1843 review of the 4<sup>th</sup> edition of W. M. L. de Wette's *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments* marked the beginning of the most intense period of investigation of Marcion's Gospel in the modern era.<sup>28</sup> Schwegler believed that the theory that Marcion had edited Luke based on his theological proclivities was completely untenable.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, Schwegler concluded that Marcion's Gospel was "eine ältere, unabhängige, in paulinischen Kreisen fortgepflanzte Evangelienschrift," because even though such a text is not attested by any other ancient witnesses it "verwickelt sich aber wenigstens nicht in so zahlreiche, unauflösliche Widersprüche und Schwierigkeiten, wie die Hypothese vom verstümmelten Lukas."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> David Schulz, "Review of Eichhorn and de Wette," 591. See also G. Fr. Franck, "Ueber das Evangelium Marcion's und sein Verhältnis zum Lukas-Evangelium," *TSK* 28 (1855): 299 and Harnack, *Marcion*, 177\*-78\*.

<sup>27</sup> The work on Marcion's Gospel during this time period is also discussed in Roth, "Marcion's Gospel and Luke," 514-21. Though there is some overlap in the discussions, certain details provided in my article are not repeated here, and some of the focus on methodology here does not appear in my article.

<sup>28</sup> F. C. Albert Schwegler, review of W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., *ThJ* 2 (1843): 544-90. An only slightly edited repetition of the arguments presented in this review appeared in *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues., 1846), 1:260-84.

<sup>29</sup> Schwegler, "Review of de Wette *Lehrbuch*," 577.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 590.

#### 1.2.4.2 Albrecht Ritschl (1846)

Albrecht Ritschl advanced this line of thought in his 1846 work *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas*.<sup>31</sup> In the preface he set forth the thesis of his monograph: “dass das Evangelium Marcions nicht eine Verstümmelung des Evangeliums des Lucas, sondern der Grundstamm desselben ist.”<sup>32</sup> Therefore, Ritschl contended that one ultimately should conclude that Luke has *added* that which was missing in Marcion’s Gospel rather than conclude that Marcion *excised* anything from Luke.<sup>33</sup>

Methodologically, Ritschl proposed that the evaluation of Marcion’s Gospel be based upon a criterion of connection (*Zusammenhang*), which assumed that redactional activity, because it introduces foreign material, can be recognized as destructive of the original connection in or between pericopes.<sup>34</sup> Though the other scholars involved in these debates expressed some reservations about this criterion, overall they tended to be favorably disposed to Ritschl’s criterion and continued to invoke it in the discussions.<sup>35</sup> Despite the support of other scholars, however, Ritschl’s criterion must ultimately be viewed as a failed attempt for objectivity in reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel. First, in his 1846 work Ritschl offered two examples from the Synoptic Gospels of how his criterion provided objective and assured results. The only problem was that the examples were used to prove that Mark was written subsequent to Matthew and Luke, a position which Ritschl embraced at the time, but had rejected by 1851.<sup>36</sup> Given that Ritschl himself no

---

<sup>31</sup> Reference to this work was made in n. 11.

<sup>32</sup> Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, v.

<sup>33</sup> See *ibid.*, 73–130. The final sections of the work deal with a comparison of Marcion’s text with that of Justin Martyr (pp. 130–51) and with Marcion’s *Apostolikon* (pp. 151–71).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, vi, 56.

<sup>35</sup> See the discussions below of Baur, Hilgenfeld, and Volckmar.

<sup>36</sup> Ritschl’s examples were Mark 9:5–6 where Peter’s response is said to have come from Matt 17:6 and Mark 12:34 where Jesus’ words are thought to have been inserted into Luke 20:20–39 before v. 40 (*Das Evangelium Marcions*, 57–58). Ritschl embraced Markan priority in his article “Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien,” *ThJ* 10 (1851): 480–538. In the fifth of seven observations on the debates concerning Marcion’s Gospel Eduard Reuss stated “Das System von einem vor-marcionitischen Ur-Lucas und nach-marcionitischen kanonischen steht und fällt mit der Behauptung dass Marcus den letztern ausgeschrieben habe” (*Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments* [4th ed.; Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke & Sohn (M. Bruhn), 1864], 245). Although he may have overstated the point, it is true that the view of the order of and relationship between the Synoptic Gospels is not completely unrelated to the debates concerning Marcion’s Gospel.

longer would have been convinced by his own examples a few years later, one may rightly question just how useful or objective Ritschl's criterion really was. Second, in 1855, Franck published a particularly devastating critique in which he observed that not only is the criterion rather subjective, but also that the idea underlying it is fundamentally flawed. A lack of connection would more likely be the case in an original text rather than a text that had been redacted, precisely because a redactor often smoothes and improves the flow and connection of pericopes in a work.<sup>37</sup>

#### 1.2.4.3 F. C. Baur (1846–1847)

Shortly after Ritschl's work appeared, Baur built on Ritschl's thesis in comments on Marcion that were printed in identical form in two publications, an article and a book.<sup>38</sup> Despite the occasional critical remark concerning the manner in which Ritschl had applied his methodology,<sup>39</sup> Baur generally embraced Ritschl's work and agreed that Ritschl's criterion demonstrated that Marcion's text was original and Luke's text, secondary. In fact, Baur concluded that Marcion's Gospel was merely the text Marcion had at hand and that all the differences between it and Luke can only be seen as interpolations by a later hand.<sup>40</sup>

#### 1.2.4.4 Gustav Volckmar and Adolf Hilgenfeld (1850)

The position of Ritschl and Baur was challenged in 1850 by Gustav Volckmar and Adolf Hilgenfeld.<sup>41</sup> The thesis of Volckmar's article was that

---

<sup>37</sup> Franck, "Ueber das Evangelium Marcion's," 305–6, 311, and 351. This point was already made in a general way by Volckmar, "Ueber das Lukas-Evangelium," 123 and was reiterated by Theodor Zahn in *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (2 vols. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888–1892), 1:683.

<sup>38</sup> F. C. Baur, "Der Ursprung und Charakter des Lukas-Evangeliums," *ThJ* 5 (1846): 459–93 and idem, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung* (Tübingen: Ludw. Fr. Fues., 1847), 397–427.

<sup>39</sup> See Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 398–401.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 404, 424.

<sup>41</sup> Volckmar, "Ueber das Lukas-Evangelium nach seinem Verhältnis zu Marcion und seinem dogmatischen Charakter, mit besonderer Beziehung auf die kritischen Untersuchungen F. Ch. Baur's und A. Ritschl's," *ThJ* 9 (1850): 110–38 and 185–235 and Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 395–475. Prior to the appearance of these two works, D. Harting sought explicitly to vindicate the patristic view in *Quaestionem de Marcione Lucani Evangelii, ut fertur, adulteratore, collatis Hahnii, Ritschelii aliorumque sententiis, novo examini submisit* (Utrecht: Paddenburg, 1849). For comments on Harting's work see Johannes Friedrich Bleek, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. by William Urwick from the 2d ed; 2 vols; Clark's Foreign Theological Library 4<sup>th</sup> series, 24; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1864), 1:145.



Schwegler, Ritschl, and Baur, despite rightly criticizing the erroneous and prejudicial elements in earlier studies, were wrong in their view that Luke is “eine vermehrte und corrupte oder vielmehr „katholisirte“ Ausgabe” of Marcion’s Gospel.<sup>42</sup> In part one of his article Volckmar gave attention to the opening sections to Marcion’s Gospel and concluded “dass der Text des Marcion weit entfernt die Grundlage für unser Lukas-Evangelium zu sein, gerade von der Eigenthümlichkeit dieses abhängig ist.”<sup>43</sup> Though Volckmar believed that based on this section alone the fundamental relationship between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke had been revealed,<sup>44</sup> he continued in part two of his article to discuss additional passages that essentially, though with a few exceptions, served to confirm his point.<sup>45</sup>

At the same time, though disagreeing with Ritschl’s conclusions on the relationship between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke and noting potential pitfalls in the application of Ritschl’s method, Volckmar nevertheless was largely sympathetic with Ritschl’s methodology.<sup>46</sup> Volckmar was aware of the way in which the arguments concerning the inclusion or omission of a passage in Marcion’s text often invoked problematic or circular reasoning,<sup>47</sup> and so he commended Ritschl by stating that it is to his credit that “er [Ritschl] zum ersten Mal den Marciontext nicht bloß [*sic*] nach den angegebenen Lücken, sondern nach dem, was er [Marcion] stehen gelassen hat, in seinem Zusammenhang betrachtet hat.”<sup>48</sup>

Hilgenfeld entered the debate concerning Marcion’s Gospel in the third section of his larger work on Justin and Clement. He began by working through a new reconstruction of Marcion’s text since he was dissatisfied with the efforts of both Hahn and Ritschl. He rightly criticized those texts as having been significantly influenced by preconceived notions of the relationship between Marcion’s Gospel

---

<sup>42</sup> Volckmar, “Ueber das Lukas-Evangelium,” 116.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 138.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> In part two, Volckmar discussed Luke 11:29–35; 11:49–51; 12:6–7; 13:28–30; 13:31–35; 16:16–18; 20:1–19; 21:18; 20:27–39; 19:28–44; 8:19–21 [N.B., the citation is incorrectly given as “XIII, 19 ff.” on p. 195 of the article]; 24:25–27; 10:22; 4:38–39; 7:29–35; and 19:9. Yet, Volckmar also considered Luke 13:1–9 to have been added after Marcion; 12:6–7 and 21:18 possibly to be later additions; and the reading in Marcion’s Gospel in 8:20 potentially to preserve an original reading (ibid., 187, 191–92, 200, 208).

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 123–24.

<sup>47</sup> See the critical comments in ibid., 121.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 124.

and Luke, particularly as it related to passages on which the sources are silent.<sup>49</sup> Despite this recognition and his attempts to avoid the same pitfalls, Hilgenfeld nevertheless was not able completely to steer clear of the same types of problems.<sup>50</sup> Hilgenfeld ultimately came to the conclusion that though Marcion did edit and omit elements of Luke, and that in general, therefore, Luke is to be seen as the original document, there are nevertheless original elements in Marcion's Gospel.<sup>51</sup> Hilgenfeld thus set forth the view that Marcion knew and edited the Gospel according to Luke, but also that Luke received its present form after an additional, though minimal, redaction.<sup>52</sup>

#### 1.2.4.5 F. C. Baur and Albrecht Ritschl (1851)

The impact of the work of Hilgenfeld and Volckmar was felt immediately, evidenced by two facts in particular. First, both Baur and Ritschl promptly revisited the issue of Marcion's Gospel in 1851.<sup>53</sup> Second, and more importantly, in these publications both scholars altered their previous position, Baur through revision and Ritschl through retraction.

Baur now admitted that Marcion, because of his theological system, altered numerous passages in the Gospel that he had before him in order to create the text we now call Marcion's Gospel.<sup>54</sup> He was also convinced, however, that this reality could not account for all the differences one sees between Marcion's Gospel and Luke and that Marcion's Gospel often preserved original readings, either in the absence of

---

<sup>49</sup> Hilgenfeld observed that whether a passage on which the sources were silent was viewed as present or absent in Marcion's text was strongly influenced by whether one held the "mutilation" or "Ur-Lukas" hypothesis concerning Marcion's Gospel (*Kritische Untersuchungen*, 394). Hilgenfeld's reconstruction with comments is found on pp. 398–442.

<sup>50</sup> See the criticisms in Volckmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 20–21.

<sup>51</sup> Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 456, 471–74. Hilgenfeld argued that verses or pericopes whose absence is original include Luke 5:39, 13:1–5, and 19:18. In addition, verses in Marcion's text that contain original readings include Luke 10:22, 11:2, 13:28, 16:17, and 18:19 (*ibid.*, 469–71).

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 474.

<sup>53</sup> F. C. Baur, *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter, nebst einem Anhang über das Evangelium Marcion's* (Tübingen: Ludw. Friedr. Fues., 1851), 191–226 and Ritschl, "Über den gegenwärtigen Stand," 528–33.

<sup>54</sup> Baur, *Das Markusevangelium*, 191. According to Baur, examples of passages that Marcion changed can be found in Luke 8:19; 10:21, 25; 12:8–9; 11:29, 32, 49–52; 13:31–35; 18:31–34; 20:37–38; 21:21–22; 22:30; 22:35–38; 24: 25, 27, 32, 44, 45; 22:16; 15:11–32; 20:9–18; 18:37; 19:9 (*ibid.*, 192–95).

verses or in the wording of verses.<sup>55</sup> Most significant among these was Baur's new contention that Luke 4:16–30 and the entirety of chapters 1 and 2 were not originally part of Luke but only added after Marcion.<sup>56</sup> Thus, Baur's conclusion now became that Marcion's Gospel was an older version of Luke from which Marcion excised and to which Luke added.<sup>57</sup>

Ritschl's reaction to the works of Hilgenfeld and Volckmar was rather different. At the outset of the section on Luke in his article addressing the current state of Synoptic Gospels scholarship, Ritschl wrote, "Die von mir vorgetragene Hypothese, dass nicht Marcion das Evangelium Lukas geändert habe, sondern dass sein Evangelium eine Vorstufe des kanonischen Lukas sei, sehe ich als durch Volckmar und Hilgenfeld widerlegt an."<sup>58</sup> Ritschl continued by observing that Hilgenfeld's arguments had not returned the discussion to the traditional view since Hilgenfeld had argued that Luke received its present form after Marcion, and Baur's arguments carried Hilgenfeld's work further by positing a more radical revision by the same author who wrote the book of Acts.<sup>59</sup> Ritschl himself, however, was not convinced by either of these positions, and explicitly disagreed with Baur's new analysis of Luke 4 in Marcion's Gospel and with Baur's contention that the first two chapters of Luke were added to Luke after Marcion by the final redactor of the canonical gospel.<sup>60</sup> A letter from Baur to Ritschl dated 1. February 1851 highlighted the irony of these now divergent opinions, as Baur wrote, "Ich bin, wie Sie [Ritschl] sehen, ein weit treuerer Anhänger Ihrer Ansicht [from 1846], als Sie selbst."<sup>61</sup>

#### 1.2.4.6 Gustav Volckmar (1852)

With Baur and Ritschl having altered their previous views, albeit in different ways, Volckmar decided to devote a book-length study to Marcion's Gospel, which

---

<sup>55</sup> Baur listed these passages as Luke 1–2; 4:16–30; 5:39; 10:22; 12:6, 7; 13:1–5; 16:17; 19:28–46; 21:18; and possibly 11:30–32, 49–51; 13:28–35; 22:30 (ibid., 224).

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 212–14, 219.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 225.

<sup>58</sup> Ritschl, "Über den gegenwärtigen Stand," 528–29.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 529–33.

<sup>61</sup> Quoted in Otto Ritschl, *Albrecht Ritschls Leben* (2 vols.; Freiburg: Mohr [Siebeck], 1892), 1:181.

appeared in 1852.<sup>62</sup> In the preface Volckmar indicated that his views had in no small way diverged from earlier perspectives, including his own,<sup>63</sup> and at the end of his work he came to the conclusion that both the earlier views of Ritschl and Baur, as well as Hilgenfeld's and his own "mediating position" were to be rejected.<sup>64</sup> In fact, Volckmar concluded that not only is "our" Luke historically to be seen as the one used by Marcion and only shortened and changed by his particular *Tendenz*,<sup>65</sup> but also that "Die *geschichtliche Ansicht* also kann, was die *Integrität* oder Vollständigkeit unseres Lucas-Evangeliums betrifft, nicht mehr von Vermittlung reden sondern *so weit* die ältere Ansicht, die der Kirchenväter und der Apologetik als *völlig bestätigt* erklären [emphasis original]."<sup>66</sup> Perhaps most telling is Volckmar's comment that he now believed the view of the church fathers to have been confirmed in its entirety.<sup>67</sup>

Once again, however, Volckmar in his analysis remained sympathetic to Ritschl's criterion, stating "*der innere Zusammenhang allein* ist es, der die Haupt-Entscheidung darüber geben kann, welches dieser beiden Lucas-Evangelien dem andern zu Grunde liegt [emphasis original]."<sup>68</sup> In addition, Volckmar did not

---

<sup>62</sup> Reference to this work was made in n. 11.

<sup>63</sup> Volckmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, vi.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 255–56.

<sup>65</sup> Volckmar reaffirmed this view in *Die Evangelien: Oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten Text mit historisch-exegetischem Commentar* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Resiland], 1870). In this work he dated Luke to 95–105 C.E. and explicitly stated, "Dem Markion von 138 ist er vorangegangen" (*ibid.*, 653). In addition he referred to Marcionites excising chapters 1 and 2 from Luke because they were deemed to be unacceptable (*ibid.*, 8–9).

<sup>66</sup> Volckmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 255–56. Karl Reinhold Köstlin came to a similar conclusion in 1853 when he argued that though there may be some instances where Marcion's text might, or in fact does, preserve the original reading, in general the arguments presented by Baur and/or Hilgenfeld for the originality of readings in Marcion's Gospel cannot be sustained (*Der Ursprung und die Komposition der synoptischen Evangelien* [Stuttgart: Carl Mäcken, 1853], 302–9).

<sup>67</sup> Volckmar goes on to explain that he wrote "*so weit*" as it relates to the view of the church fathers because in the codices of Luke corrupt readings are present and that from a text-critical standpoint Marcion's text provides original readings in Luke 10:21, 22; 11:2; 12:38; 17:2; and 18:18. It is also possible that Marcion's text has variant readings in Luke 6:17; 12:32; 17:12; and 23:2 (Volckmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 256–57). Yet, Volckmar explained these variants as harmonizing moves towards Matthew or the OT and stated, "Eine spezifisch anti-marcionitische Tendenz zeigt sich dabei nirgends ausschliesslich [emphasis original]" (*ibid.*, 257). A few years later Franck argued that even these readings were not original in Marcion's Gospel ("Ueber das Evangelium Marcion's," 353–59).

<sup>68</sup> Volckmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 18. Volckmar does attempt to guard against a simplistic use of this criterion by noting that both Luke and Marcion's Gospel are secondary to "dem ursprünglichen [Gospel], welches auf diesem Gebiet fragelos am reinsten bei *Matthäus* oder *Marcus*

hesitate, in certain instances, to make definite decisions concerning the presence or absence of passages on which the sources are silent.<sup>69</sup> On the other hand, and more positively, it is worth noting that in this volume Volckmar paid greater attention to the qualities and characteristics of the sources involved in reconstructing Marcion's Gospel, even if Volckmar's analysis did not extend beyond those works or chapters of works by Tertullian, Epiphanius, and *Adam.*, which are directed against Marcion.<sup>70</sup>

#### 1.2.4.7 Adolf Hilgenfeld (1853)

In 1853 Hilgenfeld offered a second contribution to the discussion in an article interacting primarily, though not exclusively, with Volckmar's 1852 work.<sup>71</sup> Hilgenfeld makes no new contribution to issues of methodology, though he did recognize the value of Volckmar's consideration of the sources involved in the debate.<sup>72</sup> The thrust of the article, however, is found elsewhere. Hilgenfeld began by making a few observations on the recent publications of Baur, Ritschl, and Volckmar as well as summarizing his own 1850 position.<sup>73</sup> As Hilgenfeld re-engaged numerous arguments in the section "Die ursprüngliche Elemente des marcionitischen Evangeliums,"<sup>74</sup> he concluded that concerning the originality of Marcion's text "Mit voller Sicherheit rechne ich hierher das fehlen von V, 39, die Textform X, 21. 22. in allem Wesentlichen, ferner XIII, 28. XVI, 17., auch trage ich kein Bedenken, XVIII, 19 unter diesen Gesichtspunkt zu stellen."<sup>75</sup> Clearly such a minimal conception of originality in Marcion's Gospel would lead to a quite different understanding of the source text of Marcion's Gospel than the perspective held by Baur where, for example, the entirety of Luke 1 and 2 was believed to have been missing.

---

oder bei beiden zusammen vorliegt." Therefore, the real issue is where "die *Idee* der secundären Veränderung rein und klar vorliegt" (ibid.).

<sup>69</sup> See ibid., 113–21.

<sup>70</sup> See ibid., 28–54.

<sup>71</sup> Adolf Hilgenfeld, "Das Marcionitische Evangelium und seine neueste Bearbeitung," *ThJ* 12 (1853): 192–244.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., 196–97.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 192–95.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 211–43.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 242. A few sentences later Hilgenfeld adds, "Möglich is es, dass hierher auch XXIII, 2. zu rechnen ist" (ibid.).

It is important to recognize that in the midst of this fascinating and complex discussion an incredible amount was written about the text of Marcion's Gospel and its relationship to Luke, while comparatively little attention was devoted to the lingering methodological problems with Ritschl's criterion of *Zusammenhang*, scholarly discussions' continued use of assumptions about Marcion's theological tendency when reconstructing Marcion's Gospel, and the questionable practice of drawing conclusions based on the silence of the sources. For this reason, despite the voluminous output of publications during the span of slightly more than a decade, significant shortcomings still existed in the quest to establish the text of Marcion's Gospel along critical lines.

### **1.2.5 The Latter Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century**

Three scholars in particular were important in the continuing discussion of Marcion and his Gospel following the intense debates discussed above: William Sanday, Hajo Uden Meyboom, and Theodor Zahn. Sanday first addressed the issue of Marcion's Gospel as a rejoinder to the view advanced in Walter Richard Cassels's anonymously published *Supernatural Religion* in an article that appeared in *Fortnightly Review*, an article which he subsequently revised and included in his *The Gospels in the Second Century*.<sup>76</sup> Specifically, Sanday sought to refute the idea that Marcion's Gospel was not based on Luke and observed that much of the controversy in Germany revolved around whether Marcion's text could or could not be explained

---

<sup>76</sup> William Sanday, "Marcion's Gospel," *FR* 23 (1875): 855–75 and idem, *The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled 'Supernatural Religion'* (London: MacMillan & Co., 1876), 204–37. The latter work included an appendix (pp. 362–72) in which Sanday set forth Luke 5 as attested in the sources and concluded, "Of course the remainder of the evidence [from Luke's Gospel] can easily be produced if necessary, but I do not think it will long remain in doubt that our present St. Luke was really the foundation of the Gospel that Marcion used" (ibid., 372). Sanday's arguments convinced Cassels to change his position on the relationship between Marcion's Gospel and Luke in the edition of his work appearing subsequent to Sanday's critiques (see *Supernatural Religion: An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation* [3 vols.; complete ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1879], 1:iii; 6 previous editions of this work were printed between 1874 and 1879 by Longmans, Green, and Co. in London and a later popular edition was printed in 1903 and 1905 by Watts & Co. in London). To my knowledge, the first attempt to provide an extensive reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel in English appeared in S. Baring-Gould, *The Lost and Hostile Gospels: An Essay on the Toledoth Jeschu, and the Petrine and Pauline Gospels of the First Three Centuries of which Fragments Remain* (London: Williams & Northgate, 1874), 248–55. Other early reconstructions in English scholarship are found in A. H. Charteris, *Canonicity: A Collection of Early Testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament based on Kirchhoffer's 'Quellensammlung'* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1880), 393–408 and Charles B. Waite, *History of the Christian Religion* (Chicago: C. V. Waite, 1881), 243–51. However, these reconstructions did not advance the discussion beyond the point where the German critics of the mid-nineteenth had carried it.

as arising out of his dogmatic system.<sup>77</sup> Sanday went on to state that though he believed the dogmatic argument points to the traditional view, this argument should not be pressed too far for he “should be tempted to say that the almost exclusive and certainly excessive use of arguments derived from the history of dogma was the prime fallacy which lies at the root of the Tübingen criticism.”<sup>78</sup>

Thus, Sanday offered a new methodological approach based on style and diction through which he clearly demonstrated that the style and vocabulary of the passages omitted by Marcion matched the style and vocabulary of the passages that Marcion retained.<sup>79</sup> On the basis of this argument, Sanday concluded, “We may assume, then, that there is definite proof that the Gospel used by Marcion presupposes our present St. Luke, in its complete form, as it has been handed down to us.”<sup>80</sup> Sanday’s argument largely held sway in English-speaking scholarship until the work of John Knox, who rightly pointed out that Sanday’s entire examination was made without reference to Marcion’s actual text and seems to have assumed that pericopes in Marcion’s Gospel and Luke appeared in the same form. Therefore, all Sanday really proved was the “linguistic homogeneity of our Gospel of Luke, a matter which has never been in doubt, and the evidence has no necessary relevance for Marcion’s Gospel.”<sup>81</sup> Nevertheless, Sanday did point out to subsequent scholarship the importance of moving beyond a purely theological evaluation of Marcion’s Gospel.<sup>82</sup>

In his *Marcion en de Marcioniten*, Meyboom devoted one heading of his section on Marcion’s canon to a discussion of Marcion’s Gospel.<sup>83</sup> Here Meyboom summarized the evidence of Epiphanius and provided a list of the sections of Luke which Tertullian passed over in silence in his refutation of Marcion.<sup>84</sup> Zahn,

---

<sup>77</sup> Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 218.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

<sup>79</sup> See *ibid.*, 223–30.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 230.

<sup>81</sup> John Knox, “On the Vocabulary of Marcion’s Gospel,” *JBL* 58 (1939): 195. See also the discussion in *idem*, *Marcion and the New Testament*, 88–92 and *idem*, “Marcion’s Gospel and the Synoptic Problem,” in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer* (ed. E. P. Sanders; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), 27.

<sup>82</sup> Unfortunately, however, as will become apparent in the following discussion, it would take another century for the first truly non-theological reconstruction of Marcion’s scriptures to appear.

<sup>83</sup> Meyboom, *Marcion en de Marcionieten* (Leiden: P. Engels & Zoon, 1888), 125–64.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 128–42 and 153–56.

however, correctly observed that Meyboom, in his interaction with Marcion's Scriptures, essentially relied on Hilgenfeld's work on the *Apostolikon* and Volckmar's work on the *Euangelion* without attempting to evaluate or advance their results.<sup>85</sup> In fact, Meyboom justified his not delving more deeply into the text of Marcion's Gospel because "We are not here dealing with textual criticism, but with the character and history of Marcionism."<sup>86</sup>

Zahn, on the other hand, devoted large sections of his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* to Marcion and the reconstruction of Marcion's Scriptures.<sup>87</sup> A key motivation for his work is found in that after briefly summarizing the debate between Ritschl, Baur, Volckmar, and Hilgenfeld, Zahn observed that a clear and complete presentation was still lacking.<sup>88</sup> He therefore offered a new reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel (as well as his *Apostolikon*) along with an analysis of Marcion and his Scriptures. Zahn not only concluded that Marcion possessed and edited Luke and that the conclusion of the church fathers "sich allseitig bestätigt [hat]," but also that Marcion knew and interacted with all four of the canonical gospels.<sup>89</sup>

For his reconstructions, Zahn embraced a rather positive evaluation of the reliability of the sources for reconstructing Marcion's text.<sup>90</sup> He observed that it was not simply his use and understanding of the sources that commended his reconstruction;<sup>91</sup> rather, he stated that it is above all that he, in his own words, "eine grundsätzlich andere Stellung zu den Quellen einnehme, als meine Vorgänger."<sup>92</sup> First, Zahn wished to avoid, and rightly so, the endless previous debates about passages supposedly missing in Marcion based on the silence of Tertullian or

---

<sup>85</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:449–50n2.

<sup>86</sup> Meyboom, *Marcion*, 150 [my translation].

<sup>87</sup> See Zahn, *Geschichte*, 1:585–718 and 2:409–529.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:631 (cf. 2:449–55).

<sup>89</sup> See especially *ibid.*, 1:664, 673–78, 681, and 713. The citation is from 1:717.

<sup>90</sup> For Zahn's discussion of the sources see *ibid.*, 1:599–613 and 2:409–49. Zahn had also previously discussed *Adam*. in "Die Dialoge des „Adamantius“ mit den Gnostikern," *ZKG* 9 (1888): 193–239.

<sup>91</sup> That Zahn felt that previous scholars had not fully or properly used the sources, nor yet had access to critical and corrected editions of the sources is clear from his comments in *Geschichte*, 2:450–51.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:451.



Epiphanius. Zahn commented that this type of discussion is “eine divinatorische Kritik ohne alle historische Unterlage, solange nicht bewiesen ist, daß das betreffende wirklich bei Mrc. gefehlt hat.”<sup>93</sup> Second, Zahn provided a series of examples demonstrating that previous scholars far too often allowed a bias in favor of the canonical text, as opposed to the attestation of the sources, to govern the reconstruction of Marcion’s text, an error Zahn was desirous to avoid.<sup>94</sup>

Nevertheless, as helpful as these methodological observations are, some ambiguity remains when one compares Zahn’s discussion of Marcion’s Gospel in the first volume of his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* with the actual reconstruction of Marcion’s text in the second volume. In the reconstructed text of Marcion’s Gospel that he offered, Zahn, to his great credit, sought to differentiate between unattested passages and passages attested as omitted in the sources.<sup>95</sup> At the same time, when Zahn discussed Marcion’s Gospel and its relationship to the canonical gospels, he argued that, given the weaknesses of Ritschl’s criterion of connection, a more certain proof is provided by the examination of whether the differences between Marcion’s text and Luke are better explained as a result of Marcion’s or a Catholic redactor’s theological proclivities.<sup>96</sup> Even though Zahn went on to employ this criterion primarily for readings or omissions attested in the sources<sup>97</sup> and recognized that not all differences between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke can or should be explained on the basis of Marcion’s theology,<sup>98</sup> he also inappropriately used the criterion to “create evidence” for alterations or omissions in Marcion’s Gospel.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 2:451–54.

<sup>95</sup> Zahn noted, “In runde Klammern ( ) setzte ich diejenigen Stücke, deren Vorhandensein bei Mrc. weder durch positive Nachrichten noch durch sichere Schlüsse aus den Nachrichten über andere Stücke verbürgt ist. In eckige Klammern [ ] setzte ich diejenigen Stücke, deren Abwesenheit von Mrc.’s NT in ebensolcher Weise bezeugt ist” (ibid., 2:454).

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 1:684.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 1:684–704

<sup>98</sup> Zahn clearly denied the idea that “alle nachweisbaren oder wahrscheinlichen Unterschiede zwischen beiden Büchern in der Dogmatik begründet sind” (ibid., 1:704).

<sup>99</sup> See, for example, his discussion of Luke 22:39–46 (ibid., 1:686–87). Further examples are found on pp. 706–7. The problematic nature of such arguments is discussed further in the evaluation of Harnack’s methodology below.

Therefore, despite Harnack's evaluation that Zahn had not only set the proper principles in place for research of Marcion's Gospel, but also completed the work with such diligence and care that every subsequent examination can only revise and extend his conclusions,<sup>100</sup> a methodological problem remained. Harnack's contention that it is primarily because Zahn's format left much to be desired, and that advances in textual criticism and knowledge of the sources necessitated a revisiting the reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel, did not yet address the more serious issue concerning the continued use of Marcion's theology in approaching the readings or omission in his texts.<sup>101</sup> Nevertheless, two points are quite clear: (1) Zahn, as May observed, "[hat] mit seiner Wiederherstellung des markionitischen Kanons die ältere Forschung auf diesem Gebiet überholt"<sup>102</sup> and (2) Zahn robustly reaffirmed the traditional position of the church fathers concerning the relationship between Marcion's Gospel and Luke.

### 1.2.6 The Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century

Zahn's reconstruction was employed by Hermann Freiherr von Soden in his text-critical work on the NT.<sup>103</sup> Von Soden viewed Marcion's Gospel as without doubt a mutilated copy of Luke<sup>104</sup> and concluded that Marcion's text "als Ganzes bezeugt ... daß schon um 140 in Kleinasien oder Rom Lukas im I-H-K-Text gelesen wurde."<sup>105</sup> This second conclusion was contested by August Pott who contended that Marcion actually had a "Western" text before him and that many of the readings previously considered as tendentious were in reality merely "Western" readings.<sup>106</sup> Pott's view was supported a few years later by Harnack's work on Marcion.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 41\*.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 41\*-42\*. Harnack's discussion of Zahn's problematic evaluation of *Adam*. as a source is found in *ibid.*, 56\*-63\*.

<sup>102</sup> May, "„Ein ächter Protestant“. Markion in der Sicht August Neanders," in *Gerhard May: Markion: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 116.

<sup>103</sup> Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–1913), 1:2.1624.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:2.1629.

<sup>106</sup> August Pott, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments nach seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (2d ed.; ANatG 134; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1919) and *idem*, "De textu evangeliorum in saeculo secundo," *Mnemosyne* 48 (1920): 267–309 and 338–65, esp. 348–65.

<sup>107</sup> Pott and Harnack, however, did not come to the same conclusion concerning the "Western" text and which readings in Marcion's text were reflecting original "Western" readings and

Zahn's work remained the benchmark for Marcion's Gospel only until Harnack's *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott* appeared, which eclipsed all previous work on Marcion's texts. The text of Marcion's Gospel as reconstructed by Harnack, with its continuous text and copious documentation, quickly became the standard reference for subsequent scholarship.<sup>108</sup> Before commenting on Harnack's reconstruction, it is worth noting that he made several points concerning the text of Marcion's Gospel. First, Harnack observed "Daß das Evangelium Marcions nichts anderes ist als was das altkirchliche Urteil von ihm behauptet hat, nämlich ein verfälschter Lukas, darüber braucht kein Wort mehr verloren zu werden."<sup>109</sup> Second, Marcion's Greek and Latin text of Luke is a "pure" "Western" text when considered apart from Marcion's alterations.<sup>110</sup> Third, Marcion's Gospel text reveals a strong influence of Matthew and Mark, both in readings that are elsewhere attested in the "Western" textual tradition and in otherwise unattested readings.<sup>111</sup> Following this observation Harnack noted that he considered it highly unlikely that Marcion himself was responsible for these harmonizations and that therefore Marcion possessed a text that had already been harmonized to Matthew and Mark.<sup>112</sup> Yet, he did not pursue the import of this fact other than simply to observe in a footnote that it is of great significance for the history of the canon.<sup>113</sup> Fourth, Harnack saw very minimal influence of Marcion's text on the Catholic text.<sup>114</sup> And finally, Harnack agreed that Marcion knew Matthew, Mark, and John; consciously rejected them; and provided a rationale for that rejection in his *Antitheses*.<sup>115</sup>

---

which were reflecting harmonizations to Mark/Matthew. See August Pott, "Marcions Evangelientext," *ZKG* 42 (1923): 202–23 and Harnack, *Marcion*, V, 243\*. Also, Heinrich Vogels remained unconvinced that Marcion had a "Western" text or that Marcion was not responsible for numerous stylistic changes and alterations now attested in the "Western" text (Review of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, *TRev* 3/4 [1922]: 58).

<sup>108</sup> For Harnack's discussion of the omissions, corrections, possible additions, and method employed by Marcion see *Marcion*, 52–73. For his reconstructed text of Marcion's *Euangelion* see *ibid.*, 183\*–240\*.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 240\*.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, 242\* (cf. p. 73).

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 243\*.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.* (cf. p. 43).

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 243\*n2.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 247\*.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 40–42, 249\*.

As has already been noted, Harnack's entire work on Marcion exerted a tremendous influence on subsequent scholarship and the same is true for his reconstruction of the text and discussion of the sources of Marcion's Gospel.<sup>116</sup> The reliability of a source or reading, however, is often merely asserted rather than demonstrated. For example, Harnack simply averred that nearly every page of Tertullian's work reveals that his reproduction of Marcion's text is reliable and that in nearly every instance it is possible to identify precise quotations from mere references to Marcion's text.<sup>117</sup> Yet, at no point are any arguments advanced for how one can know that these assertions, apparently self-evident to Harnack, are correct. Even if these assertions are granted, a more important question remained unanswered, namely, how is one to evaluate just how accurate a "reliable" citation or allusion is? Despite these issues, it cannot be denied that Harnack utilized nearly every available source in his offered reconstruction.

Also important in Harnack's methodological contribution is his observation that it is rather unfortunate that for a large number of passages it remains unclear whether Marcion excised them or whether they were simply passed over by his opponents. Harnack indicated that he, apart from a few instances, avoided the types of extended considerations and speculations on this issue characteristic of previous scholars.<sup>118</sup> Related to the shift away from speculating concerning Marcion's omissions is Harnack's argument that for understanding Marcion's thought and theology what he left in the text is much more important than his omissions and corrections.<sup>119</sup> Harnack was absolutely right that focus must first and foremost be placed upon attested readings of Marcion's text, and that only on the basis of that text can an understanding of Marcion and his theology be advanced. Unfortunately, when one turns to Harnack's reconstructed text, there is evidence that, on occasion, Marcion's perceived theology was still affecting the reading offered.

Therefore, the tremendous value of Harnack's work notwithstanding, it is important to note that two major methodological weaknesses limit the ultimate value of Harnack's reconstruction. First, despite his cautioning about applying the criterion

---

<sup>116</sup> The sources are discussed in *ibid.*, 41\*-67\*, 177\*-83\*.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 45\*.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 65n1.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 66.

of “Marcionite tendency” in reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel, Harnack could not quite bring himself to embrace a consistent critical posture to the sources. Thus, he did not fully recognize, as Schmid puts it, “When one of our sources doesn’t cite or evoke a passage or a phrase, it simply means that it doesn’t cite or evoke it.”<sup>120</sup>

Schmid’s observation rightly leads to the conclusion, “Arguments *e silentio*, creating positive evidence out of a lack of evidence, should not be allowed, even if the alleged omission would match supposed theological preferences of Marcion;”<sup>121</sup> and yet, at several points Harnack is guilty of just such a “creation of evidence.”<sup>122</sup> Several examples illustrating this problem can be found in Harnack’s reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel, including the discussion of Luke 5:39, 9:56, 22:43, and 24:40. Luke 5:39, 22:43, and 24:40 all involve instances where the Marcionite text is unattested in the sources, but Harnack believed Marcion excised the passages for dogmatic reasons.<sup>123</sup> Although Schmid only discussed Luke 5:39 in his article, his evaluation of Harnack’s view is applicable to all three cases: “This is simply creating positive evidence (in this very case positive negative evidence) out of no evidence at all.”<sup>124</sup>

A second methodological problem arises out of the realization that although Harnack had a tremendous knowledge of the sources for the text of Marcion’s

---

<sup>120</sup> Ulrich Schmid, “How Can We Access Second Century Gospel Texts? The Cases of Marcion and Tatian,” in *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille colloquium, July 2000 / Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000* (ed. Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott; HTB 6; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), 142.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 142. Several decades earlier, Leon E. Wright had already noted that concerning allusions or omissions in the sources for Marcion’s Gospel, “the argument from silence is precariously invoked under such circumstances of transmission” (*Alterations of the Words of Jesus: As Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century* [Harvard Historical Monographs 25; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952], 128). Ekkehard Muehlenberg similarly noted, “We are not furnished any list of omissions [by Tertullian] so that the *argumentum e silentio* cannot be admitted” (“Marcion’s Jealous God,” in *Disciplina Nostra: Essays in Memory of Robert F. Evans* [PaMS 6; Cambridge, Mass.; Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979], 98).

<sup>122</sup> In addition, a related problem is the application of the criterion as an explanation for the *motivation* of attested Marcionite readings, especially in discussions concerning “original” readings. This point was already made by G. Zuntz in critical comments concerning some of the passages in First Corinthians where Harnack posited a *tendenziöse Zufügung* or a *Tendenzänderung* (*The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946* [London: Oxford University Press, 1953], 229, 233).

<sup>123</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 190\*, 238\*, 239\*, and the summary comments on 247\*.

<sup>124</sup> Schmid, “How Can We Access?,” 143. Luke 9:56 involves an unattested element that Harnack believed was added to the text by Marcion (*Marcion*, 190\*; see the discussion in 4.1.41 Luke 9:54–55).

Gospel, he did not give enough attention to the use of Scripture in those sources more broadly. In order to avoid repetition of analysis provided in later chapters, no examples of this problem will be provided here. At numerous points in that analysis, however, it will be seen that Harnack's lack of interaction with multiple citations of a text casts doubt upon his reconstruction.

Finally, in addition to these methodological problems, there is also a problem related to textual criticism that affected Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel. In both the first and second editions of *Marcion*, Harnack indicated that he used Tischendorf's text and apparatus for the comparison of Marcion's reconstructed text with the manuscript tradition.<sup>125</sup> Concerning this reference point, Pott observed "v. Harnack hat leider das ganze Material v. Sodens ignoriert; hätte er es beachtet, so würde er an sehr vielen Stellen nicht geurteilt haben, daß die Lesart „unbezeugt“ oder „allein“stehend sei."<sup>126</sup> Harnack granted Pott's point and admitted that the Tischendorf apparatus was insufficient; however, he stated that he "aus verschiedenen Gründen mit dem Soden'schen Apparat nicht zu arbeiten vermag."<sup>127</sup> Though Harnack contended that not much was lost as a result of his exclusive use of Tischendorf, it seems quite evident that the most precise knowledge of Marcion's text would seek to utilize all available data in the manuscript tradition.<sup>128</sup>

Thus, despite the tremendous contributions by Zahn and Harnack, it is clear that May rightly observes, "Die Wiederherstellungsversuche von Theodor Zahn (1892) und Harnack sind nicht kritisch und nicht methodisch streng genug."<sup>129</sup> C. S. C. Williams correctly noted, "The difficulty ... remains of determining how far we have the exact words of Marcion preserved in the Latin or Greek quotations of

---

<sup>125</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 223\* and *Marcion*, 243\*.

<sup>126</sup> Pott, "Marcions Evangelientext," 204.

<sup>127</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 243\*n3.

<sup>128</sup> The insufficient nature of Harnack's apparatus was brought up again after the appearance of the second edition in a review by Heinrich Vogels, where he listed nearly 150 verses where the textual evidence was deficient (Review of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, *TRev* 12 [1925]: 442–46). Harnack defended himself against what Vogels termed a "Sünden katalog" in "Verwahrung," *TLZ* 5 (1926): 119–20.

<sup>129</sup> May, "Markion in seiner Zeit," 8. Klinghardt expresses a similar sentiment writing, "Harnacks Rekonstruktion, die lange Zeit als maßgeblich galt, [ist] weithin zu großzügig und von den inhaltlichen Vorgaben abhängig, um tauglich zu sein" ("Markion vs. Lukas," 492). Joël Delobel also discusses both problematic reconstructions and their uncritical use by subsequent scholars in text-critical analyses in "Extra-Canonical Sayings of Jesus: Marcion and Some 'Non-received' Logia," in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* (ed. William L. Petersen; *CJA* 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 105–16.

Tertullian or Epiphanius, which they cited in evidence against him,” but not quite accurately stated, “Harnack’s reconstructed text of Marcion is probably as accurate a text as modern scholarship can provide.”<sup>130</sup>

### **1.2.7 Post-Harnack Studies up to 1980**

Even though it would be seventy years before another complete reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel was attempted, numerous elements addressed in other studies on Marcion and his Gospel after Harnack bear some significance for reconstructing Marcion’s text. Certain of these studies are particularly relevant for methodological issues in approaching Marcion’s Gospel. Almost a decade after Harnack’s monumental monograph, Robert Smith Wilson published, to my knowledge, the first full-length treatment of Marcion in English entitled *Marcion: A Study of a Second-Century Heretic*.<sup>131</sup> Wilson discussed some of the characteristics of Marcion’s Gospel concluding “the tendency of Marcion’s Gospel is to omit, and the omissions are more frequent in the late parts than in the early.”<sup>132</sup> Nevertheless, Wilson also stated that even when every difference between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke that can be ascribed to Marcion’s theology is so ascribed, a “residuum” remains that is difficult to explain and suggests that Marcion’s text contained variant readings.<sup>133</sup> In addition, although noting that to attempt to answer the question of the type of text that Marcion had was beyond the scope of his work,<sup>134</sup> Wilson did

---

<sup>130</sup> C. S. C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospel and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), 11.

<sup>131</sup> Robert Smith Wilson, *Marcion: A Study of a Second-Century Heretic* (London: James Clarke, 1932). One German work appeared prior to Wilson, and one French work subsequent to him, neither of which is of particular significance. Before Wilson’s work, Hermann Raschke published an article (“Marcion und sein Evangelium,” *NiTT* 12 [1923]: 28–44) and a book (*Die Werkstatt des Markusevangelisten—eine neue Evangelientheorie* [Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1924]), in which he argued that Mark was actually Marcion’s Gospel and even that Marcion’s “Partei” was “der Urheber des Markusevangeliums” (“Marcion und sein Evangelium,” 44 and *Die Werkstatt*, 43). Raschke’s work rightly received very little notice; however, despite his speculative and ultimately erroneous views (see Harnack, *Marcion*, 240\*n1 and Wilson, *Marcion: A Study*, 136n\*), he did offer some valid criticism of Harnack’s methodological stance towards the sources (“Marcion und sein Evangelium,” 28, 43). After Wilson’s work, Auguste Hollard published a short book *Deux hérétiques: Marcion et Montan* (Paris: Éditions de la Nouvelle Revue Critique, 1935) in which he simply stated that Marcion’s Gospel “n’est autre que celui de Luc,” though in an excised, edited, and interpolated form (p. 26).

<sup>132</sup> Wilson, *Marcion: A Study*, 138.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 139–40. Examples of such readings provided by Wilson are Luke 7:24–26; 9:54; 12:8–9 and 15:10 vs. 16:22, 22:36, and 24:23; 18:19; 22:49–51; 23:34, 43; and 24:48 (*ibid.*, 140).

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, 141.

reiterate several of Harnack's conclusions. Wilson agreed that Marcion's text evidenced a "Western" character and that it had some influence on both this and the general textual tradition.<sup>135</sup> In addition, he stated "It is not improbable that Marcion was using a text of *Luke* that had been corrupted by assimilation to *Matthew* and *Mark*," and was more explicit in the implication of this fact than Harnack was, concluding, "By the time of Marcion the three Gospels had already circulated so long together that scribes had begun to be influenced in their copying of one by their habitual use of the others."<sup>136</sup>

In 1936, Paul-Louis Couchoud reasserted Baur's 1847 position in an article entitled "Is Marcion's Gospel One of the Synoptics?"<sup>137</sup> He recognized the merits of Harnack's work on Marcion's Gospel, though also pointing out that it was "not perfect" and was influenced by Harnack's own convictions.<sup>138</sup> Couchoud concluded that Marcion's Gospel was very similar to Streeter's and Taylor's Proto-Luke<sup>139</sup> and that a methodical comparison of the Gospels of Marcion and Luke would reveal the former as original, and the latter as corrected and considerably amplified.<sup>140</sup> An

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid., 144–49. Wilson noted, however, that just because Marcion's text is of a "Western" character it does not mean that Marcion prepared his text in Rome, as Harnack concluded. "The type of text does not decide the place, and we must be content to admit that we do not know where Marcion prepared his New Testament" (ibid., 150).

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 142.

<sup>137</sup> Paul-Louis Couchoud, "Is Marcion's Gospel One of the Synoptics?," *HibJ* 34 (1936): 265–77.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 271. For Streeter's and Taylor's views see Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates* (London: MacMillan, 1924; 2d ed.; London: MacMillan, 1930) and Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926).

<sup>140</sup> Couchoud, "Is Marcion's Gospel," 271. Couchoud believed that all three Synoptic Gospels were composed in the middle of the second century, stating that they were composed "roughly between A.D. 135 and 145" (ibid., 276). In 1931, Couchoud, in a paper at a conference of *l'Union Rationaliste*, had already argued that the Synoptics were written after Marcion (see Georges Ory, "Paul-Louis Couchoud," *CCER* 112 [1979]: 161–63). In another work on Christian origins, Couchoud provided a translation of Marcion's Gospel, along with notes designed to function as a Marcionite commentary to the text (*The Creation of Christ: An Outline of the Beginnings of Christianity* [trans. C. Bradlaugh Bonner; 2 vols.; London: Watts & Co., 1939], 2:321–423). This translation, however, did not advance the scholarly discussion. For example, for details concerning Marcion's text Couchoud simply referred the reader to Harnack (ibid., 319). In addition, Couchoud's text is marked by some idiosyncrasies as he uncritically incorporated testimony from every source, listed by Couchoud "in order of importance" as Tertullian, the Dialogue of Adamantios (Greek), Rufinus' Latin translation of the dialogues, Epiphanius, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Hegemonius, Ephrem, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium, Esmik of Kolb, and Jerome (ibid., 319–20). The curious placement of the "Dialogue of Admantios" and its translation as second and third in the list may be explained by Couchoud's belief that "the *Dialogue* of Adamantios alone gives direct Marcionite matter" (ibid., 321). Georges Ory continued arguing along the lines of Couchoud's



immediate response to Couchoud's article was offered by Alfred Loisy who resoundingly criticized Couchoud's assumptions and reasserted the dependence of Marcion on Luke.<sup>141</sup>

As the subtitle to John Knox's work *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*<sup>142</sup> indicates, he was primarily concerned with Marcion and the NT canon and not with the text of Marcion's Gospel. Even the chapters focusing specifically on Marcion's Gospel and its relationship to Luke are said to be "particularly tentative in character and presume only to reopen a question which, in my judgment, has been prematurely closed."<sup>143</sup> That question is the relationship of Marcion's Gospel to Luke, which Knox answered in sharp contrast to Sanday, Zahn, and Harnack. Knox advocated a position almost identical to that of the later Baur in arguing that a separate Gospel—"the Gospel which was the basis of both Marcion's Gospel and the later canonical Gospel of Luke—preceded the making of Luke-Acts [emphasis original]."<sup>144</sup> Concerning the text of Marcion's Gospel, Knox provided a table of Marcionite, non-Marcionite, and uncertain passages as compared to Luke, though he admitted that his classification, and indeed any such list, could only claim approximate correctness.<sup>145</sup> Nevertheless, Knox used the classification of this table for his arguments against the view that Marcion mutilated Luke to create his Gospel. In fact, although the grouping of verses into

---

theses concerning Marcion and his Gospel in "Marcion et Luc: Interpolés par des Esséniens?," *CCER* 50 (1966): 56–66 and *Marcion* (CCERChs; Paris: Cercle Ernest-Renan, 1980).

<sup>141</sup> Alfred Loisy, "Marcion's Gospel: A Reply," *HibJ* 34 (1936): 378–87. Even Knox, who, as can be seen below, certainly did not affirm the traditional position, agreed that Couchoud's "effort to identify Marcion's Gospel with Streeter's 'Proto-Luke' ... cannot be convincing because of the large Markan element the Gospel of Marcion evidently contained" (*Marcion and the New Testament*, 106–7).

<sup>142</sup> Reference to this work was made in n. 11.

<sup>143</sup> Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, vii.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 130. Knox also believed that the Gospel from which Marcion derived his Gospel "almost certainly" did not contain the first two chapters of canonical Luke (*ibid.*, 111).

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, 85n23. The reason for this conclusion is that "Although the verses known to have been missing from Marcion's Gospel ('B' in the table) can be designated with considerable precision, it is often not possible to know whether other pericopes should be classified under 'A' [Marcionite] or 'C' [uncertain]. Only when we are explicitly told by an ancient writer that Marcion did not have a pericope or a verse have we included it under 'B.' When all our sources are silent about a pericope, we have included it under 'C.' But when an ancient witness, presumably with a copy of Marcion's Gospel open before him, quotes the text of a Lukan pericope, even though only a few words of it, we have assumed that the whole pericope was there in some form. But obviously it is precarious to count verses on the basis of such an assumption. There is no doubt that many verses I have placed under 'A' should fall under 'C.'" (*ibid.*).

these categories provided a helpful overview of the broad shape of Marcion's Gospels, all of Knox's specific discussion of verses and vocabulary in the text was, by his own admission, completely reliant upon Harnack's reconstruction.<sup>146</sup>

Important for methodological considerations is that after correctly noting the problematic manner in which Sanday had advanced his argument based on vocabulary and style,<sup>147</sup> Knox presented his own arguments that Marcion's Gospel, in fact, contains minimal Lukan vocabulary and style.<sup>148</sup> Some forty years later, however, Knox, though reaffirming his view that the author of Luke enlarged Marcion's Gospel or one very similar to it,<sup>149</sup> admitted that in his earlier discussion of the vocabulary and style of Marcion's Gospel he may have pushed the point too far. He stated, "I think now that I should have been content with this demonstration [that Sanday's proof was inadequate] and should not have attempted to build any positive argument for Marcion's priority on so meager and uncertain a basis as the recoverable text of his Gospel provides (that is, in its detail)."<sup>150</sup> Given Knox's distancing himself from his own argument, the specifics will not be discussed here, though it is important to note that the argument from style and vocabulary, until

---

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., 48. Cf. *ibid.*, 94 where Knox stated that he drew the data for his arguments from "the recovered text of Marcion's Gospel as Harnack has assembled it."

<sup>147</sup> See the discussion above under 1.2.5 The Latter Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

<sup>148</sup> Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, 92–99. Robert M. Grant's later comments on Marcion's Gospel seem, at least in part, to have been motivated by Knox's study. In an appendix to his *The Letter and the Spirit*, Grant contests Knox's conclusions and attempts "to show that Marcion presumably corrected the Gospel of Luke in the light of his own peculiar doctrines. He did not possess an 'original Gospel' and his philology is only a weapon for his theology" (*The Letter and the Spirit* [London: S.P.C.K., 1957], 115; see also Grant, "Marcion and the Critical Method," in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in honour of Francis Wright Beare* [ed. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984], 213). Later, however, Grant stated: "My own argument that the 'changes' correspond with Marcion's theology and prove that he was an editor is not convincing because conceivably Marcion relied on his 'proto-Luke' and did not create it" (*Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature* [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993], 43; see also Grant, "Marcion, Gospel of" in *ABD*, 4:520). Nevertheless, Grant still finds it "unlikely" that Marcion relied on an earlier document that he happened to discover and is at a loss to explain how such "certainty" could have arisen on the part of many "modern scholars to reject the unanimous consensus of early patristic writers that Marcion edited the Gospel of Luke" for "there is nothing irrational about either the editorial process or the patristic claim" (*Heresy and Criticism*, 34, 46).

<sup>149</sup> Knox, "Marcion's Gospel," 26.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 27–28n6. With this statement it appears that Knox, at least at this point, had recognized the validity of objections raised by E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2004), 38–41 and Leland Edward Wilshire, "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? — A Continuing Discussion," *NTS* 20 (1974): 246–53.

Marcion's text is more critically established, has been shown to be of minimal usefulness.

Knox also argued that the possibility of the final author of Luke adding to a shorter Gospel quite similar to Marcion's, "assumes something of the aspect of likelihood, however, when we observe the relation of the Gospel of Marcion to the peculiarly Lukan elements in Luke, on the one hand, and to the common Synoptic elements, on the other."<sup>151</sup> Based on his table of Marcionite, non-Marcionite, and uncertain readings,<sup>152</sup> Knox observed,

Of the verses which [*sic*] there is positive evidence to show did *not* belong to Marcion, 79.7 per cent are peculiar to Luke. Of all the verses of Luke which are peculiar to Luke, 39 per cent are known to be missing in Marcion, whereas of verses of Luke paralleled in Matthew or Mark or both, only 10 per cent are known to be missing from Marcion [emphasis original].<sup>153</sup>

Tyson also employed this argument in his recent attempt to revitalize Knox's views, once again relying on Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel and creating tables like those of Knox.<sup>154</sup> Although there are slight differences in the numbers due to Tyson's occasionally different evaluation about certain Lukan pericopes, the results are quite similar.<sup>155</sup> Tyson states, "About 12 percent of Lukan material with synoptic parallels is probably absent from Marcion's Gospel. But 41-43 percent of Lukan Sondergut material is omitted."<sup>156</sup> Tyson continues his argument with a discussion of the reasons why he believes the infancy narratives were later additions as was most of Luke 24.<sup>157</sup> He then recalculates the statistics in the comparison of Marcion's Gospel and Luke using only Luke 3–23. In this comparison "the rate of omission, although still about 12 percent for material with synoptic parallels, is only about 22 percent for material peculiar to Luke. Although there is still a difference to

---

<sup>151</sup> Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, 106.

<sup>152</sup> See n. 145.

<sup>153</sup> Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, 108.

<sup>154</sup> Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 86. Tyson's tables are provided on p. 87.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 86. Tyson, unlike Knox, also provides a second table based on the number of words in the verses and not only the verses themselves. In an appendix containing Knox's data, Tyson reiterates the occasional variance in classifying material (*ibid.*, 133).

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, 90, 101. The entire discussion is found on pp. 90–109. On pp. 109–16 Tyson discusses the Lukan preface arguing that it "may plausibly be read as introducing a text that responds to 'heretical' challenges, especially those of the Marcionites" (*ibid.*, 116).

be noted, the difference is about half of what we saw in tables 1 and 2 [using Luke 1–24 as a comparison].”<sup>158</sup> Even though Tyson does not wish to press the point too far,<sup>159</sup> he does stress the conclusion: “*Whatever text lies behind the Gospel of Marcion and canonical Luke, it almost certainly did not contain the birth narratives or the preface, and it probably had only a trace of the resurrection account that now appears in canonical Luke* [emphasis original].”<sup>160</sup> Of course, if one holds this view, the fact that a comparison of Marcion’s Gospel with Luke 3–23 yields a less radical re-working of Lukan material may seem impressive. The point that Tyson seems to have missed, however, is that his analysis may just as easily be used for the contrary position. In fact, Tyson has shown that the majority of Lukan Sondergut material omitted by Marcion is found at the beginning and the end of Luke, and one could point out that there is no easier place to omit material than in the opening or closing of the Gospel. With two strokes Marcion could have eliminated a vast amount of material peculiar to Luke and then re-worked Luke 3–23 where, incidentally, Tyson believes, “it is not difficult to account for his [Marcion’s] omissions from the text.”<sup>161</sup> Ironically therefore, Tyson’s figures serve to severely weaken Knox’s argument if one does not hold to the idea that Luke 1–2 and 24 were later additions to the Gospel. Regardless of these issues, the point to be emphasized here is that the significance of Marcion’s exclusion of Lukan *Sondergut* is largely determined by an *a priori* view of the extent of Marcion’s source text. In other words, the significance of the statistics offered by Knox and Tyson are dependent on factors external to the readings found in Marcion’s Gospel. Thus, it seems that Knox and Tyson have engaged in an interesting exercise, but one that ultimately does not serve to advance the understanding of Marcion’s Gospel text or its relationship to Luke.

Despite Knox and Tyson’s arguments based on vocabulary, style, and “general content” ultimately not providing a better understanding of the text of Marcion’s Gospel, Knox did emphasize an important methodological point made

---

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>159</sup> Tyson notes, “None of these observations is sufficient to compel the conclusion that Luke 3–23 was the exact text that Marcion and the author of canonical Luke used” (ibid., 119).

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 117. From a slightly different perspective Grant questioned Knox’s statistics by arguing “if we count sections rather than verses the figure is reduced to fifty per cent [from nearly eighty per cent]. Was Marcion concerned with words and phrases or with ideas?” (*The Letter and the Spirit*, 116). Of course, though Grant apparently intends his question to be rhetorical, the answer to it is actually determinative of how convincing his statistic is versus that of Knox.

above in the criticism of Harnack's methodology. Knox noted that concerning the verses he classified as "uncertain," i.e., verses on which the sources are silent, it is precarious to contend that the verses either belonged or did not belong to Marcion's text based on doctrinal considerations: "The argument from the silence of Epiphanius and Tertullian is ... unreliable."<sup>162</sup> On this point Knox is absolutely correct.

In 1948 E. C. Blackman's work on Marcion appeared,<sup>163</sup> which Knox, though not agreeing with all of Blackman's conclusions, noted was "the most valuable book on Marcion since the appearance of Harnack's work a quarter of a century ago."<sup>164</sup> Although the work was at numerous points critical of Harnack's study because of what Blackman perceived was an overestimation of Marcion's religious significance and impact on Catholic Christianity,<sup>165</sup> Blackman fully agreed with and followed Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel. Blackman also agreed with Harnack's conclusions that Marcion altered Luke and that the copy of Luke that he possessed was a "Western text."<sup>166</sup> Although he simply utilized Harnack's reconstructed text, Blackman's helpful contribution to the discussion was his examination of the influence of Marcion's Gospel on the Old Latin versions.<sup>167</sup> His conclusion, based on the evidence as marshaled by Harnack, was, "The influence of Marcion on Catholic texts was on the whole greater than Harnack allowed, but it was nevertheless, very limited. The more palpable Marcionite alterations did not insinuate themselves."<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>162</sup> Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, 109.

<sup>163</sup> Reference to this work was made in n. 150.

<sup>164</sup> John Knox, review of Edwin Cyril Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, *CH* 19 (1950): 295.

<sup>165</sup> Blackman ventured "to protest that Harnack estimated too highly the significance of the great second-century nonconformist" (*Marcion*, x). The issue of Marcion's determinative influence on the canon was taken up especially by Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (trans. J. A. Baker; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 148–67. For critiques of the Harnack/Campenhausen view see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 97–99 and especially John Barton, *Holy Writings, Sacred Text: The Canon in Early Christianity* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 35–62 and idem, "Marcion Revisited" in *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 341–54.

<sup>166</sup> See Blackman, *Marcion*, 45–52.

<sup>167</sup> See especially the discussion in appendix 7 "Did Marcion's Text Influence the Old Latin?" in *ibid.*, 128–68.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 60. The passages where Blackman saw Marcion's influence in the Old Latin tradition are Luke 10:21, 25; 11:29–32, 42; 13:28; 16:12; 21:27, 32; 23:2, 5; 24:12 and possibly 5:39; 6:35; 17:10b; 23:34a; and 24:6 (*ibid.*).

In his discussion of Marcion's scriptures, Blackman indicated "The Marcionite Gospel and Apostle have been carefully restored by Harnack.... Nothing more remains to be done except a revision of the critical apparatus."<sup>169</sup> Despite recognizing that one often cannot draw a firm conclusion concerning Marcion's text from Tertullian's silence and reminding the reader that Marcion was not completely consistent in his alterations of his texts,<sup>170</sup> this evaluation of Harnack's text is too naïve. In Blackman's discussion of the texts that evidence "the most striking of Marcion's omissions and alterations"<sup>171</sup> it should first be noted that he included comments on nine verses from Marcion's *Apostolikon* that Schmid has shown to be somewhat dubiously attributed to Marcion.<sup>172</sup> Since Blackman discussed only twenty examples from Paul's letters, questionable examples encompass nearly half of the total number. It is noteworthy that in each of these cases Blackman focused on the theological reason for the change or omission, which may well have led him prematurely to agree with Harnack's readings.

Second, in his discussion of readings in Marcion's Gospel the same problem is evidenced. For example, Blackman stated, "Luke 22:20 lacked *καὶ νῦν* before *διὰ θήκη*. The 'old' covenant was made by the God of the Old Testament, whereas Marcion's God had made no previous covenant with men."<sup>173</sup> This reading is based entirely on an allusion by Tertullian, and it appears that a theological consideration is the primary motivation in accepting this reading.<sup>174</sup> Apparently, the weaknesses of Harnack's methodology were here perpetuated. Blackman nevertheless made a crucial observation noting, "it is difficult always to be certain that the variant reading really stood in Marcion's text; the sources, Tertullian, *Adamantius*, or Epiphanius may have quoted incorrectly."<sup>175</sup> He did not, however, suggest any methodological

---

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., 43–44.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid.

<sup>172</sup> Included are 1 Cor 3:17, 15:3; Rom 1:18, 11:33; and Phil 2:7 (see, respectively, Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 80–81; 193–94; 63; 64; 76). Blackman also commented on readings attested solely in *Adam.*, which Schmid argues cannot be used as a reliable independent source for Marcion's text (*Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 236). These verses are 1 Cor 15:20, 2 Cor 2:15; Rom 6:9; and Eph [Laodiceans] 4:6 (see *Marcion*, 44–45).

<sup>173</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 46.

<sup>174</sup> See the discussion under the heading 4.1.90 Luke 22:20, 22.

<sup>175</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 51.

steps that could be taken to aid in evaluating the accuracy of the sources. That step was left for a later generation of scholars to take.

### **1.2.8 1980 to Present**

In 1982, David Salter Williams submitted an M.A. thesis at the University of Georgia entitled “Marcion’s Gospel: Reconsidered.”<sup>176</sup> In his thesis Williams did not seek to reconstruct Marcion’s Gospel, a point that has been subsequently overlooked, but rather to challenge the view that Marcion used Luke as the text base for his Gospel.<sup>177</sup> Williams points out that his examination of the question and advocating the “non-traditional” position differs from other studies claiming the independence of Marcion’s Gospel in that they were “largely concerned with theological issues, while we will be involved almost exclusively with textual considerations.”<sup>178</sup> For this emphasis Williams is to be commended, as well as for his attempt to develop a rigorous methodology in approaching the sources for readings in Marcion’s Gospel.

At the same time, however, his method must ultimately be regarded as too restrictive and geared towards negative results, for his work is designed to negate a view of Marcion’s text, not reconstruct Marcion’s text. Although such an approach to Marcion’s Gospel is not inherently invalid, and Williams is rightly skeptical about the validity of invoking Marcion’s theology in considering readings in Marcion’s text,<sup>179</sup> nevertheless there are several difficulties in the method Williams employed in

---

<sup>176</sup> Both the thesis and subsequent *JBL* article were referenced in n. 9.

<sup>177</sup> In his M.A. thesis Williams writes, “It is not our intention to attempt to reconstruct the original text of MG. We seek only to question the traditional view’s strict identification of Marcion’s text base with the canonical Gospel of Luke” (“Marcion’s Gospel: Reconsidered,” 24). Both Schmid and Gregory, however, appear to classify Williams’s work as a “reconstruction.” On the one hand, Schmid groups Williams’s and Tsutsui’s work together under the heading “Rekonstruktionsversuche der marcionitischen Evangelienschrift” (*Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 23). On the other hand, Andrew Gregory states, “Williams’ *reconstruction* is methodologically much more rigorous and its results much more radical [emphasis added]” (*The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus* [WUNT 2.169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 178). Schmid admits he was not able to consult Williams’s M.A. thesis, and Gregory does not mention it, but even so, in Williams’s *JBL* article, which Schmid and Gregory do cite, Williams nowhere indicates his objective is to *reconstruct* Marcion’s Gospel. In fact, Williams only writes that he intends to call into question the position that Marcion’s Gospel “represents simply a systematic abbreviation of the canonical Gospel of Luke,” and that “the safest and surest procedure in approaching Marcion’s Gospel is to limit study to what I shall call ‘explicit correlated readings’” (“Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” 478, 481).

<sup>178</sup> Williams, “Marcion’s Gospel: Reconsidered,” 14.

<sup>179</sup> Williams states that though theologically based alteration by Marcion is possible, his study suggests “that we are either less familiar with Marcion’s theology and/or editorial goals than has been previously thought, or he may have transmitted his text with greater fidelity than has been supposed” (“Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” 483).

his work. The methodological problems begin with Williams restricting his examination to what he calls “explicit correlated readings,” i.e., readings attested in both Tertullian and Epiphanius as a “direct quote.”<sup>180</sup> Schmid points out that although Williams employs a “methodisch kontrollierbarer Ausgangspunkt,”<sup>181</sup> he also observes, “Diese methodisch sehr restriktive Rekonstruktion erlaubt fast nur negative Schlußfolgerungen im Blick auf die Vorlage des marcionitischen Evangeliums und auch im Blick auf die anzunehmende marcionitische Bearbeitung desselben.”<sup>182</sup> Two specific questions Schmid sets forth highlighting the weakness of such a restrictive methodology are “ob es nicht noch andere methodisch kontrollierbare Verfahren gibt, die auch die Zeugnisse, die nur eine der Quellen bietet, erschließen helfen” and “ob die etwas mechanisch anmutende Identifizierung von direkten Zitaten durch ein einleitendes Verbum dicendi wirklich zuverlässige Resultate ermöglicht.”<sup>183</sup>

Furthermore, Williams has chosen to consider only the evidence provided by Tertullian and Epiphanius, thus completely ignoring *Adam*. and any other sources. In his M.A. thesis Williams simply states, “Because of the doubts which surround the Dialogue and our need to use only the surest readings possible, we shall exclude this work from further consideration here.”<sup>184</sup> It is problematic to draw definitive conclusions concerning Marcion’s Gospel while entirely excluding some sources from the discussion.<sup>185</sup> In addition, when Williams interacts with the two sources he does consult, he simply compares the readings as found in the text, making no

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., 481. Williams offers this criterion because of six challenges he perceives in examining Marcion’s Gospel (listed in *ibid.*, 478–80) and provides a list of these readings in an appendix to the article (*ibid.*, 483–96; see also Williams, “Marcion’s Gospel: Reconsidered,” 25–60).

<sup>181</sup> Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 24.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 23. See the comments above concerning the significance of Williams’s concern only to disprove a position for issues pertaining to methodology. Tyson, though agreeing with Williams’s conclusion, also notes, “Williams’s appendix may be useful as a kind of check list, but it cannot be regarded as an adequate reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel” (*Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 42).

<sup>183</sup> Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 24.

<sup>184</sup> Williams, “Marcion’s Gospel: Reconsidered,” 16.

<sup>185</sup> It is one thing to offer tentative conclusions pending further research on other sources and quite another to embrace a methodology that *a priori* excludes sources. Concerning *Adam*., its problematic nature as a source has also been highlighted by others, a fact clearly demonstrated in summary form by Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 236. At the same time, however, the final element in Schmid’s seven-point summary evaluation of the dialogue should not be overlooked, namely, “Alles in allem kann der Dial. als selbständige Quelle für den marcionitischen Text m.E. nicht methodisch kontrolliert ausgewertet werden und ist daher für diesen Zweck auszuscheiden (Ausnahme: sicher etablierbare Übereinstimmungen mit Tertullian oder Epiphanius)” (*ibid.*).



attempt to examine the citations within the context of the citation tendencies or proclivities of either Tertullian or Epiphanius, to determine whether a difference in the citation could be explained or even resolved by what may be termed a “characteristic change” by either writer.<sup>186</sup> Of course, the possibility remains that differences in citation cannot be explained along these lines, but without considering this option, any conclusion, such as the idea that of the twenty-three “explicit correlated readings” only five “allow us to be reasonably sure of the wording of Marcion’s Gospel,”<sup>187</sup> seems to be premature. At the same time, however, Tyson highlights the importance of Williams’s work by stating, “Critiques by Williams and others remind us that an examination of Harnack’s suggestions about the actual wording of individual verses requires special caution. Each case should be questioned, and the basis of his suggested wording reexamined.”<sup>188</sup> I would simply add that this re-examination should and must begin with a comprehensive examination of the sources and the citation customs of the church fathers who provided them.

Hoffmann’s 1984 study on Marcion,<sup>189</sup> in which he states that he “tried to avoid approaching Marcion on the basis of Harnack’s conclusions,” took a very skeptical stance over and against the patristic sources, and he therefore notes “the amount of patristic evidence that I have felt able to credit is much less than Harnack put forward; accordingly, there has been no attempt to reproduce the text of Marcion’s Gospel.”<sup>190</sup> Nevertheless, this fact does not keep Hoffmann from using his thesis of a significantly earlier date for Marcion and his conviction of the relative lateness of the Lukan corpus to argue that because of these points it “makes it probable that Marcion’s evangelion was an Urukās, and without question an abbreviated version of the Third Gospel.”<sup>191</sup> Hoffmann’s study appears to be another

---

<sup>186</sup> Clabeaux observes, “In the discussion of these criteria [used to reconstruct pre-Marcionite readings] it should have become clear how important a knowledge of the style and tendencies of a church father is for evaluating the reliability of biblical citations” (*A Lost Edition*, 39). This point is valid not only in considering Marcion’s text but also in comparing readings between church fathers.

<sup>187</sup> Williams, “Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” 481.

<sup>188</sup> Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 43.

<sup>189</sup> Reference to this work was made in n. 11.

<sup>190</sup> Hoffmann, *Marcion*, xv.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 133–34. Hoffmann’s attempt to revise the dates, understanding, and context of Marcion has generally been met with skepticism or outright rejection. See the particularly critical reviews by C. P. Bammel, *JTS* 39 (1988): 227–32 and Gerhard May, “Ein neues Markionbild?,” *TRu* 51 (1986): 405–13.

case where a particular conviction arises from historical assumptions external to Marcion's Gospel itself.

In 1992, Kenji Tsutsui offered the only new reconstruction of the entirety of Marcion's Gospel to appear since Harnack.<sup>192</sup> Tsutsui notes, "Wenn auch Harnacks Name ewig leben wird, so ist seine Rekonstruktion des Textes Marcions doch kein Heiligtum."<sup>193</sup> Regardless of how one is inclined to evaluate his first assertion, he is certainly correct in his second. Tsutsui provides the text in three rows: the top row is Tertullian's Latin text, the second row contains the references of Epiphanius and *Adam.*, and the third row contains text-critical comments and discussion of the contents of the first two rows.<sup>194</sup> Tsutsui's reconstructed text does differ from that of Harnack's in several places;<sup>195</sup> however, because of methodological shortcomings, Tsutsui's offered text cannot be said to have advanced scholarly knowledge of Marcion's text beyond Harnack.

Although, as distinguished from Williams, Tsutsui seeks to incorporate multiple witnesses in a complete reconstruction of Marcion's *Euangelion*, Schmid again rightly points out, "Eine ausgeführte Quellenkritik oder Überlegungen zum Charakter der Quellen und zur methodisch kontrollierten Rückgewinnung des marcionitischen Textes wird allerdings kaum vorgenommen."<sup>196</sup> For example, Tsutsui simply asserts

In bezug auf Tertullian ist es ferner beachtenswert, daß er oft den Text Marcions in direkter Rede (z.B. "dicit, ...", "dicens, ...", "adicit, ...", "inquit, ...") oder in einem unabhängigen Satz (worin oft das Subjekt bzw., das Verb in 1./2. Person beibehalten ist) wiedergibt. Dieser Bericht, der im folgenden 'direktes Zitat' genannt und in der Textangabe fett gedruckt (wie: **fett**) wird, ist von besonderer

---

<sup>192</sup> Reference to this work was made in n. 9.

<sup>193</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 68.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>195</sup> Tsutsui helpfully summarizes the verses where his text differs from that of Harnack's (*ibid.*, 68n4).

<sup>196</sup> Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 24–25. Similarly, in his introduction to Tertullian, *Contre Marcion: Tome IV* (critical text by Claudio Moreschini; trans. René Braun; SC 456; Paris: Cerf, 2000) Braun observes that in Tsutsui's reconstruction "l'auteur s'attache au seul latin de notre livre IV comme source principale pour reconstituer l'évangile marcionite, mais selon nous, sans tenir compte suffisamment de la pratique de T[ertullien] comme citateur" (29–30). Similarly, Klinghardt states that the same negative evaluation he made of Harnack's reconstruction (see n. 129) "gilt auch für K. Tsutsui" (Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Lucas," 492n32).

Zuverlässigkeit und kann ausführlicher als die sonstigen behandelt werden.<sup>197</sup>

Schmid observes that this rather unsophisticated approach to Tertullian's citations "muß in methodischer Hinsicht als ein Zurückgehen hinter ein schon erreichtes Problembewußtsein gewertet werden."<sup>198</sup> That this evaluation of Tsutsui's methodology is not unfairly leveled was already confirmed before Schmid's study by the work of Clabeaux in his examination of Tertullian as a witness to the text of Marcion's Pauline corpus.<sup>199</sup> It is unfortunate that Tsutsui makes no reference to Clabeaux's study, and therefore, may not even have been aware of the problematic nature of his assertion.

Since the work of Tsutsui, Ulrich Schmid has published two articles dealing with Marcion's Gospel. In the first he addresses the questions of whether Marcion knew the Fourfold Gospel collection and why Marcion chose Luke as the foundation for his text.<sup>200</sup> In the second he addresses methodological issues in reconstructing Marcion's Gospel text that have already been seen to figure importantly in the discussion concerning methodology.<sup>201</sup>

Interestingly however, the two most recent studies to discuss Marcion's Gospel, both appearing in 2006, have once again challenged the view that Marcion's Gospel is a reworking of Luke. Tyson's work was already discussed in some detail in conjunction with Knox's study above, and it simply can be noted here that Tyson has drawn on both Hoffmann's earlier dating of Marcion's life and work and Knox's theories to argue that Luke is "the end of a rather long process of composition."<sup>202</sup> A pre-Marcionite Gospel (beginning with Luke 3:1, already containing material from Mark and Q, containing a brief resurrection narrative, and dating to 70–90 C.E.) was re-worked by Marcion around 115–120 C.E., and again re-worked by the author of

---

<sup>197</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 70. Braun provides several examples where Tsutsui unsatisfactorily applied his own method in René Braun et al., eds., *Chronica Tertulliana et Cyprianea 1975-1994: Bibliographie critique de la première littérature latine chrétienne* (CEA 157; Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1999), 491.

<sup>198</sup> Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 25.

<sup>199</sup> See Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition*, 20–22, 40–49.

<sup>200</sup> Schmid, "Marcions Evangelium," 69–77.

<sup>201</sup> Schmid, "How Can We Access," 39–50. See the citations referenced by nn. 120 and 121.

<sup>202</sup> Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 119.

Luke, who had as one of his purposes the refutation of Marcionism, around 120–125 C.E.<sup>203</sup>

Matthias Klinghardt also relies heavily on Knox's work and he explicitly states that in his article he will renew Knox's thesis.<sup>204</sup> Klinghardt's recognition of the inadequacy of Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel and the challenges that confront any new attempt to reconstruct this text leads him to focus on the general content (*Umfang*) of Marcion's Gospel.<sup>205</sup> He directs most of his attention to the beginning of Marcion's Gospel and of Luke as he formulates his argument that Luke's opening chapters are secondary and that the author of Luke, for his chapter four, has re-worked the Marcionite text.<sup>206</sup> In addition, Klinghardt interprets the Lukan prologue as "antimarkionitisch."<sup>207</sup> Not surprisingly, Klinghardt concludes "Markion hat das kanonische Lk-Evangelium nicht verstümmelt. Vielmehr stellt Lk eine redaktionelle Erweiterung des älteren Evangeliums dar, das auch Markion benutzt hatte."<sup>208</sup>

At this point it is clear that a long, complex, and at times convoluted history of research has attended the scholarship on Marcion's Gospel. As was mentioned prior to this survey, the only way truly to move forward in the discussion is to revisit the content and readings of Marcion's Gospel. Knox appropriately noted, "The raising of that question ... confronts us with one of the most intricate problems of the whole intricate field of the textual criticism of the New Testament."<sup>209</sup> Indeed, the challenges to reconstructing Marcion's Gospel have often been noted.<sup>210</sup> Therefore,

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., 119–20.

<sup>204</sup> Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Lukas," 491.

<sup>205</sup> For Klinghardt's criticism of Harnack's text see n. 129. The entirety of Klinghardt's discussion is found in *ibid.*, 491–94.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid., 499.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., 508. The entire discussion of the prologue is found on pp. 500–508.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 512. See also Klinghardt, "„Gesetz“ bei Markion und Lukas" in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag* (ed. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt; NTOA 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 99–128. Klinghardt's view has recently been criticized by Christopher M. Hays, "Marcion vs. Luke: A Response to the *Plädoyer* of Matthias Klinghardt," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 213–32 and Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HNT 5; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 2–3.

<sup>209</sup> Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*, 46.

<sup>210</sup> See, for example, n. 180 for reference to Williams's list of challenges as well as David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1999), 416–17n71 and Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Lukas," 491–92.

any renewed attempt to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel *from* the sources is inextricably linked with methodological questions concerning one's *approach to* the sources. Up to this point, the discussion has largely focused on the shortcomings of previous studies, even if areas where scholarship has advanced have also been noted. At the same time, the crucial need for providing a positive contribution to the understanding of the sources for Marcion's Gospel and to methodological considerations has become evident. It is to that endeavor to which we turn in the following chapter.

## Chapter 2

### 2.1 The Sources for Marcion's Gospel

#### 2.1.1 Sources for Reconstructing Marcion's Gospel

It must be admitted that no new source texts for the reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel have come to light since Harnack's tome on Marcion.<sup>1</sup> The most important sources remain Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*, especially book four; the *Panarion (Adversus haereses)* of Epiphanius, especially section forty-two and the seventy-eight *σχόλια* and *ἔλεγχοι* concerning Marcion's Gospel; and the Pseudo-Origen *Adamantius Dialogue*, especially books one and two where Adamantius debates the Marcionites Megethius and Marcus.<sup>2</sup> Apart from these sources, Harnack rightly noted, "Die Ausbeute, welche die Angaben anderer Zeugen gewähren (von Hippolyt und Origenes an bis zum Armenier Esnik), ist nicht groß."<sup>3</sup> It is important, however, not to confuse having no new sources with having no new knowledge of the sources. Since Harnack's work, important new editions and studies of these sources, as well as of the church fathers who wrote them, have appeared.

For Tertullian, since the publication of Francis Oehler's 1851–1854 edition of his works<sup>4</sup> and the 1906 Emil Kroymann edition of *Adversus Marcionem*,<sup>5</sup> a revised edition of the Kroymann text by Eligius Dekkers<sup>6</sup> and a new edition by Claudio

---

<sup>1</sup> Claire Clivaz, "The Angel and the Sweat Like 'Drops of Blood' (Lk 22:43–44): P<sup>69</sup> and f<sup>43</sup>," *HTR* 98 (2005): 429–32 has recently suggested that P<sup>69</sup> is a fragment of Marcion's redaction of Luke. This view, however, cannot be accepted as it rests entirely on an argument from silence; the verses Clivaz considers are unattested for Marcion's Gospel.

<sup>2</sup> May observes, "Die griechischen und lateinischen Quellen zu Marcion liegen schon im 19. Jahrhundert fast vollständig bereit" ("Marcion ohne Harnack," 5).

<sup>3</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 177\*.

<sup>4</sup> *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Quae Supersunt Omnia* (ed. Francis Oehler; 3 vols.; Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1851–1854).

<sup>5</sup> *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera* (ed. Emil Kroymann; CSEL 47; Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1906), 290–650.

<sup>6</sup> The revised edition of *Adversus Marcionem* is found in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera* (2 vols.; CCSL 1, 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 1:441–726. Helpful studies of the text of *Adversus Marcionem* that appeared in the interim include Petrus Corssen, "Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem in librum quartum animadversiones," *Mnemosyne* 51 (1923): 242–61, 390–411, and *Mnemosyne* 52 (1924): 225–49; Heinrich Hoppe, *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians* (SVSL 14; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1932); and three articles by J. H. Waszink, "Tertulliana," *Mnemosyne* 3 (1935–1936): 165–74, "Varia critica et exegetica," *Mnemosyne* 11 (1943): 68–77, and "Varia critica et exegetica," *Mnemosyne* 13 (1947): 121–29. Also helpful is J. E. L. van der Geest, *Le Christ et*

Moreschini<sup>7</sup> were published. In addition, a text and English translation of *Adversus Marcionem* by Ernest Evans<sup>8</sup> and a French translation by René Braun based on an updated critical text by Moreschini<sup>9</sup> have become available.<sup>10</sup> More significantly, several new scriptural indices to Tertullian's works have improved on Hermann Roensch's study of Tertullian's NT.<sup>11</sup> In particular, studies devoted exclusively to examining the text of Luke in Tertullian, including several articles and a doctoral dissertation by Merrill Chapin Tenney, are valuable aids in evaluating the citations of Luke by Tertullian, even if they all must be used with caution due to both incomplete and inaccurate data.<sup>12</sup>

A final issue of considerable significance concerning Tertullian's testimony is the scholarly discussion concerning the language in which he knew the text of Marcion that has occurred since Harnack first proposed that Tertullian was working from a Latin translation of Marcion's *Apostolikon* and *Euangelion*.<sup>13</sup> In a

---

*l'ancien testament chez Tertullien: Recherche terminologique* (SSLC 22; Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1972).

<sup>7</sup> *Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem* (ed. Claudio Moreschini; TDSA 35; Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1971).

<sup>8</sup> Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* (ed. and trans. Ernest Evans; 2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

<sup>9</sup> Tertullian, *Contre Marcion* (critical text by Claudio Moreschini; trans. René Braun; 5 vols.; SC 365, 368, 399, 456, 483; Paris: Cerf, 1990–2004).

<sup>10</sup> Helpful overviews of the manuscripts and editions of *Adversus Marcionem* are found in Braun, *Contre Marcion*, 19–30 and Volker Lukas, *Rhetorik und literarischer ‚Kampf‘: Tertullians Streitschrift gegen Marcion als Paradigma der Selbstvergewisserung der Orthodoxie gegenüber der Häresie: Eine philologisch-theologische Analyse* (EH 23.859; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008), 33–35.

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, the index in *Tertulliani Opera* (CCSL 2), 2:1457–93 and especially J. Allenbach et al., eds., *Des origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien* (vol. 1 of *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*; Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975). Roensch's study is *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's: Aus den Schriften des Letzteren möglichst vollständig rekonstruiert, mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen textkritischen und sprachlichen Inhaltes* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1871).

<sup>12</sup> See G. J. D. Aalders, "Tertullian's Quotations from St Luke," *Mnemosyne* 5 (1937): 241–82; A. J. B. Higgins, "The Latin Text of Luke in Marcion and Tertullian," *VC* 5 (1951): 1–42; David S. Williams, "On Tertullian's Text of Luke," *SecCent* 8 (1991): 193–99; and Tenney, "The Quotations from Luke in Tertullian as Related to the Texts of the Second and Third Centuries" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1944).

<sup>13</sup> For Harnack's view and arguments, see *Marcion*, 178\*–181\*. Ulrich Schmid comments that Harnack was also the first to posit that Tertullian used a Latin translation of Marcion's *Apostolikon* (see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 40). In 1914 Harnack still believed that Tertullian had Greek copies of Marcion's works (see "Tertullians Bibliothek christlicher Schriften," *SKPAWB* 10 [1914]: 324). In the following years Harnack's examination of the issue apparently led him to contend that Tertullian not only had Marcion's biblical text in Latin translation, but that he knew it exclusively in Latin translation (see *Marcion*, 77, 49\*n2).

forthcoming article, and in agreement with those who have returned to the view that Tertullian used a Greek copy of Marcion's *Apostolikon*,<sup>14</sup> I have defended the view that Tertullian also had a Greek copy and not a Latin translation of Marcion's Gospel when writing *Adversus Marcionem*.<sup>15</sup> In that article, I have argued that in considering this issue it is important not only to consider the differences in the Latin terms found in the attested texts for Marcion's Gospel and the citation of those same texts elsewhere in Tertullian's corpus, but also the similarities.<sup>16</sup> Both these similarities and differences must then be compared to readings in extant Old Latin witnesses. On the one hand, the agreement of Latin terminology between Marcion's Gospel and Tertullian's text against the attested readings in Old Latin witnesses becomes an argument against Tertullian working from a Latin copy of Marcion's Gospel, and, on the other hand, differences in the terminology between Marcion's Gospel and Tertullian's text, where neither reading is attested in the extant witnesses, may also confirm that the variation is due to Tertullian's own translations rather than his working from a Latin copy of Marcion's Gospel. An examination of the 87 Greek terms rendered in verses attested both for Marcion's Gospel and elsewhere in Tertullian's corpus reveals that Marcion's Gospel and Tertullian's text agree in their Latin renderings on 51 occasions, or 59% of the time. Of these 51 agreements, in about one-third of them the agreement is in renderings that are completely unique or rather uncommon in the extant Latin textual tradition for that verse. In addition, when Marcion's Gospel and Tertullian's text disagree, 69% of the time one of their respective renderings is not found within, or only at the periphery of, the surviving Old Latin textual tradition. It is surely simpler to explain these phenomena through the view that Tertullian himself is largely responsible for the Latin of Marcion's text as he translated it *ad hoc* from the Greek than to persist in Harnack's view that Tertullian had a Latin translation of Marcion's Gospel when he wrote *Adversus*

---

<sup>14</sup> Though Harnack's position found significant support in the twentieth century, several scholars have now questioned and challenged his view. See, for example, Hermann Josef Frede, ed., *Epistulae ad Ephesios* (VL 24/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1962–1964), 30\* and *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses* (VL 24/2; Freiburg: Herder, 1966–1971), 9; Bonifatius Fischer, "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache: Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte," in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte* (ed. K. Aland; ANTF 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 10–11, 26n73, and 31n88; Clabeaux, *A Lost Edition*, 49–57; and Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 40–59.

<sup>15</sup> See Dieter T. Roth, "Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?," *VC* (forthcoming).

<sup>16</sup> This point was also made by Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 46.



*Marcionem*.<sup>17</sup> Undoubtedly, the view that Tertullian is translating from the Greek rather than copying from a Latin *Vorlage* will lead one to view his testimony to Marcion's Gospel somewhat differently than Harnack.<sup>18</sup>

For Epiphanius, the critical text of his works remains the edition by Karl Holl,<sup>19</sup> though the second and third volumes have been corrected and supplemented in second editions by Jürgen Dummer.<sup>20</sup> More notably, an index volume has now been published,<sup>21</sup> which, together with the *Biblia Patristica* index,<sup>22</sup> greatly facilitates the study of Epiphanius's texts. In addition, an English translation with helpful notes by Frank Williams of the *Panarion* and *De fide* is now available.<sup>23</sup> Concerning Epiphanius's own biblical text, Carroll D. Osburn has recently offered a new and expanded study of the topic of his Ph.D. dissertation, namely, the *Apostolos* in Epiphanius, which also offers helpful discussion of methodological issues involved in using the church fathers for textual criticism of the NT.<sup>24</sup> For the Gospels' text used by Epiphanius, the study by Lawrence Allen Eldridge<sup>25</sup> is unfortunately rather significantly flawed in both data and methodology,<sup>26</sup> and therefore of limited value for evaluating Epiphanius's text in this section of the NT canon.

---

<sup>17</sup> For the full argument the interested reader is referred to the article referenced in n. 15.

<sup>18</sup> See also the observations by Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 40 and 40n31.

<sup>19</sup> Holl's original editions are Epiphanius, *Epiphanius* (ed. Karl Holl; 3 vols.; GCS 25, 31, 37; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915–1933).

<sup>20</sup> Epiphanius, *Epiphanius II* (ed. Jürgen Dummer; 2d ed.; GCS 31; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980) and *Epiphanius III* (ed. Jürgen Dummer; 2d ed.; GCS 37; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985).

<sup>21</sup> Epiphanius, *Epiphanius IV: Register zu den Bänden I-III (Ancoratus, Panarion haer. 1-80 und De fide)* (ed. Christian-Friedrich Collatz et al.; GCS 13; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006).

<sup>22</sup> J. Allenbach et al., eds., *Eusèbe de Césarée, Cyrille de Jérusalem, Épiphanie de Salamine*, (vol. 4 of *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*; Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1987).

<sup>23</sup> Epiphanius, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* (trans. Frank Williams; 2 vols.; NHS 35, 36; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987–1994).

<sup>24</sup> See Carroll D. Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (SBLNTGS 6; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004). Osburn's Ph.D. dissertation was "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Epiphanius of Salamis" (Ph.D. diss., University of St. Andrews, 1974).

<sup>25</sup> Lawrence Allen Eldridge, *The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis* (SD 41; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1969).

<sup>26</sup> See Gordon D. Fee, review of Lawrence Allen Eldridge, *The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis*, *JBL* 90 (1971): 368, 370 and Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos*, 18–20.

For the Greek text of all five of the books of *Adam*, one must still rely on the 1901 edition by W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen.<sup>27</sup> For the text of books one and two, however, there is a new edition by Kenji Tsutsui, who also provided important discussion concerning the sources, structure, and evaluation of the dialogue.<sup>28</sup> For the Latin translation by Rufinus, a complete new critical edition has been provided by Vinzenz Buchheit.<sup>29</sup>

In addition, Schmid's study of the citation customs found in these works, which comprises the majority of his study on Marcion's *Apostolikon*, has identified numerous trends in citations of Marcion's text that also must be considered when reconstructing Marcion's Gospel.<sup>30</sup> For all of these reasons, it is readily apparent that scholarship on the most significant sources for the reconstruction of the text of Marcion's Gospel has continued to advance since the time of Harnack, making it appropriate to revisit their testimony to that text.

Because so few verses are attested in the minor sources, the scholarly work since Harnack on Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Pseudo-Tertullian, (Pseudo-)Ephrem, Jerome, Philastrius, and Eznik will not be discussed in detail here.<sup>31</sup>

### **2.1.2 The Attestation of Marcion's Gospel**

A significant challenge in attempting to gain an overview of Marcion's Gospel is that to my knowledge there is no comprehensive list of the verses *and* the reference(s) in the sources.<sup>32</sup> This observation remains true even for the list of

---

<sup>27</sup> Pseudo-Origen, *Der Dialog des Adamantius: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ* (ed. W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen; GCS 4; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901).

<sup>28</sup> Kenji Tsutsui, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Markioniten im Adamantios-Dialog: Ein Kommentar zu den Büchern I-II* (PTS 55; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).

<sup>29</sup> Vinzenz Buchheit, *Tyranni Rufini librorum Adamantii Origenis Adversus haereticos interpretatio* (STA 1; Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1966). Buchheit also provided an important contribution in "Rufinus von Aquileja als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialogs," *ByzZ* 51 (1958): 314–28.

<sup>30</sup> See Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 35–235 for his discussion of Tertullian, Epiphanius, and the *Adamantius Dialogue* as sources. Further discussion of the citation habits identified by Schmid is found below under 2.2.3 Tertullian's Citation Custom. The examinations of Clabeaux, though smaller in scope, are also helpful (see *A Lost Edition*, 40–49, 57–69).

<sup>31</sup> References to editions of these additional sources can be found in the notes to the table in 2.1.2.1 Attested Verses (Present).

<sup>32</sup> This is not to say that no resource exists for finding sources that provide testimony concerning a particular verse, as Harnack provided an apparatus to his reconstruction of Marcion's

passages in Knox's work, which provides an often helpful general overview.<sup>33</sup> It is important to remember that Knox's list of Lukan verses present, absent, or unattested in Marcion's text is based on Harnack's reconstruction and not the sources, and that Knox allowed the mention of only a few words of a Lukan pericope in a source to lead to the inclusion of the entire pericope in the "attested" list.<sup>34</sup>

In order to provide a more detailed picture of Marcion's Gospel the following tables apply a rigorous standard: only the specific verses mentioned by a source are included in the list of attested passages. Of course, there are occasions when a source, particularly Epiphanius, provides a reference apparently intended to indicate that a pericope was present in Marcion's text through a general reference including καὶ τὰ ἕξῃς or by referring to an opening, medial, and closing verse.<sup>35</sup> It may well be that in such cases Marcion's text included the entire pericope; yet, the reality remains that not every verse of the pericope is attested.<sup>36</sup> In addition, generally only those passages with the greatest likelihood of having come from Marcion's text are included. For example, Harnack recognized concerning *Adam*. that it remains unclear at numerous points whether citations arose from Marcion's text.<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless, Harnack tended rather liberally to include data from the Dialogue in his reconstruction.<sup>38</sup> Though Marcionite readings may appear in citations not identified as arising from Marcion's text or not made by Megethios or Marcus, they can only be identified as such if they corroborate an already established Marcionite reading from another source. Even in this case, however, being convinced that a reading is a

---

Gospel that contains references to nearly all the relevant sources (see *Marcion*, 183\*–240\*). However, it is difficult to gain an overview of the whole of Marcion's Gospel and the testimony concerning it.

<sup>33</sup> Knox's list contains only references to the verses with no mention of the sources.

<sup>34</sup> Knox himself was aware of this latter weakness (see chapter 1, n. 145).

<sup>35</sup> See *Pan.* 42.11.4, 42.11.5, and 42.11.6 in scholia 5, 59, 64, and probably 38.

<sup>36</sup> Slightly different is the case when an omission is noted in this manner, since even though an attestation of the *presence* of a pericope does not necessarily attest to the presence, and certainly not to the wording, of every verse in the pericope, a reference to the *omission* of a passage from one verse up to another necessarily indicates that the intervening verses were absent.

<sup>37</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, 181\*. Tsutsui curiously states "Es ist ... davon auszugehen, daß die antimarkionitische Auseinandersetzung über das Evangelium im Adamantiosdialog ursprünglich auf der Basis des markionitischen Textes geführt wurde" (*Die Auseinandersetzung*, 93). Such a claim is never made in *Adam*. In fact, in a later discussion Tsutsui admits that "Adamantios eigentlich nicht versprochen hat, seine Behauptung aus den Schriften des Megethios ... zu begründen" (*ibid.*, 179).

<sup>38</sup> To take simply one example, Harnack reconstructed Luke 24:37 based on the citation by Adamantius in 5.12 in a discussion with Marinus (identified as a follower of Bardesanes). Adamantius simply gives no indication that he is using Marcion's text here.

Marcionite reading still does not guarantee that the citation is directly attesting Marcion's text. Thus, I have chosen to err on the side of caution concerning the citations included in the table below. Overall, the data is intended, as much as possible, to reveal not simply the broad strokes, but the specific verses on which the sources comment or are silent.

Concerning the tables themselves, the first two, respectively, list verses which are attested in one of two ways: (1) the verse is attested as present or (2) the verse is attested as absent. The latter phenomenon appears almost exclusively in the testimony of Epiphanius; however, in numerous instances, Epiphanius's explicit indication of an omission in Marcion's text corresponds with the silence of Tertullian. Thus, the Tertullian column of table two contains references in brackets with the indication "*tacitus*" in order to indicate those instances when Tertullian silently passes over verses that Epiphanius states were missing. The third table lists the "unattested" verses, in other words, the verses on which all sources are silent.

### 2.1.2.1 Attested Verses (Present)

Verse in Luke	Tertullian	Epiphanius <sup>39</sup>	<i>Adam</i> . <sup>40</sup>	Other(s)
3:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.7.1	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.5	<i>Adam.</i> 64.14–15 (2.3); 98.2–3 (2.18); 102.68–69 (2.19)	Irenaeus, <i>Haer.</i> 1.27.2; 4.6.2 <sup>41</sup>  Hippolytus, <i>Haer.</i> 7.31.5 <sup>42</sup>  (Pseudo-)Ephrem, <i>An Exposition of the Gospel</i> 1 <sup>43</sup>  Origen, <i>Ex libro Origenis in Epistolam ad Titum</i> <sup>44</sup>
4:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.2			Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 11.23 <sup>45</sup>

<sup>39</sup> In the references to *Pan.* 42.11.6, the number in parentheses refers to the scholia. The scholia are repeated in the same order in *Pan.* 42.11.17, each followed by an elenchus. When, in an elenchus (ἔλ.), a reference is made to a verse other than the one(s) found in the scholia, it is noted in the chart.

<sup>40</sup> References to *Adam.* give both the page and line number from the Bakhuyzen edition of the Greek text (see n. 27) and the divisions in C. P. Caspari's edition of Rufinus's Latin translation of the text in *Kirchenhistorische anecdote: nebst neuen Ausgaben patristischer und kirchlich-mittelaltlicher Schriften / 1, Lateinische Schriften: die Texte und die Anmerkungen* [Oslo: Mallng, 1883], 1–129. Caspari's divisions are given in parentheses. Not included in this table are the questionable instances when the Marcionites cite verses not found in Luke: in the case of Markus, the altered version of Matt 5:17 in 88.33 (2.15), John 13:34 in 90.4 (2.16), and John 15:19 in 108.32 (2.20), and in the case of Megethius Matt 12:29 in 124.2–4 (3.7).

<sup>41</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Norbert Brox edition *Irenäus von Lyon: Epideixis, Adversus Haereses / Darlegung der apostolischen Verkündigung, Gegen die Häresien* (5 vols.; FonCh 8; Freiburg: Herder, 1993–2001).

<sup>42</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Miroslav Marcovich edition *Hippolytus: Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (PTS 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986).

<sup>43</sup> Section numbers are taken from the George A. Egan edition *Saint Ephrem: An Exposition of the Gospel* (CSCO 291; Leuven: Peeters, 1968). For an overview of the debate concerning the authorship and unity of this work see David Bundy, "Marcion and the Marcionites in Early Syriac Apologetics," *Mus* 101 (1988): 26–27 and idem, "The Anti-Marcionite Commentary on the Lucan Parables (*Pseudo-Ephrem A*): Images in Tension," *Mus* 103 (1990): 112–14. Egan maintains that the work is by Ephrem, but even if this likely is not the case, Egan is absolutely correct in noting that the author makes no statement that he intends to use Marcion's text in his refutation and in only two places makes any comment about the relationship between a citation and Marcion's Gospel (*An Analysis of the Biblical Quotations of Ephrem in "An Exposition of the Gospel" (Armenian Version)* [CSCO 443; Leuven: Peeters, 1983], 42). Only one of these statements involves a passage from Luke (Luke 5:34), which is also the only other place evidence from *An Exposition of the Gospel* is listed in this table.

<sup>44</sup> This reference is found in *Origenes opera omnia* (ed. Carol Henric Eduard Lommatzsch; 25 vols.; Berlin: Haude & Spener, 1831–1848), 5:286.

<sup>45</sup> Chapter and section numbers are taken from *Éphrem de Nisebe: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant ou diatessaron: Traduit du syriaque et de l'arménien* (trans. Louis Leloir; SC 121; Paris: Cerf, 1966). The same divisions are used in the works presenting only the Syriac text (see

4:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.2			Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 11.23
4:27 <sup>46</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.6	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(48)		
4:29	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.2			Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 11.23  Jerome, <i>Contra Johannem</i> 34 <sup>47</sup>
4:30	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.3			Jerome, <i>Contra Johannem</i> 34
4:31	<i>Marc.</i> 4.7.1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7			Origen, <i>Ex libro Origenis in Epistolam ad Titum</i>  Hippolytus, <i>Haer.</i> 7.31.6  An anonymous Syriac manuscript preserved in the British Museum (cod. Add. 17215 fol. 30).
4:32	<i>Marc.</i> 4.7.7, 8			
4:34	<i>Marc.</i> 4.7.9, 10, 12			
4:35	<i>Marc.</i> 4.7.13			
4:40	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.4			
4:41	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.5			
4:42	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.9, 10			
4:43	<i>Marc.</i> 4.8.10			
5:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.1			
5:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.1			
5:10	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.1			
5:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.2			
5:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.3			
5:13	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.4, 7			
5:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.9.9, 10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(1)		
5:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.10.1			
5:18 <sup>48</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.10.1			
5:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.10.13, 14			
5:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.10.1, 13			

*Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant: Texte Syriaque [Manuscript Chester Beatty 709]* [ed. and trans. Louis Leloir; CBM 8; Dublin: Hodges Figgis & Co., 1963] and *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes* [trans. Carmel McCarthy; JSSSup 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993]).

<sup>46</sup> Both Tertullian and Epiphanius attest the presence of this verse in the pericope of the cleansing of the ten lepers (Luke 17:11–19).

<sup>47</sup> Section numbers are taken from the J.-L. Feiertag edition *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Opera III, Opera Polemica 2: Contra Iohannem* (CCSL 79A; Turhout: Brepols, 1999).

<sup>48</sup> In Ephrem, *Commentary on the Diatessaron* 5.21, after commenting on Jesus' statement "your sins are forgiven you," Ephrem references a Marcionite view that since the paralytic committed sin through his body he was punished through the body. It is difficult to know what, if any, particular verse is being referenced.

5:24 <sup>49</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.10.1, 13	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(2)		
5:26	<i>Marc.</i> 4.10.1			
5:27	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.1			
5:30	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.2			
5:31	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.1			
5:33	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.5			Ephrem, <i>Hymns Against Heresies</i> , 47.4 <sup>50</sup>
5:34	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.6			Ephrem, <i>Hymns Against Heresies</i> , 47.4  (Pseudo-)Ephrem, <i>An Exposition of the Gospel</i> 64
5:35	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.6			
5:36	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.9, 10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.2.1	<i>Adam.</i> 90.8–9, 22–23 (2.16)	Philastrius, <i>Diversarum hereseon liber</i> 45 <sup>51</sup>
5:37	<i>Marc.</i> 4.11.9, 10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.2.1		
5:38			<i>Adam.</i> 90.5–7 (2.16)	
6:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.1, 5			
6:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.1, 5			
6:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.5	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(21)		
6:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.5	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(21)		
6:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.11; 16.5	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(3)		
6:6	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.11, 14			
6:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.9			
			<i>Adam.</i> 36.14 (1.17)	
6:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.12.11			
6:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.13.1			
6:13	<i>Marc.</i> 4.13.4			
6:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.13.6			
6:16	<i>Marc.</i> 2.28.2	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(4)		
6:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.13.7	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(4)		
6:19		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(5)		
6:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.14.1, 9, 13	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(5)		Ezriq, <i>De deo</i> 405 <sup>52</sup>
6:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.14.9, 11, 13			
6:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.14.14			

<sup>49</sup> Harnack referenced *Acta Archelai* 44 on this verse and noted that according to this text “deren Antithesen wahrscheinlich Marcionitische sind, hat sich das an einem Sabbat abgespielt” (*Marcion*, 189\*). Even if Harnack is correct on the Marcionite character of the antitheses, a position recently discussed and defended by Jason BeDuhn, “Biblical Antitheses, Adda, and the Acts of Archelaus,” in *Frontiers of Faith: The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus* (ed. Jason BeDuhn and Paul Mirecki; NHMS 61; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007), 136–42, no insight into the text of Marcion’s Gospel can be gained.

<sup>50</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Edmund Beck edition and translation *Des Heiligen Ephraem des Syers Hymnen Contra Haereses* (CSCO 169, 170; Leuven: L. Durbecq, 1957).

<sup>51</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Friderich Marx edition *Sancti Filastrii Episcopi Brixienis: Diversarum Hereseon Liber* (CSEL 38; Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1898).

<sup>52</sup> Section numbers are taken from *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Ezriq of Kolb (flourit c.430-c.450): An English Translation, with Introduction and Notes* (trans. Monica J. Blanchard and Robin Darling Young; ECTT; Leuven: Peeters, 1998).

6:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.15.1	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(6)		
6:24	<i>Marc.</i> 4.15.3, 9			Eznik, <i>De deo</i> 405
6:25	<i>Marc.</i> 4.15.13			
6:26	<i>Marc.</i> 4.15.14			
6:27	<i>Marc.</i> 4.16.1		<i>Adam.</i> 26.20–21 (1.12); 88.27 (2.15)	
6:28	<i>Marc.</i> 4.16.1		<i>Adam.</i> 26.20–21 (1.12)	
6:29	<i>Marc.</i> 4.16.2, 6		<i>Adam.</i> 32.5–6 (1.15); 38.2–3 (1.18)	
6:30a	<i>Marc.</i> 4.16.8			
6:31	<i>Marc.</i> 4.16.13, 16			
6:34a	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.1			
6:35b	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.5, 6			
6:36	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.8			
6:37	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.9			
6:38	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.9		<i>Adam.</i> 32.17 (1.15); 66.33–34 (2.5)	
6:39	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.12			
6:40	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.12			
6:41	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.12			
6:42	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.12			
6:43	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.12		<i>Adam.</i> 56.14–16; 58.11–13 (1.28)	Origen, <i>Princ.</i> 2.5.4 <sup>53</sup>  Hippolytus, <i>Haer.</i> 10.19.3  Pseudo-Tertullian, <i>Adversus omnes</i> <i>haereses</i> , 6.2  Philastrius, <i>Diversarum</i> <i>hereseon liber</i> 45
6:45	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.12			Origen, <i>Princ.</i> 2.5.4
6:46	<i>Marc.</i> 4.17.13, 14			
7:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.1			
7:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.1	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(7)		
7:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.2			
7:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.2			
7:15	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.2			
7:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.2			
7:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.4			
7:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.5, 6, 7		<i>Adam.</i> 50.13–14 (1.26)	
7:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.6			
7:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.6			Eznik, <i>De deo</i> 358
7:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.8	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(8)		Ephrem, <i>Against</i> <i>Marcion I</i> , xxxix/86 <sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Paul Koetschau edition *Origenes Werke: Fünfter Band: De principiis* (GCS 22; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1913).



7:24	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.7, 8			
7:26	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.7			
7:27	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.4, 7, 8	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(9)	<i>Adam.</i> 98.11–13 (2.18) <sup>55</sup>	
7:28	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.8			
7:36		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(10)		
7:37	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.9	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(10)		
7:38	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.9	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(10)		
7:44		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(11)		
7:45		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(11)		
7:47	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.9			
7:48	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.9			
7:50	<i>Marc.</i> 4.18.9			
8:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.1			
8:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.1			
8:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.2			
8:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.2			
8:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.5			
8:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.5			
8:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.3, 4			
8:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.7	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(12)		Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 11.9
8:21 <sup>56</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.19.6, 10, 11			
8:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.2, 3			
8:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.3	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(13)		
8:24	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.3	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(13)		
8:25	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.1			
8:27 <sup>57</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.4			
8:28	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.5			
8:30	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.4		<i>Adam.</i> 36.20 (1.17)	
8:31	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.6			
8:32	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.7			
8:42b		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(14)		
8:43	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.8			
8:44	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.8, 13	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(14)		
8:45	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.8	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(14)		
8:46	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.8	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(14)		
8:48	<i>Marc.</i> 4.20.9			
9:1			<i>Adam.</i> 82.2–4 (2.12)	
9:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.1		<i>Adam.</i> 82.4–5 (2.12)	

<sup>54</sup> This text is found in vol. 2 of *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan* (ed. and trans. C. W. Mitchell, A. A. Bevan, and F. C. Burkitt; 2 vols.; London: Williams & Norgate, 1912–1921). Roman numerals refer to the page number of the English translation and Arabic numerals to the Syriac text.

<sup>55</sup> It is not certain that Adamantius is here referring to the Marcionite text.

<sup>56</sup> Epiphanius referenced Luke 8:21 in *Pan.* 42.11.17 (ἐλ. 12); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion's Gospel.

<sup>57</sup> Epiphanius referenced Luke 8:27 in *Pan.* 42.11.17 (ἐλ. 24); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion's Gospel.

9:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.1		<i>Adam.</i> 22.7–9 (1.10)	
9:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.1			
9:6			<i>Adam.</i> 82.6–7 (2.12)	
9:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.2			
9:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.2			
9:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.3			
9:13	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.3			
9:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.3			
9:16		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(15)		
9:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.4			
9:18			<i>Adam.</i> 84.1–2 (2.13)	
9:19			<i>Adam.</i> 84.2–4 (2.13)	
9:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.6		<i>Adam.</i> 84.4–5 (2.13)	
9:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.6			
9:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.7	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(16)		
9:24	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.9, 10			
9:26a	<i>Marc.</i> 4.21.10, 12			
9:28	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.1, 7			
9:29	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.13			
9:30	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.1, 2, 3, 12	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(17); 42.11.17 (ἐλ. 63) <sup>58</sup>		Ephrem, <i>Against Marcion I</i> xxxix/87  Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 14.9
9:31a	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.12	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(17); 42.11.17 (ἐλ. 63)		Ephrem, <i>Against Marcion I</i> xli/91
9:32	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.16			
9:33	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.4, 16			
9:34	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.7, 13			
9:35	<i>Marc.</i> 4.22.1, 8, 10, 12	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(18)		Ephrem, <i>Against Marcion I</i> xlii– xlili/93–95  Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 14.9
9:40		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(19)		
9:41	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.1, 2	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(19)		
9:44		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(20)		
9:46	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.4			
9:47	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.4			
9:48	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.4			
9:54	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.7			
9:55	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.7			
9:57	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.9			
9:58	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.9			
9:59	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.10			

---

<sup>58</sup> In the elenchus Epiphanius also referenced Elijah and Moses being on the mountain (Luke 9:28); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion's Gospel.

9:60	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.10			Clement of Alexandria, <i>Strom.</i> 3.4.25 <sup>59</sup>
9:61	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.11			
9:62	<i>Marc.</i> 4.23.11			
10:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.1, 2			
10:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.2, 3			
10:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.4			
10:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.5			
10:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.7			
10:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.6			
10:10	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.7			
10:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.7			
10:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.8			
10:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.24.9, 12			
10:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.1, 3	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(22)		
10:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.7, 10		<i>Adam.</i> 44.1–2 (1.23)	Irenaeus, <i>Haer.</i> 4.6.1 Eznik, <i>De deo</i> 392
10:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.12			
10:24	<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.12			
10:25	<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.15, 18	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(23)		
10:26		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(23)		
10:27	<i>Marc.</i> 4.25.15	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(23)		
10:28		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(23)		
11:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.1			
11:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.3, 4			
11:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.4			Origen, <i>Fragment</i> 180 <sup>60</sup>
11:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.4			
11:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.8	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(24)		
11:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.8			
11:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.9			
11:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.5, 6	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(24)		
11:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(24)	<i>Adam.</i> 110.3–4 (2.20) <sup>61</sup>	
11:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(24)	<i>Adam.</i> 110.4–5 (2.20)	
11:13	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(24)	<i>Adam.</i> 110.5–6 (2.20)	
11:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.11			
11:15	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.11			
11:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.11			
11:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.11			
11:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.11			
11:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.12			
11:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.26.12			

<sup>59</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Stählin, Früchtel, and Treu edition *Clemens Alexandrinus: Zweiter Band: Stromata Buch I–VI* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.; GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985).

<sup>60</sup> The number of this fragment is taken from *Origenes Werke: Neunter Band: Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas-Kommentars* (ed. Max Rauer; 2d ed.; GCS 49; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 302.

<sup>61</sup> It is not certain that Adamantius is referring to the Marcionite text for Luke 11:11–13.

11:27	<i>Marc. 4.26.13</i>			Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron 11.9</i>
11:28	<i>Marc. 4.26.13</i>			
11:29	<i>Marc. 4.27.1</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(25)</i>		
11:33	<i>Marc. 4.27.1</i>			
11:37	<i>Marc. 4.27.2</i>			
11:38	<i>Marc. 4.27.2</i>			
11:39	<i>Marc. 4.27.2, 6</i>			
11:40	<i>Marc. 4.27.2</i>			
11:41	<i>Marc. 4.27.3, 6</i>			
11:42	<i>Marc. 4.27.4, 6</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(26)</i>		
11:43	<i>Marc. 4.27.5</i>			
11:46	<i>Marc. 4.27.6</i>			
11:47	<i>Marc. 4.27.8</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(27)</i>		
11:48	<i>Marc. 4.27.8</i>			
11:52 <sup>62</sup>	<i>Marc. 4.27.9; 28.2</i>			
12:1	<i>Marc. 4.28.1</i>			
12:2	<i>Marc. 4.28.2</i>			
12:3	<i>Marc. 4.28.2</i>			
12:4	<i>Marc. 4.28.3, 4</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(29)</i>		
12:5	<i>Marc. 4.28.3</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(29)</i>		
12:8	<i>Marc. 4.28.4</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(30)</i>		
12:9	<i>Marc. 4.28.4</i>			
12:10	<i>Marc. 4.28.6</i>			
12:11	<i>Marc. 4.28.8</i>			
12:12	<i>Marc. 4.28.8</i>			
12:13	<i>Marc. 4.28.9</i>			
12:14	<i>Marc. 4.28.9, 10</i>			
12:16	<i>Marc. 4.28.11</i>			
12:19	<i>Marc. 4.28.11</i>			
12:20	<i>Marc. 4.28.11</i>			
12:22	<i>Marc. 4.29.1</i>			
12:23	<i>Marc. 4.29.1</i>			
12:24	<i>Marc. 4.29.1</i>			
12:27	<i>Marc. 4.29.1</i>			
12:28 <sup>63</sup>	<i>Marc. 4.29.1, 3</i>			
12:30	<i>Marc. 4.29.3</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(32)</i>		
12:31	<i>Marc. 4.29.5</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(33)</i>		
12:32		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(34)</i>		
12:35	<i>Marc. 4.29.6</i>			
12:36	<i>Marc. 4.29.6</i>			
12:37	<i>Marc. 4.29.6</i>			
12:38		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(35)</i>		
12:39	<i>Marc. 4.29.7</i>			
12:40	<i>Marc. 4.29.7, 8</i>			
12:41	<i>Marc. 4.29.9</i>			
12:42	<i>Marc. 4.29.9</i>			

<sup>62</sup> In the notes to the series of “Woes” in Luke 11, Harnack commented “Auf das „Wehe“ im Ev. M.s spielt auch Ephraem an (51. Lied gegen die Ketzler c. 5)” (*Marcion*, 211\*). In Hymn 51, however, Ephrem makes a reference to “blessed” and “woe,” indicating that the passage in view is more likely Luke 6:20–26 (see also Beck, *Haereses*, 174n1 of the translation). In either case no element of the text, apart from the “woe” is attested in the Hymn.

<sup>63</sup> On Tertullian’s allusion to Luke 12:28a in 4.29.1 and Epiphanius attesting its omission, see the comments in 3.1.64 Luke 12:27–28.

12:43	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.9			
12:44	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.9			
12:45	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.9			
12:46	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.9, 10, 11	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(36)		
12:47	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.11		<i>Adam.</i> 112.10–11 (2.21) <sup>64</sup>	
12:48	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.11		<i>Adam.</i> 112.11–12 (2.21)	
12:49a	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.12, 13			
12:51	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.14			
12:53	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.14			
12:56	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.15			
12:57	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.15, 16			
12:58	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.16	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(37)		
12:59	<i>Marc.</i> 4.29.16			
13:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.1			
13:15	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.1			
13:16		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(39)		
13:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.1, 2			
13:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.3			
13:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.3			
13:25	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.4			
13:26	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.4			
13:27	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.4			
13:28	<i>Marc.</i> 4.30.4, 5	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(40)		
14:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.1			
14:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.1			
14:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.2			
14:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.3			
14:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.4			
14:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.4			
14:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.4			
14:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.5, 6			
14:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.6			
14:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.6			
14:24	<i>Marc.</i> 4.31.6			
15:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.2			
15:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.1			
15:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.1			
15:6	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.1			
15:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.2			
15:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.1			
15:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.1			
15:10	<i>Marc.</i> 4.32.2			
16:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1			
16:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1			
16:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1			
16:6	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1			
16:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1			
16:9a	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1			
16:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.4			
16:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.4			
16:13	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.1, 2		<i>Adam.</i> 56.11–12 (1.28)	

---

<sup>64</sup> It is not certain that Adamantius is referring to the Marcionite text in Luke 12:47–48.

16:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.2			
16:15	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.6			
16:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.7	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(43)		
16:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.33.9			
16:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.34.1, 4, 9			
16:19		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(44)	<i>Adam.</i> 76.16–17 (2.10)	
16:20		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(44)	<i>Adam.</i> 76.17–18 (2.10)	
16:21			<i>Adam.</i> 76.19–21 (2.10)	
16:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.34.10, 11	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(44)	<i>Adam.</i> 76.21–23 (2.10)	
16:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.34.10, 11, 12		<i>Adam.</i> 76.23–25 (2.10)	
16:24			<i>Adam.</i> 76.26–29 (2.10)	
16:25		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(45)	<i>Adam.</i> 76.29–31 (2.10)	
16:26	<i>Marc.</i> 4.34.11		<i>Adam.</i> 76.31–34 (2.10)	
16:27			<i>Adam.</i> 76.34–35 (2.10)	
16:28			<i>Adam.</i> 76.35– 78.2 (2.10)	
16:29	<i>Marc.</i> 4.34.10, 17	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(46); 42.11.17(ἔλ. 59)	<i>Adam.</i> 78.2–3 (2.10)	
16:30			<i>Adam.</i> 78.3–5 (2.10)	
16:31		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(46)	<i>Adam.</i> 78.5–6 (2.10)	
17:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.1		<i>Adam.</i> 88.4–5 (2.15)	
17:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.1			
17:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.2			
17:4	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.3			
17:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.9			
17:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.4, 6	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(48)		
17:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.4, 7, 8, 10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(48)		
17:15	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.11			
17:16	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.9			
17:17	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.11			
17:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.11			
17:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.11			
17:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.12			
17:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.12			
17:22		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(49)		
17:25	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.14			
17:26	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.16			
17:28	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.16			
17:32	<i>Marc.</i> 4.35.16			
18:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.1			
18:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.1			
18:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.1			
18:5	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.1			
18:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.1			
18:10	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.2			
18:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.2			

18:12	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.2			
18:13	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.2			
18:14	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.2			
18:16			<i>Adam.</i> 32.26–27 (1.16)	
18:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.4, 6	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(50)	<i>Adam.</i> 92.25–26 (2.17)	
18:19 <sup>65</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.3, 6	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(50)	<i>Adam.</i> 2.18–19 (1.1); 92.26–27 (2.17)	Origen, <i>Princ.</i> 2.5.1, 4 Hippolytus, <i>Haer.</i> 7.31.6
18:20	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.4, 5, 7	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(50)	<i>Adam.</i> 92.27–29 (2.17)	
18:21	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.4		<i>Adam.</i> 92.29–30 (2.17)	
18:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.4, 6, 7		<i>Adam.</i> 92.30–32 (2.17)	
18:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.5			
18:35	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.9	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(51)	<i>Adam.</i> 200.22–24 (5.14)	
18:36			<i>Adam.</i> 200.24–25 (5.14)	
18:37	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.9		<i>Adam.</i> 200.25–26 (5.14)	
18:38	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.9, 11; 37.1; 38.10	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(51)	<i>Adam.</i> 200.26 (5.14)	
18:39	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.9			
18:40			<i>Adam.</i> 200.26–28 (5.14)	
18:41			<i>Adam.</i> 200.28–29 (5.14)	
18:42	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.10, 12	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(51)	<i>Adam.</i> 200.29–30 (5.14)	
18:43	<i>Marc.</i> 4.36.12; 37.1		<i>Adam.</i> 200.30 (5.14)	
19:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.37.1			
19:6	<i>Marc.</i> 4.37.1			
19:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.37.1			
19:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.37.1			
19:10	<i>Marc.</i> 4.37.2			
19:11	<i>Marc.</i> 4.37.4 <sup>66</sup>			

<sup>65</sup> Along with these other sources, Harnack also noted, “Vielleicht gehört auch Clem. hom. XVIII, 1 hierher, wo wohl Marcion als Simon Magus spricht: μή με λέγε αγαθόν· ὁ γὰρ αγαθός εἶς ἐστιν, ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.” (*Marcion*, 225\*; see also Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:469). In addition, IGNTP attests the reading as Marcion ap Clementina. It is entirely possible that Marcionite and anti-Marcionite material appears in the *Homilies*, as M. J. Edwards observes “Simon is a composite intellectual of that era—a Simon, a Valentinus and a Marcion” (“The *Clementina*: A Christian Response to the Pagan Novel,” *CQ* 42 [1992]: 462; for further discussion see A. Salles, “Simon le Magicien ou Marcion?,” *VC* 12 (1958): 197–224; Dominique Côté, “La fonction littéraire de Simon le Magicien dans les *Pseudo-Clémentines*,” *LTP* 57 [2001]: 513–23; and Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Heresiology in the (Jewish-) Christian Novel: Narrativized Polemics in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*,” in *Heresy and Self-Definition in Late Antiquity* [ed. Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin; TSAJ 119; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 273–98). It is tenuous, however, to posit that here Marcion speaks as Simon and that in so doing attests Marcion’s text.

<sup>66</sup> In *Marc.* 4.37.4 Tertullian also makes the barest of allusions to the contents of vv. 16–24.

19:13	<i>Marc. 4.37.4; 39.11</i>			
19:22	<i>Marc. 4.37.4</i>			
19:23	<i>Marc. 4.37.4</i>			
19:26	<i>Marc. 4.37.4</i>			
20:1	<i>Marc. 4.38.1</i>			
20:4	<i>Marc. 4.38.1, 2</i>			
20:5	<i>Marc. 4.38.2</i>			
20:6	<i>Marc. 4.38.1</i>			
20:7	<i>Marc. 4.38.2</i>			
20:8	<i>Marc. 4.38.2</i>			
20:19		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(54); 42.11.17(ελ. 53)</i>		
20:24	<i>Marc. 4.38.3</i>			
20:25	<i>Marc. 4.38.3</i>			
20:27	<i>Marc. 4.38.4</i>			
20:28	<i>Marc. 4.38.4</i>			
20:29	<i>Marc. 4.38.4</i>			
20:30	<i>Marc. 4.38.4</i>			
20:31	<i>Marc. 4.38.4</i>			
20:33	<i>Marc. 4.38.4</i>			
20:34	<i>Marc. 4.38.5, 8</i>			
20:35	<i>Marc. 4.38.5, 7</i>			
20:36	<i>Marc. 4.38.5, 7</i>			
20:39	<i>Marc. 4.38.9</i>			
20:41	<i>Marc. 4.38.10</i>			
20:44	<i>Marc. 4.38.10</i>			
21:7	<i>Marc. 4.39.13</i>			
21:8	<i>Marc. 4.39.1, 2</i>			
21:9	<i>Marc. 4.39.3</i>			
21:10	<i>Marc. 4.39.3</i>			
21:11	<i>Marc. 4.39.3</i>			
21:12	<i>Marc. 4.39.4</i>			
21:13	<i>Marc. 4.39.4</i>			
21:14	<i>Marc. 4.39.6, 7</i>			
21:15	<i>Marc. 4.39.6, 7</i>			
21:16	<i>Marc. 4.39.8</i>			
21:17	<i>Marc. 4.39.8</i>			
21:19	<i>Marc. 4.39.8</i>			
21:20	<i>Marc. 4.39.9</i>			
21:25	<i>Marc. 4.39.9</i>			
21:26	<i>Marc. 4.39.9</i>			
21:27	<i>Marc. 4.39.10</i>			
21:28	<i>Marc. 4.39.10, 12</i>			
21:29	<i>Marc. 4.39.10, 13, 16</i>			
21:30	<i>Marc. 4.39.16</i>			
21:31	<i>Marc. 4.39.10, 16</i>			
21:32	<i>Marc. 4.39.18</i>			
21:33	<i>Marc. 4.39.18</i>			
21:34	<i>Marc. 4.39.18</i>			
21:35a	<i>Marc. 4.39.18</i>			
21:37	<i>Marc. 4.39.19</i>			
21:38	<i>Marc. 4.39.19</i>			
22:1	<i>Marc. 4.40.1</i>			
22:3	<i>Marc. 4.40.2</i>			
22:4	<i>Marc. 4.40.2</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(60)</i>		
22:5	<i>Marc. 4.40.2</i>			
22:8		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(61)</i>		
22:14		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(62)</i>		



22:15	<i>Marc.</i> 4.40.1, 3	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(62); 42.11.17(ελ. 61)		Ezrik, <i>De deo</i> 415
22:17 <sup>67</sup>			<i>Adam.</i> 108.27 (2.20)	
22:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.40.3, 4		<i>Adam.</i> 108.27 (2.20)	
22:20 <sup>68</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.40.4, 6			
22:22b	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.1			
22:33	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.2			
22:34	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.2			
22:41		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(65)		
22:47		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(66)		
22:48	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.2	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(66)		
22:63		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(68)		
22:64		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(68)		
22:66	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.3			
22:67	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.3			
22:69	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.4			
22:70	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.4, 5; 42.1			
22:71	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.5			
23:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.1			
23:2	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.1	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(69) <sup>69</sup>		
23:3	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.1			
23:7	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.2, 3			
23:8	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.3			
23:9	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.3			
23:18	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4			
23:19	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4			
23:22	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4			
23:23	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4			
23:25	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4			
23:32	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4			
23:33	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(71)		
23:34	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.4	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(71)		Ephrem, <i>Commentary on the Diatessaron</i> 23.3
23:44	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.5			Ezrik, <i>De deo</i> 358
23:45	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.5	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(71)		Ezrik, <i>De deo</i> 358
23:46	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.6	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(73)		
23:50	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.8	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(74)		
23:51	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.8			
23:52	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.7			
23:53	<i>Marc.</i> 4.42.7	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(74)		
23:55	<i>Marc.</i> 4.43.1			
23:56		<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(75)		
24:1	<i>Marc.</i> 4.43.1			

<sup>67</sup> Tsutsui, *Die Auseinandersetzung*, 287 sees a reference to both vv. 17 and 19 in this passage. Harnack stated “Aus Dial. II, 20 läßt sich nichts Sicheres schließen” but sees vv. 17–18 as unattested and probably deleted by Marcion (*Marcion*, 233\*). In his earlier work Tsutsui agreed with Harnack that the verses were probably omitted (“Evangelium,” 123). In any case, it is not entirely clear that Marcion’s text is in view here.

<sup>68</sup> Epiphanius referenced Luke 22:20 in *Pan.* 42.11.17 (ελ. 61); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion’s Gospel.

<sup>69</sup> Epiphanius also references this verse in *Pan.* 42.11.6(70). In both scholia he indicates that Marcion made additions to the verse.

24:3	<i>Marc. 4.43.2</i>			
24:4	<i>Marc. 4.43.2</i>			
24:5		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(76)</i>		
24:6	<i>Marc. 4.43.5</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(76)</i>		
24:7	<i>Marc. 4.43.5</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(76)</i>		
24:9	<i>Marc. 4.43.2</i>			
24:11	<i>Marc. 4.43.3</i>			
24:13	<i>Marc. 4.43.3</i>			
24:15	<i>Marc. 4.43.3</i>			
24:16	<i>Marc. 4.43.3</i>			
24:19	<i>Marc. 4.43.3</i>			
24:21a	<i>Marc. 4.43.3</i>			
24:25	<i>Marc. 4.43.4</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(77)</i>		
24:26		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(77)</i>		
24:30		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(77)</i>		
24:31		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(77)</i>		
24:37	<i>Marc. 4.43.6</i>			
24:38	<i>Marc. 4.43.6</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(78)</i>		
24:39	<i>Marc. 4.43.6, 7, 8</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(78)</i>		
24:41	<i>Marc. 4.43.8</i>			
24:42				Eznik, <i>De deo</i> 407
24:43				Eznik, <i>De deo</i> 407
24:47	<i>Marc. 4.43.9</i>			

### 2.1.2.2 Attested Verses (Absent)

Verse(s) in Luke	Tertullian	Epiphanius	<i>Adam. Dial.</i>	Other(s)
1:1–2:52 <sup>70</sup>	<i>Marc. 4.7.11 [Marc. 4.7.1 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.9.1–2; 42.11.4–5</i>		Hippolytus, <i>Haer.</i> 7.31.5  Origen, <i>Ex libro Origenis in Epistolam ad Titum</i>
4:1–13	<i>Marc. 5.6.7<sup>71</sup></i>			
8:19	<i>[Marc. 4.19.6–7 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(12)</i>		
9:31b	<i>Marc. 4.22.16</i>			
11:30–32	<i>[Marc. 4.27.1 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(25)</i>		
11:49–51	<i>[Marc. 4.27.8 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(28)</i>		
12:6	<i>[Marc. 4.28.3 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(29)</i>		
12:28a		<i>Pan. 42.11.6(31)</i>		
13:1–9	<i>[Marc. 4.30.1 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(38)</i>		
13:29–35	<i>[Marc. 4.31.1 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(41)</i>		
15:11–32	<i>[Marc. 4.33.1 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(42)</i>		
17:10b	<i>[Marc. 4.35.4 tacitus]</i>	<i>Pan. 42.11.6(47)</i>		

<sup>70</sup> D. Donatien de Bruyne argued that elements in the Prologue to Luke combat Marcion's Gospel and the omission of the opening chapters ("Les plus anciens prologues latins des évangiles," *RBén* 40 [1928]: 205). The suggestion is intriguing though ultimately likely incorrect in the light of the critique by Jürgen Regul, *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe* (AGLB 6; Freiburg: Herder, 1969), especially 77–80.

<sup>71</sup> This passage, though found in Tertullian's discussion of 1 Cor, clearly reveals that these verses were not in Marcion's Gospel.

17:12b–13 <sup>72</sup>	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.35.4 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(48)		
18:31–33	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.36.8 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(52)		
19:29–46	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.38.1 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(53)		
20:9–17	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.38.3 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(55)		
20:37–38	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.38.8–9 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(56) <sup>73</sup>		
21:18	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.39.8 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(58)		
21:21–22	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.39.9 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(59)		
22:16	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.40.3 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(63) <sup>74</sup>		
22:35–37	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.41.2 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(64) <sup>75</sup>		
22:50	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.41.3 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(67)		
23:34b <sup>76</sup>	<i>Marc.</i> 4.41.4			
23:43	[ <i>Marc.</i> 4.42.5 <i>tacitus</i> ]	<i>Pan.</i> 42.11.6(72)		

---

<sup>72</sup> The inclusion here of Luke 17:12b–13 arises out of a comparison of Tertullian’s and Epiphanius’s testimony. It is admittedly difficult, at first glance, to reconcile the two. Harnack stated “Nach Epiph. [war] einiges in der Perikope gestrichen, aber was? Alle Hauptsachen müssen nach Tertullians Bericht vorhanden gewesen sein” (*Marcion*, 223\*). Noteworthy, however, is that Epiphanius mentions that Jesus met ten lepers (17:12a), then states ἀπέκοψε δὲ πολλὰ καὶ ἐποίησεν followed by the citation of 17:14. Harnack rightly noted the problem if Epiphanius is referring to elements “cut out” of the remainder of the pericope (vv. 15–19), for they are all attested by Tertullian; yet, if Epiphanius is referring to vv. 12b–13, these elements are not attested by Tertullian. Of course, the question arises as to whether Epiphanius would refer to one and a half verses as πολλὰ. If Epiphanius has the whole pericope in mind that may indeed be unlikely; yet, if he is only considering vv. 12–14, the only verses to which he makes reference, the excision of half the material may indeed be seen as omitting “much.” For a similar argument see Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:482–83.

<sup>73</sup> Epiphanius also states that these verses were missing in *Pan.* 42.11.6(57) apparently based on a belief that Jesus made the statement twice (cf. *Pan.* 42.11.17[57]).

<sup>74</sup> In *Pan.* 42.11.17 (ἔλ. 63) Epiphanius referenced Luke 22:30, elsewhere unattested for Marcion’s Gospel; however, it is not clear that Epiphanius is here drawing from Maricon’s Gospel.

<sup>75</sup> Though Epiphanius cites the beginning of v. 35 followed by καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς before referencing v. 37, the context strongly suggests that v. 36 was also missing.

<sup>76</sup> Though Tertullian explicitly notes the excision of v. 34b, Epiphanius quotes from it in *Pan.* 42.11.6(71).

### 2.1.2.3 Unattested Verses

Verse(s) in Luke	7:25	11:10	17:33–37	22:23–32
3:2–38 <sup>77</sup>	7:29–35	11:16–17	18:4	22:38–40
4:14–15	7:39–43	11:23–26	18:6	22:42–46
4:17–22	7:46	11:34–36	18:8–9	22:49
4:24–25	7:49	11:44–45	18:15	22:51–62
4:28	8:1	11:53–54	18:17	22:65
4:33	8:5–17	12:7	18:24–30	22:68
4:36–39	8:9–15	12:15	18:34	23:4–5
4:44	8:26	12:17–19	19:1	23:10–17
5:1	8:29	12:21	19:3–5	23:20–21
5:4–8	8:31	12:25–26	19:7	23:24
5:15–16	8:33–42a	12:29	19:12	23:26–32
5:19	8:47	12:33–34	19:14–21	23:35–42
5:22–23	8:49–56	12:49b–50	19:24–25	23:47–49
5:25	9:4	12:52	19:27–28	23:54
5:28–29	9:9–11	12:54–55	19:47–48	24:2
5:32	9:15	13:10–13	20:2	24:8
5:39	9:23	13:17–18	20:18	24:10
6:10–11	9:25	13:22–24	20:20–23	24:12
6:15	9:26b–27	14:1–11	20:26	24:14
6:18	9:36–39	14:13	20:32	24:17–18
6:30b	9:42–43	14:15	20:40	24:20
6:32–33 <sup>78</sup>	9:45	14:25–35 <sup>79</sup>	20:42–43	24:21b–24
6:34b–35a	9:49–53	15:1–2	20:45–47	24:27–29
6:44	9:56	16:1	21:1–6	24:32–36
6:47–49	10:2–3	16:3	21:23–24	24:40
7:1	10:6	16:8	21:35b–36	24:44–46
7:3–8	10:12–15	16:9b–10	22:2–3	24:48–53
7:10–11	10:17–18	17:5–10a	22:6–7	
7:13	10:20	17:23–24	22:9–13	
7:17	10:29–42	17:27	22:18	
7:21	11:6	17:29–31	22:21–22a	

### 2.1.3 Tertullian's Testimony to Marcion's Gospel

#### 2.1.3.1 Statistical Analysis of Tertullian's Testimony

Even a cursory glance at the tables above reveals that Tertullian's testimony is crucial for our knowledge of the text of Marcion's Gospel. As already mentioned in the introduction, Tertullian makes reference to 438 verses in Marcion's Gospel. It is striking that of the 486 verses attested as present in this text, 90% of them are

<sup>77</sup> There is an indirect indication that 3:2–22 was missing as an implication of Tertullian's comments in *Marc.* 4.11.4.

<sup>78</sup> The comment by Harnack, *Marcion*, 194\* in his apparatus that an allusion to these verses "ist vielleicht in IV,16 („denique hac inconvenientia voluntatis et facti agunt ethnici nondum a deo instructi" [ethnici=ἔθνα])" is contextually unlikely. Harnack is surely right when in the main text of his reconstruction he indicated that vv. 32–33 are "unbezeugt."

<sup>79</sup> Epiphanius referenced Luke 14:26 in *Pan.* 42.11.17 (εἰλ. 70); however, it is not clear that he is here drawing from Marcion's Gospel.

attested by Tertullian. When one also takes into account that Tertullian is the sole witness for 328 verses, comprising 67% of the total verses attested as present in Marcion's Gospel, his vital importance in any attempt to reconstruct Marcion's text is evident. Therefore, even though the reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel ultimately requires bringing together the entire extant testimony from all the sources, the obvious first step is critically establishing Tertullian's testimony.

### 2.1.3.2 Book Four of *Adversus Marcionem*

The tables above also reveal the rather systematic way in which Tertullian's testimony to Marcion's text is set forth in book 4 of *Adversus Marcionem*. In this book, Tertullian continues his refutation of Marcion by working through Marcion's Gospel, though also having Marcion's *Antitheses* in view (*Marc.* 4.1.2), in order to refute Marcion on the basis of his own text.<sup>80</sup> With very few exceptions, Tertullian appears to be commenting on the verses in Marcion's Gospel in the order in which he found them.<sup>81</sup> Even more significantly, as Tertullian works his way through Marcion's text there are indications that he does so without referring to his own text of Luke. Perhaps the clearest example of this fact is when Tertullian accuses Marcion of having changed *μάχαίρων* to *διαμερισμόν* in Luke 12:51. The problem is that the former is the reading of Matt 10:34 and never, apart from the corrector of the 13<sup>th</sup>-century minuscule 1242, appears in Luke 12:51. If Tertullian were consistently checking his own text of Luke, it is difficult to imagine how such an error could have occurred. Tertullian apparently did not consult his own copy of Luke even when accusing Marcion of making an alteration.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> For background information and discussion of the entirety of *Adversus Marcionem* see Braun, *Contre Marcion I*, 7–80; *III*, 7–39; *IV*, 17–49; and *V*, 15–65; Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 35–39; and now especially Lukas, *Rhetorik*. Prior to Hahn it was occasionally questioned whether Tertullian actually had Marcion's text in hand; however, Hahn effectively refuted the notion and convincingly demonstrated that Tertullian was, as he claimed, refuting Marcion from "the heretic's" own Gospel (see Hahn, *Evangelium Marcions*, 91–94). To my knowledge no persuasive challenge to this view arose in any of the subsequent eras of debate on Marcion's Gospel. On Tertullian's method see Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 26–28 and Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 215–16.

<sup>81</sup> There are instances in which verses within a pericope do not appear to be addressed in the order in which they appeared in Marcion's text. Minor examples include 4.24.1–7 (Luke 10:1–11), 4.26.11 (Luke 11:14–20), 4.29.6 (Luke 12:35–37), 4.37.4 (Luke 19:22–26), 4.38.1–2 (Luke 20:1–8), and 4.42.7–8 (Luke 23:50–56). More significant are 4.20.1 (Luke 8:22–25), 4.27.1–6 (Luke 11:37–43), and 4.43.2–5 (Luke 24:1–11). The position of Luke 6:5 (4.16.5) may also be an instance of Tertullian altering the order of Marcion's text; however, the reading in D complicates the issue (see chapter 3, n. 30).

<sup>82</sup> Volckmar noted this example to support his contentions that Tertullian not only did not consult his own text of Luke, but also was most familiar with Matthew, a point to which I return

Finally, as Tertullian draws closer to the conclusion of his work against Marcion, he discusses fewer pericopes and often employs more general references to Marcion's Gospel. This observation has often been made in scholarly works and is undoubtedly relevant when attempting to reconstruct readings in Marcion's text.<sup>83</sup>

## 2.2 The Methodology Employed in this Study

The sections above have highlighted the advancement in the knowledge of the sources of Marcion's Gospel since the time of Harnack, provided a more precise and nuanced knowledge of the verses which those sources attest, and underscored the central place of Tertullian's testimony to Marcion's Gospel. At the same time, none of this insight is particularly beneficial if, when one actually begins to attempt to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel, the methodology governing the use of any of the sources is not also precise and nuanced.

### 2.2.1 Multiple Citations

In setting forth a methodology for reconstructing Marcion's Gospel, it is important to recognize that the usefulness of the sources is limited and the era of the second century is notoriously difficult for questions relating to the text of the NT or Marcion's Gospel (with its close affinity to Luke). May's observation that it is difficult to detect Marcion's textual corrections because of the loose citations found in the sources and the fluid nature of the Gospels' text in the second century clearly has validity.<sup>84</sup> Nevertheless, a significantly better understanding of Marcion's text than is currently available is possible.

Particularly in the light of the history of research presented in chapter one, it may be observed that despite their value, previous attempts to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel ultimately fell short of offering a critically established text. The way forward has already been shown by Schmid's work on Marcion's *Apostolikon*, and in many

---

below (*Evangelium Marcions*, 30–31). Along similar lines Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:471 took issue with the statement of Westcott and Hort in their appendix when they noted, concerning Tertullian's comments on the Lord's Prayer in *Adversus Marcionem*, "whether according to his own text, or Marcion's, or both, is as usual uncertain" (*The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix* [2d ed. London: MacMillan & Co., 1896], 60). See also Zahn's discussion of Luke 12:51 along with Luke 23:34 where he thinks Tertullian is remembering John 19:23 (*Geschichte*, 1:604).

<sup>83</sup> For Tertullian's "hastening towards the conclusion," see, for example, Zahn, *Geschichte*, 1:604–5 and Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 320, 322.

<sup>84</sup> See May, "Markion in seiner Zeit," 9.

ways the present work embraces his methodology and begins to apply it to Marcion's *Euangelion*.<sup>85</sup> The foundational principle of Schmid's work, and of the current work, is the recognition that if readings found in Marcion's Gospel are to be gleaned from the "citations"<sup>86</sup> offered from it by his adversaries "müssen wir das Zitierverhalten unserer Quellen möglichst präzise beschreiben, und das geschieht am überzeugendsten, indem man sämtliche Bibelzitate in allen Schriften eines Kirchenvaters untersucht."<sup>87</sup> In other words, in order to be able to evaluate the testimony that the church fathers offer for readings found in Marcion's Gospel, their general handling of texts throughout their corpus, based on multiple citations, must be understood as precisely as possible.<sup>88</sup> As Barbara Aland has pointed out, such an understanding entails: (1) examining how a particular author understood a particular passage through studying the parallel usage of the passage in the author's corpus, (2) considering how the author incorporates the citation into his own language and style, and (3) understanding citations by Christian writers in their historical contexts and against the background of contemporary non-Christian stylistic sensibilities, because influence from that background always remains possible.<sup>89</sup> Many helpful insights concerning the citation customs of the church fathers interacting with Marcion have already been gained through the work of Clabeaux and Schmid, and it remains here to build on their work by examining every reference from the Gospel according to Luke in the work of Tertullian that also appears in his work against Marcion.<sup>90</sup> Only

---

<sup>85</sup> See Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 26–31, 33–34. Klinghardt observes that Schmid "für die Rekonstruktion des markionitischen Apostolos-Texts methodische Einsichten gewonnen [hat], die auch für die Herstellung des Evangeliums wichtig sind" ("Markion vs. Lukas," 492n30).

<sup>86</sup> Schmid rightly observes, "Wenn die antimarcionitischen Polemiker versuchen, den Häretiker *ex his revinci, quae servavit* [Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.4.2], dann muß dies nicht notwendigerweise bedeuten daß sie seinen Text auch in jedem Fall wörtlich zitieren" (*Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 26).

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> The beginnings of the recognition of the importance of understanding the manner in which a church father quotes Marcion's texts can be found in Wright, *Alterations*, 128–34 where he discussed eleven readings found in Marcion's Gospel as reconstructed by Harnack.

<sup>89</sup> See Barbara Aland, "Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten," in *The New Testament in Early Christianity* (ed. Jean-Marie Sevrin; BETL 86; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 38.

<sup>90</sup> Although allusions to Luke will not be ignored, in order to evaluate citation custom primary emphasis will fall on citations and adaptations. For the purposes of this study "citation" and "adaptation" are understood as defined by Osburn: "*Citation*. A verbally exact quotation, whether it corresponds entirely (for very brief instances) or largely (for longer instances) and whether made from a text or from memory, often having an introductory formula and always having an explicit or implicit que [*sic*] to the reader that it is intended as a deliberate citation. *Adaptation*. A quotation from a recognizable text, without an introductory formula, in which much of the lexical and syntactical

after collecting and comparing the data—with special attention given to “stereotype, geprägte Wendungen ein und desselben Textstückes über mehrere Zitate hinweg und in unterschiedlichen Kontexten (und Schriften) des Kirchenvaters”—can the value and accuracy of his testimony to Marcion’s Gospel text be assessed and evaluated.<sup>91</sup> Two assumptions underlie the ultimate validity of this approach, namely that a church father’s citation custom remains essentially constant, in the sense that he does not approach citing Marcion’s text radically differently from his own text, and that Marcion’s text is not the text the church father usually utilized, and therefore he would not have been influenced by its particular form in his other writings.<sup>92</sup>

It is crucial to recognize that in this approach to reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel text, Marcion’s theological tendencies will not be invoked in the evaluation of Tertullian’s testimony.<sup>93</sup> Thus, I am consciously embracing and agreeing with Schmid’s perspective when he wrote, “I would prefer to see appeals to Marcionite tendency banned from any serious reconstruction of the Marcionite text. We need to first of all screen our sources for the Marcionite text against themselves in order to better understand their theological agendas and rhetorical strategies.”<sup>94</sup> Therefore, in the following chapters Tertullian first will be individually “screened against himself” in his use of Luke in order to attempt to ascertain the reliability of his testimony

---

structure of the text is preserved and woven unobtrusively into the patristic context, reflecting intent to cite, but which is adapted to the patristic context and/or syntax [emphasis original]” (*The Text of the Apostolos*, 28). For these definitions Osburn is summarizing the progression of Fee’s categories and thought (see Gordon D. Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations,” *Bib* 52 [1971]: 357–94 as compared to Bart D. Ehrman, Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* [SBLNTGF 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992]). A comprehensive examination of the citation custom of Tertullian is, of course, beyond the scope of a work focusing on Marcion’s Gospel. Therefore, in addition to the results of previous studies, I am using the texts most immediately relevant for reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel as a “control group” for examining Tertullian’s citation customs.

<sup>91</sup> Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 27.

<sup>92</sup> Once again, these points were already made by Schmid (*ibid.*, 27–28). This study, however, has the benefit of Schmid already having demonstrated that numerous citation habits for Tertullian are found throughout his corpus (see n. 100).

<sup>93</sup> A necessary consequence of this approach is that there is also no discussion of passages which Tertullian passes over in silence. Concretely stated, an initial reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel must resist the temptation to draw any conclusions concerning the unattested passages listed in table three.

<sup>94</sup> Schmid, “How Can We Access?,” 149. Klinghardt also laments the use of “Marcion’s theological tendency” from Tertullian to Harnack in discussions of Marcion’s Gospel (“Markion vs. Lukas,” 496).



concerning Marcion's text.<sup>95</sup> Passages that have multiple citations in Tertullian's corpus form the basis of establishing the characteristic elements of his citation custom, the results of which subsequently undergird the analysis of passages that are not multiply cited.

### **2.2.2 Textual Criticism**

It was noted in the history of research that in addition to methodological problems in Harnack's reconstruction, he did not avail himself of all the data available concerning attested readings in the manuscript tradition. In the present work, however, every attempt will be made to overcome this weakness. Attested readings for Marcion's Gospel will be compared with the manuscript tradition of Luke and the relevant synoptic parallels as found in the apparatus of Tischendorf,<sup>96</sup> von Soden,<sup>97</sup> NA<sup>27</sup>, and the two Luke volumes edited by the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project.<sup>98</sup> In addition, attention will be given not only to whether other manuscripts or how many other manuscripts attest a particular reading, but also to which manuscripts attest the reading.<sup>99</sup> In this way, as Tertullian's testimony is evaluated, evidence in the manuscript tradition, which may at times increase or decrease the likelihood of a reading in Marcion's text, will be kept in view.

---

<sup>95</sup> At relevant points questions relating to the manuscript evidence for Tertullian's own works will also be considered.

<sup>96</sup> Constantin Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece: Volumen I* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869).

<sup>97</sup> Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments: II. Teil: Text mit Appar.*

<sup>98</sup> *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (ed. American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project; 2 vols.; The New Testament in Greek 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984–1987). The present study provides an opportunity to observe both of the following comments by François Bovon: "the two volumes are a welcome tool, providing a handy and comprehensive view of the manuscript evidence for the Gospel of Luke" and "the apparatus, for all practical purposes, is a permanent source of mistakes for both the author and the reader" (*Studies in Early Christianity* [paperback ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005], 25).

<sup>99</sup> The principle espoused by Westcott and Hort, "Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings" (*New Testament: Introduction, Appendix*, 31) is also valuable when considering points of contact, or the lack thereof, between Marcion's Gospel and the textual tradition. Thus, I am consciously adopting "reasoned," sometimes called "rational," eclecticism when considering the evidence from the NT textual tradition. For discussion of this method see Gordon D. Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?," in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. J. K. Elliot; NovTSup 44; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 174–97; repr., *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee; Studies and Documents 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 124–40. For an example of how this principle can affect the evaluation of Marcion's Gospel, see below in chapter 5, n. 3.

### 2.2.3 Tertullian's Citation Custom

As already noted, Schmid's work on Marcion's *Apostolikon* has helpfully identified and established numerous citation customs of Tertullian related to the shortening of verses, content-created alterations, rhetorical changes, translational variants, and changes due to the flow of argument.<sup>100</sup> Many of these tendencies also appear in Tertullian's references to Marcion's *Euangelion*, though just as some citation customs noted by Schmid are more relevant for the epistles, the issue of the presence or absence of influence from Synoptic parallels, irrelevant in Schmid's study, factors significantly in Tertullian's citations from Marcion's Gospel.

Though Schmid organized his analysis under the various identified citation habits, for two reasons I have elected to present the verses in canonical order. First, in this way the layout largely follows the order in which the elements appear in Tertullian's work and there is greater ease of reference to the significant number of attested verses. Second, and more significantly, numerous passages evidence several different citation habits shaping the reference, and the organization of the data by verse rather than by citation custom allows multiple habits to be discussed simultaneously. One drawback of this approach, however, is that all the evidence for a particular citation custom is not gathered together under one heading. For this reason, an overview of the citation habits, in addition to those demonstrated by Schmid, will be provided in the following pages.<sup>101</sup> In this way, an awareness of the significant issues in evaluating Tertullian's testimony can be provided before attention is given to the individual verses.

#### 2.2.3.1 Variations in Conjunctions

Tertullian exhibits significant variation in his use of conjunctions in passages he is citing. The tendency alternately to omit, include, or change a conjunction is evident in numerous multiply-cited texts. For example, in Luke 6:27 *enim* is both

---

<sup>100</sup> See Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 62–105. Schmid also offered sub-categories for numerous of these headings including, (1) simple omissions, (2) shortening of citations with multiple elements, (3) omissions in christological titles, (4) simplification of expression, (5) improvement/non-improvement of readings, (6) *Vetus Testamentum* in *Novo*, (7) alterations due to particular interpretations, (8) rhetorical questions, (9) rearranging sentences in parallel construction, and (10) verb voice. In addition, Schmid also considered explicit comments on readings in Marcion's text and glosses implying readings in Marcion's text (see *ibid.*, 105–21).

<sup>101</sup> Examples are often provided for each identified citation habit, though the full data set is found in the following chapter where every verse is actually analyzed.

attested and unattested, and Tertullian seems to be adding *et* into the verse; in Luke 8:18 the almost universally attested *καί* may twice be rendered with *autem*; in Luke 9:24 he may have used *et* for *δέ* in *Adversus Marcionem* (though the parallel Matt 10:39 reads *καί*), but no conjunction appears in the citation in *Scorp.* 11.1; in Luke 9:26 Tertullian omits the nearly uniformly attested opening *γάρ* in every citation and appears to add a medial *et*; in Luke 12:2 Tertullian includes the opening *autem* in *Adversus Marcionem*, though twice when he elsewhere cites the parallel Matt 10:26 he does not render the opening *γάρ*; and in Luke 20:36 Tertullian offers the reference to being like angels both with and without *enim*. Therefore, great care needs to be taken before drawing conclusions concerning conjunctions in Marcion's text.<sup>102</sup>

### 2.2.3.2 Word Order and Altering the Position of Pronouns

Tertullian's citations exhibit considerable variation in the rendering of the word order in biblical citations. For example, Tertullian attests three different word orders in his three citations of the phrase "Are you the Son of God?" attested for Luke 22:70 (*Marc.* 4.41.4–5). In addition, a particularly prominent tendency is the fluidity evidenced by Tertullian in his placement of pronouns in his citations. It is therefore problematic to invest too much confidence in Tertullian's word order reflecting that of Marcion's text.<sup>103</sup> Thus, concerning Tertullian's testimony to Marcion's text, regardless of whether Tertullian was working with a Greek copy or Latin translation of that text, significant caution needs to be employed before attributing any significance to variant word order, especially when it involves pronouns. On this point Schmid rightly observes "Wortstellungsvarianten beim Zeugen Tertullian gelten für sich betrachtet grundsätzlich als nicht signifikant. Lediglich in Verbindung mit weiteren charakteristischen Lesarten in einem Vers können sie bedeutsam werden."<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup> The following chapter reveals just how often Harnack, and to some extent Tsutsui, derived conclusions concerning Marcion's text from the conjunction attested by Tertullian in a certain verse.

<sup>103</sup> Once again, it is noteworthy how often Harnack relies on Tertullian's testimony for the specific ordering of elements in Marcion's text.

<sup>104</sup> Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 61.

### 2.2.3.3 Use of Future Tense

It also appears that Tertullian is at times inclined to use the future tense when interacting with and citing the biblical text. Some examples of this phenomenon can be found in Luke 6:22, 10:19, 12:20, and 20:35. The same phenomenon is attested in Tertullian's citation of the LXX of Isa 63:9 in 4.22.11 where Braun notes, "Le futur ici utilisé permet d'intégrer la citation dans la perspective qui est celle de T[ertullian]" and Lukas comments "Das Vergangenheitstempus des Originaltextes wurde hier von Tertullian in ein „passenderes“ Futur übergeführt."<sup>105</sup>

### 2.2.3.4 General Inclination to Matthean Accounts

For those passages in Luke that have Matthean parallels, Tertullian demonstrates a general tendency to cite or refer to the Matthean version.<sup>106</sup> This tendency is exhibited in two ways. First, Tertullian reveals his greater familiarity with Matthew through errors that he commits. Luke 12:51 was already discussed above, and Tertullian's memory error there is attributable to his familiarity with the Matthean phrasing.<sup>107</sup> Another telling error occurs in Tertullian's discussion of the beatitude found in Luke 6:20. Though Tertullian in his first citation correctly writes *dei regnum* (*Marc.* 4.14.1) when he shortly thereafter interpolates Isa 61:1–3 with Luke 6:20–22 he slips into the Matthean *regnum caelorum* (*Marc.* 4.14.13).<sup>108</sup> Second, apart from errors, in multiply-cited passages numerous instances reveal Tertullian's tendency to offer the Matthean passage in references outside of *Adversus Marcionem*. A few examples of this occurrence are found in Luke 6:20 (Matt 5:3), 6:22 (Matt 5:11), and 12:8 (Matt 10:32).

The custom of citing from Matthew affects the analysis of Tertullian's testimony to Marcion's text in two ways. First, when Tertullian incontrovertibly

---

<sup>105</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion*, 286n4 and Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 274n1291.

<sup>106</sup> This point was already noted and discussed, though in less detail than here, by Volckmar, *Evangelium Markions*, 30–31. Of course, this is not to say that Tertullian is never influenced by the Lukan version of an account. Examples of this phenomenon can be found in Luke 8:18; 12:24, and 21:25–26. In addition, one of Aalders's conclusions in his study on Tertullian's quotations from Luke stated "Ter. often quotes from memory and by doing so mixes up the synoptic gospels" ("Tertullian's Quotations," 282). I would simply add that this "mixing up" often inclines to the Matthean reading.

<sup>107</sup> For further comments on this memory slip see Roth, "Matthean Texts," 596–97.

<sup>108</sup> A similar phenomenon occurs with Luke 11:15, where in *Marc.* 4.26.11 Tertullian cites it in its Lukan form, but when he references the passage again in *Marc.* 4.28.2 he offers it in one of its Matthean forms (Matt 12:24).

attests a Lukan reading, there is a greater likelihood, though far from certainty, that the phrasing is arising from Marcion's text. Conversely, when Tertullian attests a Matthean reading for Marcion's text, though a harmonization to Matthew's Gospel may have been present in Marcion's text, the possibility of the phrasing being due to Tertullian's greater familiarity with Matthew must always be kept in mind.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> It is particularly the occurrence of "unconscious influence" errors, as in the second citation of Luke 6:20, that belies Zahn's contention that it is "eine willkürliche Annahme, er [Tertullian] habe in seine Übersetzungen und freie Reproduktionen des vor ihm liegenden marcionitischen Textes Erinnerungen an den katholischen Text sei es des Lucas oder des Matthäus einfließen lassen" (*Geschichte*, 2:453).

## Chapter 3

### 3.1 Tertullian as a Source: Multiple Citations

This chapter begins the analysis of Tertullian's testimony to the text of Marcion's Gospel by considering all of the texts with multiple citations in the works of Tertullian.<sup>1</sup> The vast majority of these multiple citations involve the citation of the verse in a work other than *Adversus Marcionem*; however, at times a multiple citation within the latter also provides insight into Tertullian's attestation of Marcion's text and is therefore included in the discussion. The analysis of readings is conducted with the reconstructions of Marcion's Gospel by Harnack and Tsutsui consistently in view.<sup>2</sup> At times, however, the works and views of other scholars who have studied Marcion's text will also be referenced.<sup>3</sup>

#### 3.1.1 Luke 4:32

4.7.7<sup>4</sup> – *Stupebant autem omnes ad doctrinam eius. Plane. Quoniam, inquit, in potestate erat sermo eius,...* | 4.7.8 – *Alioquin non stuperent, sed horrerent, nec mirarentur, sed statim aversarentur* [if teaching had been against the law and the prophets] ... | 4.13.1 – *Adhuc in vigore obstupescebant in doctrina eius; erat enim docens tamquam virtutem habens.*

Though Luke 4:32 is not multiply cited outside of *Adversus Marcionem*, the citations in two different contexts provide insight into Marcion's Gospel. From Tertullian's quotation in 4.7.7, Harnack reconstructed Marcion's text as ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.<sup>5</sup> According to IGNTP this verse is quite uniform in the manuscript tradition,

---

<sup>1</sup> As mentioned in the introduction, chapters 3 and 4 contain an analysis of every verse attested by Tertullian; however, in chapter 5 only those verses for which Tertullian is the sole witness are reconstructed.

<sup>2</sup> Focusing on these two works is fairly self-evident since the former is the current, standard scholarly text for Marcion and the latter is the most recent attempt to reconstruct the text.

<sup>3</sup> The next most frequently invoked work is that of Zahn, who, as noted in chapter 1, provided the most important reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel before Harnack. Earlier works will not be entirely ignored, though the reader interested in details is referred to the respective works, as well as to the helpful overview found in Harnack, *Adolf Harnack: Marcion: die Dorpater Preisschrift (1870)*, 146–53.

<sup>4</sup> References without the title of a work are to *Adversus Marcionem*. The divisions and Latin text are those found in the SC volumes referenced in chapter 2, n. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 184\*.

though two readings require comment. First, ἐξεπλήσσοντο δέ is elsewhere attested only in ff<sup>2</sup>, and even Harnack recognized that δέ instead of καί is “nicht sicher.”<sup>6</sup> In addition, πάντες is only attested elsewhere in r<sup>1</sup>, sa, and Vaticani Syriaci 268.<sup>7</sup> Since there is no compelling reason in Tertullian’s argument for him to have added the term, however, it may have been present in Marcion’s text. A confirmation of the overall accuracy of Tertullian’s citation here is that in 4.13.1, when Tertullian glosses a quotation of Isa 40:9, his recollection of the content of this passage follows the phrasing of the parallel Matt 7:28–29/Mark 1:22. Therefore, it seems that Tertullian’s interaction with Marcion’s Gospel in 4.7.7 may well be governed by the reading in Marcion’s text.

### 3.1.2 Luke 4:34

4.7.9 – *Exclamat ibidem spiritus daemonis: Quid nobis et tibi est Iesu? venisti perdere nos. Scio qui sis, sanctus dei.* | 4.7.10 – ... *at nunc discepto, quomodo hoc eum vocari cognoverit daemon ...* | 4.7.12 – *Nam et praemisit: Quid nobis et tibi?... Nec enim dixit: Quid tibi et nobis? sed: Quid nobis et tibi?... quam iam videns adicit: Venisti perdere nos.* | 5.6.7 – ... *Iesum autem et secundum nostrum evangelium diabolus quoque in temptatione cognovit, et secundum commune instrumentum spiritus nequam sciebat eum sanctum dei esse et Iesum vocari et in perditionem eorum venisse.* | *Carn. Chr. 22.1*<sup>8</sup> – *Deleant igitur et testimonia daemonum filium David proclamantium ad Iesum,...* | *Prax. 26.8* – ... *hoc [that he who was born of the virgin is the Son of God] et satanas eum in temptationibus novit: Si Filius Dei es; hoc et exinde daemonia confitentur: Scimus qui sis, Filius Dei.*<sup>9</sup>

4.7.9 contains a quotation of Luke 4:34, and Tertullian’s argument in 4.7.12 reveals that the word order in the question was τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί. Tertullian also attests *est* before *Iesu*, though the opening interjection ἔα and Ναζαρηνέ after Ἰησοῦ are not attested. Harnack believed the interjection to be missing, but apparently did not believe ἐστίν to be present.<sup>10</sup> The interjection is not attested in D or any OL

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 185\*. The sigla employed for referencing manuscripts are those found in NA<sup>27</sup>, pp. 64\*–76\*, 684–720. The only additional siglum used is “OL” for the Old Latin version.

<sup>7</sup> In the NT πάντες occurs with ἐκπλήσσω only in Luke 9:43.

<sup>8</sup> References to Tertullian’s works other than *Adversus Marcionem* follow the divisions and Latin text found in CCSL volumes referenced in chapter 2, n. 6.

<sup>9</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 4:33–34 occur in 4.7.13–14.

<sup>10</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 185\*.

manuscript, and it may have been absent in Marcion's text.<sup>11</sup> It is also possible, however, that Tertullian simply omitted the interjection at the outset of his citation. ἔστιν is attested in c and r<sup>1</sup>, and after *nobis* in a. Tertullian does not use *est* in 4.7.12, and it is unlikely that its presence in 4.7.9 is because Tertullian saw it in Marcion's text. Concerning Ναζαρηνέ, Harnack succinctly stated “Ναζαρηνέ tendenziös gestrichen.”<sup>12</sup> Even though Harnack could be right, when Tertullian referred to this passage in 5.6.7 he stated that the evil spirit knew that Jesus simply *Iesum vocari*.<sup>13</sup> It is noteworthy that immediately prior to this statement Tertullian refers to the temptation account in Luke 4:1–13 as “according to our Gospel” (*secundum nostrum evangelium*) but references the account of the evil spirit as “according to [our] common document” (*secundum commune instrumentum*). Tertullian is apparently content to name Jesus as “Jesus” and to ascribe this simple designation to both the church's own and Marcion's text. On the other hand, the fact that in 4.8.1–2 (the beginning of the section discussing Luke 4:16–30) Tertullian states that Marcion's Christ ought to have rejected with horror any interaction with Nazareth since it was associated with the Creator's Christ may lead one to expect Tertullian to have made some comment here if Marcion's text had read Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ.

Tertullian twice (4.7.9, 12) cites the unproblematic ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς. For the final element of the verse Harnack reconstructed οἶδα τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>14</sup> Tertullian's curious reference in *Prax.* 26.8 to a phrase that does not appear in the Gospels (*Scimus qui sis, Filius Dei*), and his inaccurate reference to the devils crying out *filius David* in *Carn. Chr.* 22.1 lends credence to the view that here the Lukan *scio* and *sanctus dei* accurately reflect Marcion's text.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, Harnack appealed to the passage in *Adversus Praxean* to support the absence of σε in Marcion's text. Here, however, precisely the opposite conclusion should be reached.

---

<sup>11</sup> IGNTP indicates that it is also missing in 33, 2766<sup>c</sup>, several versions, and a few church fathers. The interjection does not appear in the parallel Mark 1:24.

<sup>12</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 186\*.

<sup>13</sup> Tertullian here is in the midst of an argument against Marcion's interpretation of 1 Cor 2:8.

<sup>14</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 185\*.

<sup>15</sup> In *Prax.* 26.8 it appears as though Tertullian has conflated elements of Luke 5:34/Mark 1:24 and Matt 8:29, using the plural verb of Mark 1:24 (plural pronouns are used in all three passages) and the address of Jesus from Matt 8:29. In *Carn. Chr.* 22.1 Tertullian has placed the words of the blind men (Matt 9:27; 20:30) into the mouth of the demons (Matt 8:29).



Tertullian's citation without the pronoun when he is not following Marcion's text may reveal that Tertullian himself is responsible for its omission.<sup>16</sup>

### 3.1.3 Luke 5:11

4.9.2 – *Denique relictis nauclis<sup>17</sup> secuti sunt eum, ipsum intellegentes, qui coeperat facere quod edixerat. | Bapt. 12.9 – ... patrem et navem et artem qua vitam sustentabat deservit ...*

Tertullian argues that Jesus' words in Luke 5:10 were intended to make Peter and the sons of Zebedee realize that he was fulfilling Jer 16:16, to which Tertullian then adds the statement from 4.9.2 cited above. That Luke 5:11b lies behind Tertullian's comment is clear from the plural *nauclis*<sup>18</sup> as opposed to the singular *navem*, which Tertullian uses in *Bapt. 12.9*, rendering *πλοῖον* in Matt 4:22.<sup>19</sup> Tertullian's focus upon fishermen, and possibly the statement in Matt 4:22, could explain why, in his allusion here, Tertullian stated that they left their boats (mentioned in Luke 5:11a) instead of simply *πάντα* (as found in Luke 5:11b).<sup>20</sup> Harnack offered only *ἀφέντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ* for Marcion's text of Luke 5:11, though *πλοῖα* should also be considered as attested in 5:11a.<sup>21</sup>

### 3.1.4 Luke 5:20–21

4.10.1 – ... *qui dicturi erant: Quis dimittet peccata nisi solus deus?* | 4.10.13 – *Nam cum Iudaei, solummodo hominem eius intuentes, ... merito retractarent non posse hominem delicta dimittere, sed deum solum, ...* | 4.10.14 – [Son of Man] *consecutum iudicandi potestatem, ac per eam utique et dimittendi delicta—qui enim iudicat, et*

---

<sup>16</sup> One could contend that both Marcion's and Tertullian's texts did not contain the pronoun; however, given the fact that in Luke 4:34 only 1654, r<sup>1</sup>, and references by Augustine, Hilary, and Quodvultdeus (according to IGNTP) and in Mark 1:24 no manuscripts (according to Tischendorf and von Soden) attest its absence, this view is less likely.

<sup>17</sup> For this reading, following *M* and *F* against *X* and *R* and understood as a doubly apocopated form of *navicula*, see Braun's comments in *Contre Marcion IV*, 114n2.

<sup>18</sup> τὸ πλοῖον is read in Luke 5:11 in only two minuscules (472, 1009), along with a few Armenian and Georgian manuscripts.

<sup>19</sup> The use of *navicula* and *navis* in these allusions to Luke 5:11 and Matt 4:22 are simply variant translations of *πλοῖον*. *Navis* is significantly more common in Tertullian, as *navicula* is used only here and twice in the singular in *Bapt. 12.6–7* in reference to the *πλοῖον* in Matt 8:24.

<sup>20</sup> Thus, Tsutsui's suggestion that Tertullian is attesting a Marcionite alteration, though perhaps possible, is unnecessary ("Evangelium," 78–79).

<sup>21</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 188\*.

*absoluit—, ut scandalo isto discusso per scripturae recordationem facilius eum agnoscerent ipsum esse filium hominis ex ipsa peccatorum remissione. Denique nusquam adhuc professus est se filium hominis quam in isto loco primum in quo primum peccata dimisit, id est in quo primum iudicavit, dum absolvit. | Bapt. 10.3 – Sed neque peccata dimittit neque spiritum indulget nisi solus deus. | Bapt. 12.8 – ... remittuntur tibi peccata ... | Pud. 21.2 – Quis enim dimittit delicta, ni solus Deus?*

Tertullian's comments in 4.10.13, 14 seem to require Jesus' words in v. 20, though no reading can be reconstructed. The brief reference in *Bapt.* 12.8 that appears to refer to Luke 5:20/Matt 9:2/Mark 2:5 also provides no real point of comparison for Marcion's text. Tertullian's testimony to the final element in Luke 5:21 occurs twice in 4.10. It is worth noting that in the citation in 4.10.1 there is no reference to the ability (δύναται) to forgive sins; however, in 4.10.13 this element is attested.<sup>22</sup> Its absence in the former citation should not be used to posit an omission in Marcion's text as neither the citation of Luke 5:21/Mark 2:7 in *Pud.* 21.2, nor the apparent allusion to this verse in *Bapt.* 10.3 contains a direct reference to the ability or power to forgive sins. In addition, the use of the future *dimittet* in 4.10.1 could be due to Tertullian's citation habit, in spite of his writing *dimittit* in *Pud.* 21.2 and *Bapt.* 10.3. Thus, Harnack is probably generally correct in reconstructing δύναται ἀφεῖναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεός.<sup>23</sup> It should be noted, though, that the reading ἀφεῖναι ἁμαρτίας is elsewhere unattested. B, D, and Ξ read ἁμαρτίας ἀφεῖναι and all other witnesses read ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, as in Mark 2:7. Tertullian also varies the word order in his citations, and thus no firm decision can be made on whether Marcion read an aorist or present infinitive or on the order of the elements in his text. In addition, the omission of the nearly uniformly attested τίς must have been an oversight by Harnack as Tertullian cites it (*quis*).

### **3.1.5 Luke 5:31**

4.11.1 –*Atquin [Christ] probavit potius Iudaeos, dicendo medicum sanis non esse necessarium, sed male habentibus. | Pud. 9.12 – Venerat Dominus utique, ut quod perierat salvum faceret, medicus languentibus magis quam sanis necessarius. | Res.*

---

<sup>22</sup> It is therefore not quite correct when IGNTP states “‘will forgive’ Marcion ap TE.”

<sup>23</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 189\*.

9.4 – ... *etsi inbecillam* [the flesh], *sed Medicum non desiderant nisi male habentes*;

That Tertullian likely provides an accurate adaptation of Luke 5:31 can be seen in the phrase *male habentibus*, reflecting the Greek οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. The same adverb plus participle construction is used in *Res.* 9.4 where Tertullian cites Luke 5:31/Matt 9:12/Mark 2:17 in the midst of a series of biblical citations.<sup>24</sup> When Tertullian’s argument remains close to the wording of the biblical text he continues to use *male* or *malus*;<sup>25</sup> however, when he is simply referring to the concept of the text he avoids this rendering, and may be “improving” the reading, as seen in *Pud.* 9.12 or in the conclusion to the argument in 4.11.3 (*Hoc similitudo praeiudicat, ab eo magis praestari medicum ad quem pertinent qui languent*).<sup>26</sup>

### 3.1.6 Luke 5:36–37

3.15.5 – *Quomodo denique docet novam plagulam non adsui veteri vestimento, nec vinum novum veteribus utribus credi,...* | 4.11.9 – *Errasti in illa etiam domini pronuntiatione qua videtur nova et vetera discernere. Inflatu es utribus veteribus et excerebratus es novo vino, atque ita veteri, id est priori evangelio, pannum haereticae novitatis adsuisti.* | 4.11.10 – *Nam et vinum novum is non committit in veteres utres qui et veteres utres habuerit, et novum additamentum nemo inicit veteri vestimento nisi cui non defuerit et vetus vestimentum.* | *Or.* 1.1 – *Oportebat enim in hac quoque specie novum vinum novis utribus recondi et novam plagulam novo adsui vestimento.* | *Res.* 44.3 – *Perituris enim peritura creduntur, sicut veteribus utribus novum vinum.*

Harnack recognized that this parable “im Wortlaut genau nicht mehr festzustellen [ist],” an assessment with which Tsutsui agrees.<sup>27</sup> The parable is also attested by Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Ephrem, Philastrius, and in *Adam.*, which means

---

<sup>24</sup> In *Res.* 9.4 Tertullian cites from 2 Cor 12:9; Luke 5:31/Matt 9:12/Mark 2:17; 1 Cor 12:13; Luke 19:10; Ezek 18:23; and Deut 32:39. The only difference between Matt 9:12/Mark 2:17 and Luke 5:31 in the phrase under consideration is the use of ἰσχύοντες in the former and ὑγιάνοντες in the latter.

<sup>25</sup> Tertullian uses this adverb/adjective twice as he continues his argument in 4.11.2.

<sup>26</sup> Tertullian also uses *languo* to speak of illness in *An.* 24.5; *Cor.* 8.2; 1.2.2, 4.14.13; and *Res.* 42.14. On *male habere* and *bene habere* being the revival of an old literary form see Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (OECSS; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 132–33.

<sup>27</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 189\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 79.

that here, and whenever there are multiple witnesses to Marcion’s text, no final conclusion concerning readings in that text can be made without considering the testimony of those witnesses. Concerning Tertullian’s testimony, first, in 4.11.9–10, Tertullian twice makes reference to the wine and then to the patch, which is the order found in *Gos. Thom.* 47. This is different from Tertullian’s order in 3.15.5, where the reverse order, found in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 9:16–17/Mark 2:21–22/Luke 5:36–37), is followed. Some hesitancy about concluding that Tertullian definitively attests the reverse order of the elements for Marcion’s Gospel arises as Tertullian himself chose the variant order—wine then patch—in *Or.* 1.1. Second, Tertullian employed a word-play in his accusations leveled against Marcion in 4.11.9 that is suggestive of the underlying reading. The phrase *pannum haereticarum novitatis*<sup>28</sup> seems to play on ἐπίβλημα ῥάκου ἀγνάφου (as in Matt 9:16/Mark 2:21) and not on the Lukan ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ (Luke 5:36).<sup>29</sup>

### 3.1.7 Luke 6:5

4.12.11 – ... *dominus sabbati dictus* ...<sup>30</sup> | 4.16.5 – ... *dominus et sabbati et legis et omnium paternarum dispositionum Christus* ... | *Carn. Chr.* 15.1 – ... *Dominus est sabbati filius hominis.*

---

<sup>28</sup> There is no real significance in the various renderings of ἐπίβλημα (*plagula*, *additamentum*, and probably *pannus*) and ἐπιβάλλω (*inicere* and *adsuere*) in Tertullian’s allusions as they are indicative of not only his own vocabulary variation, but also the large amount of variation in the OL manuscripts for Matt 9:16–17/Mark 2:21–22/Luke 5:36–37 (see Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess?,” [forthcoming]).

<sup>29</sup> Tsutsui also notes Tertullian’s word-play (“Evangelium,” 80).

<sup>30</sup> Tertullian makes reference to this verse after citing Luke 6:9. Both Harnack, *Marcion*, 190\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 81 posit that Luke 6:5 came at this point and not after Luke 6:4 in Marcion’s text. Given that 6:5 follows 6:10 in D and d, this view is possible. Heinrich Joseph Vogels argued not only that Marcion was responsible for this relocation, but also that Marcion is responsible for the saying uniquely attested in Luke 6:4 of D, even if that saying was not present in Tertullian’s and Epiphanius’s copies of Marcion’s Gospel (*Evangelium Palatinum: Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der lateinischen Evangelienübersetzung* [NAb 12.3; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926], 97–98; Hugo Grotius, *Annotationes in libros evangeliorum: cum tribus tractatibus & appendice eo spectantibus* [Amsterdam: Ioh. & Cornelium Bleuv, 1641], 674 appears to have been the first to suggest that a Marcionite was responsible for this short pericope. The relevant statement by Grotius can also be found in J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Luke 6:5D Reexamined,” *NovT* 37 [1995]: 233n5). Alternatively, Amphoux contended that Marcion evidences a text that is an intermediary between that of D and the rest of the textual tradition, with Marcion having omitted the saying in Luke 6:4 of D. (“La révision marcionite,” 113–14). Delobel, however, argues that Tertullian’s text does not permit any of these conclusions and contends that Tertullian himself is responsible for the delayed allusion to Christ as “Lord of the Sabbath.” Delobel notes that Tertullian makes reference to *dominum sabbati* in 4.12.1 and 4.12.11, thus forming an *inclusio* (“Extra-Canonical Sayings,” 107–8; cf. idem, “Luke 6, 5 in Codex Bezae: The Man who Worked on Sabbath,” in *À cause de l’évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes: Offerts au P. Jacques Dupont, O. S.*

This verse is also cited by Epiphanius. Tertullian twice makes a passing allusion to Christ being “Lord of the Sabbath,” with the emphasis falling on Christ being the protector of the Sabbath that belonged to him (4.12.11) or on Christ being the interpreter of the Sabbath (4.16.5). In *Carn. Chr.* 15.1, when Tertullian cites the entire statement, Tertullian is responding to Valentinus’s docetism as he cites numerous passages where Jesus refers to himself as “man” or “Son of Man.” As the shorter and longer citation are easily explainable due to the course of Tertullian’s argument, his truncated reference to Luke 6:5 cannot be used to posit an omission in Marcion’s text.

### 3.1.8 Luke 6:20

4.14.1 – *Beati mendici—sic enim exigit interpretatio vocabuli, quod in Graeco est— quoniam illorum est dei regnum.*<sup>31</sup> | 4.14.13 – ... *beati mendici, quoniam illorum est regnum caelorum;... | Fug. 12.5 – Felices itaque pauperes, quia illorum, inquit, est regnum caelorum, qui animam solam in confiscato habent. | Idol. 12.2 – Egebo. Sed felices egenos dominus appellat. | Pat. 11.6 – ... Beati pauperes spiritu, illorum est enim regnum caelorum. | Ux. 2.8.5 – Nam si pauperum sunt regna caelorum, divitum non sunt,...*<sup>32</sup>

Luke 6:20 is also attested by Epiphanius and Eznik. Several arguments point to Tertullian providing an accurate quotation of Marcion’s text of Luke 6:20b in 4.14.1. First, *beati mendici* indicates that Marcion’s text read μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, because even though Tertullian often simply makes reference to “the poor,” when he

---

*B. à l’occasion de son 70<sup>e</sup> anniversaire* [LD 123; Paris: Cerf, 1985], 469–70). Yet, Delobel does not mention that editors of *Adversus Marcionem* are not agreed as to whether the reading in 4.12.1 should be *deum sabbati* or *dominum sabbati* (see Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 152), though conceptually his argument could be valid on either reading. It is also noteworthy that just before stating that Christ called himself “Lord of the Sabbath” (4.12.11) Tertullian is speaking of divine works done for the soul (drawn from Luke 6:9). In 4.12.14, referring back to Luke 6:1–4, he speaks of Christ performing a work *pro anima* of the disciples in feeding them, revealing that Tertullian has linked the two accounts dealing with the Sabbath and at least raising the possibility that Tertullian withholds the reference to Christ as “Lord of the Sabbath” for the culmination of his argument. Finally, this is not the only instance where Tertullian alters the order in which he discusses verses as part of his argument (for several examples see chapter 2, n. 81). Overall, therefore, Tertullian’s testimony is too ambiguous for a definitive linking of Marcion’s text with the reading of D in these verses.

<sup>31</sup> Moreschini follows the reading of *M* and Kroymann. β and the other editors, except Pamelius and Rigaltus who read *regnum coelorum*, read *regnum dei*.

<sup>32</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 6:20 occur in 4.14.9 and 4.15.7.

cites the Matthean text in *Pat.* 11.6 he writes *beatis pauperes spiritu*.<sup>33</sup> Second, that Marcion also read ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is confirmed through the recognition that the Matthean reading (Matt 5:3) is the one toward which Tertullian naturally, and probably unconsciously, inclines. In fact, when Tertullian interpolates Isa 61:1–3 with Luke 6:20–22 in 4.14.13, he slips back into his regular pattern and writes *beati mendici, quoniam illorum est regnum caelorum*. Finally, the accuracy in these two points would tend to indicate that *illorum* reveals the presence of the Matthean αὐτῶν and not the Lukan ὑμετέρᾳ in Marcion’s text.<sup>34</sup> Nevertheless, Tertullian’s citations always offering *illorum* means that an unconscious Matthean influence cannot be ruled out entirely.

### 3.1.9 Luke 6:21

4.14.9 – *Beati esurientes, quoniam saturabuntur*.<sup>35</sup> | 4.14.11 – *Beati plorantes, quia ridebunt*. | 4.14.13 – ... *beati qui esuriunt, quoniam saturabuntur;... beati qui plorant, quoniam ridebunt;... | Jejun.* 15.6 – ... *qui beatos non saturatos, sed esurientes et sitientes pronuntiarit,...* | *Pat.* 11.7 – *Beati, inquit, flentes atque lugentes.... Itaque talibus et advocatio et risus promittitur*.<sup>36</sup>

In *Marc* 4.14.9, 11 Tertullian cites the two sayings of Luke 6:21. As was the case in Luke 6:20, the sayings are not in the Lukan second person, but rather in third

---

<sup>33</sup> Tertullian’s gloss—*sic enim exigit interpretatio vocabuli, quod in Gaeco est*—in 4.14.1 on the word *mendici* led Harnack to contend “Hieraus folgt, daß Tert. einen Bibeltext, der ‚mendici‘ bot, nicht kannte („pauperes“ hieß es allgemein), daß er aber (s. seine Ausführung im folgenden) auf das präzise „mendici“ Gewicht legte (um der Weissagung willen) und es daher hier einführte” (*Marcion*, 191\*). The second half of Harnack’s statement is undoubtedly true; yet, Harnack’s belief that Tertullian’s gloss is due to his knowledge, or lack thereof, of readings in Latin texts is suspect. The gloss is not a justification for one Latin term as opposed to another, but is used to argue that the Greek requires a term that links the words of Christ to a litany of Psalms cited in 4.14.3–5. Variation of vocabulary in different contexts is commonplace in Tertullian. In fact, in addition to the lemma *mendicus* offered in *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian uses *pauper* (*Fug.* 12.8; *Pat.* 11.6; *Ux.* 2.8.5) and *egenus* (*Idol.* 12.2) to render the Greek πτωχός. Additionally, Harnack’s attempt to assign *beati* to a Latin text of Marcion, a term with which Tertullian is supposedly uncomfortable and which he replaces with *felices* in his own comments, founders on Tertullian’s own variation between *felix* (*Fug.* 12.8; *Idol.* 12.2) and *beatus* (*Pat.* 11.6) in citations of this verse. This same variation in Tertullian’s works is found for several other beatitudes as well (see Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess?,” [forthcoming]).

<sup>34</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 191\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 82 both believe that the Matthean reading was present in Marcion’s text.

<sup>35</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *quoniam*, rejecting the readings *qui* in *F* and *quia* in *X*. Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read *ipse saturabuntur*.

<sup>36</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 6:21 occurs in 4.14.10, and an additional allusion to Matt 5:4 occurs in *Cor.* 13.4.

person address (*saturabuntur, ridebunt*). These third person readings are also attested in numerous manuscripts, and it is possible that Marcion's text contained this textual variant. Once again, however, Matthean influence on Tertullian cannot be completely excluded from consideration. Secondly, the *vûv* in both sayings of the verse in the Greek text is unattested. It may be that Tertullian has simply omitted this adverb as his argument focuses on the presence of these promises *before* the coming of Christ.<sup>37</sup> In the reference to Luke 6:25, however, where Tertullian is equally concerned with the teaching of the Creator before the coming of Christ, Tertullian does include *nunc*. It is possible, therefore, that *vûv* was missing in both sayings in Marcion's text of Luke 6:21, but once again the evidence is not conclusive and Harnack's "auch hier fehlt *vûv*" is overstated.<sup>38</sup> At the same time, the overall accuracy of the citation is confirmed by the absence of elements from Matthean beatitudes as the allusion in *Jejun.* 15.6 appears to also have Matt 5:6 in the background, and the allusion in *Pat.* 11.7 conflates elements of Luke 6:21 and Matt 5:4. Finally, the participial forms *esurientes* and *plorantes* reflect the Greek participles since when Isa 61:1–3 is interpolated with Luke 6:21 (4.14.13) Tertullian appears to be citing from memory and renders the meaning of the participles with *qui esuriunt* and *qui plorant*.

### 3.1.10 Luke 6:22

4.14.14 – *Beati eritis, cum vos odio habebunt homines et exprobrabunt, et eicient nomen vestrum velut nequam*<sup>39</sup> *propter filium hominis.* | *Fug.* 7.1 – *Felices qui persecutionem passi fuerint causa nominis mei.* | *Pat.* 8.3 – *Si linguae amaritudo maledicto sive convicio eruperit, respice dictum: Cum vos maledixerint gaudete.* | *Pat.* 11.9 – *Cum vero: Gaudete et exultate dicit quotiens vos maledicent et persequentur: merces enim vestra plurima in caelo,...* | *Scorp.* 9.2 – *... beati eritis, cum vos dedecoraverint et persecuti fuerint et dixerint adversus vos omnia mala propter me ...*

---

<sup>37</sup> According to IGNTP no other witnesses attest the omission of the first *vûv* and very few attest the omission of the second.

<sup>38</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 191\*.

<sup>39</sup> Moreschini's text reads *nequam* with *M*, Rigalti, and Kroymann, rejecting *malum* in  $\beta$  and the other editors.

Apart from the reference in *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian always refers to this saying in its Matthean form. Given the absence of the Matthean elements in the citation of Luke 6:22 here, it is likely that Tertullian reflects the wording of Marcion's text. Nevertheless, the quotation in 4.14.14 contains several notable elements. First, Tertullian begins the citation with *beati eritis*. Harnack therefore reconstructed Marcion's text as reading ἔσεσθε instead of ἔσστε, and noted that the future form is "sonst unbezeugt."<sup>40</sup> This claim, however, is erroneous.<sup>41</sup> According to IGNTP, the future appears in θ, most OL manuscripts, the Vulgate, Ambrose, and Cyprian. At the same time it is notable that in Tertullian's citation of Matt 5:11 in *Scorp.* 9.2, he also writes *beati eritis*, which, once again, is attested by a handful of OL manuscripts.<sup>42</sup> It is possible that both Marcion's Gospel and Tertullian's copy of Matthew contained ἔσεσθε, but it may also be that Tertullian simply chose to translate ἔσστε with a Latin future as he interpreted the meaning of the verb "to be" in the only beatitude that has a verb after μακάριοι. Given that Tertullian elsewhere reveals a propensity to use the future tense, ἔσεσθε may not be the reading of Marcion's text. In addition, the fact that Tertullian continues with simple futures in 4.14.14 does not necessarily mean that Marcion's text read futures in Greek, even if there is some manuscript evidence for this reading. Though the future perfect often renders aorist subjunctives (as in *Scorp.* 9.2, *Pat.* 8.3, and *Fug.* 7.1), a simple future can be used, and in any case Tertullian does use simple futures in *Pat.* 11.9.<sup>43</sup>

Second, Harnack also believed that Marcion's text read ὑμῶς before the verb μισέω because of the placement of *vos* in Tertullian's citation, again wrongly stating the reading to be otherwise unattested.<sup>44</sup> It is true that Tertullian follows the Greek

---

<sup>40</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*.

<sup>41</sup> D. Plooiij also noted the error (*A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1925], 78n1).

<sup>42</sup> b, f, q, and k, according to *Itala*.

<sup>43</sup> John Thorley, in a comment on the difference between the aorist and present subjunctive in Greek, notes "The distinction is well drawn out by the Vulgate translation, which in most instances translates aorist subjunctives in clauses with ἄν, ἐάν, and ὅταν by a future perfect and present subjunctives by a present or a simple future. (Latin future perfect usage was itself not entirely consistent, in that a simple future was often regarded as sufficient, and this doubtless explains the few cases where a simple future is used for the aorist subjunctive)" ("Subjunctive Aktionsart in New Testament Greek: A Reassessment," *NovT* 30 [1988]: 201).

<sup>44</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*. Again the error was noted by Plooiij, *Further Study*, 78n1 who pointed out that it is the reading found in the Vulgate. It is also found in numerous OL manuscripts, Ambrose, and Cyprian.



word order very closely for the remainder of the citation;<sup>45</sup> however, Tertullian often alters the position of pronouns. It is telling in this case that Tertullian also places *vos* before the verb in *Pat.* 8.3, 11.9 and *Scorp.* 9.2.<sup>46</sup> Thus, Tertullian’s own tendency may be at work, which would preclude confidently moving ὑμᾶς forward in Marcion’s text.

Finally, Tertullian’s quotation does not attest the second of the four phrases in Luke 6:22, namely καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς. It is possible that the phrase was missing in Marcion’s text; yet, given that Tertullian could have simply omitted the phrase or the omission could have come about through parablepsis as a scribe (or Tertullian) skipped from one καί to the next καί, it should be considered “unattested” and not “missing,” as is assumed by Harnack.<sup>47</sup>

### 3.1.11 Luke 6:23

4.15.1 – *Secundum haec, inquit, faciebant prophetis patres eorum. | Scorp. 9.2 – ... gaudete et exultate, quoniam merces vestra plurima in caelo: sic enim faciebant et prophetis patres illorum:...*

Luke 6:23b is also attested by Epiphanius. Both Harnack and Tsutsui posited the omission of Luke 6:23a by Marcion, but again Tertullian’s silence simply means that half of the verse is unattested.<sup>48</sup> The second half of the verse is multiply cited, though in *Scorp.* 9.2 the citation is a conflation of Matt 5:12 and Luke 6:23.<sup>49</sup> There,

---

<sup>45</sup> Note the order of the verbs, ὀνειδίζω and then ἐκβάλλω, against the reverse order in D, many OL manuscripts, and Cyprian.

<sup>46</sup> In Matt 5:11 *vos* precedes different verbs in a b c (*maledicere*), g<sup>1</sup> (*odio habere*), and h (*persequor*). Tertullian’s *dedecorare* in *Scorp.* 9.2 is unattested in the OL manuscripts.

<sup>47</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*. As noted by Schmid (see chapter 2, n. 100), it is not at all uncommon for Tertullian to omit individual elements in multi-element lists. It is interesting that the related Matthean form contains only three phrases, as opposed to Luke’s four, which could also have influenced Tertullian’s citation of Luke 6:22.

<sup>48</sup> Harnack stated “Da Tert. hier genau dem Texte folgt, aber 23a ausläßt, fehlte es, und das folgt auch aus der Tendenz Marcions” (*Marcion*, 192\*). However, Harnack did not explain how he determined Tertullian’s accuracy, why such accuracy means Tertullian cannot silently skip over elements in Marcion’s text, or what supposed Marcionite tendency is at work in the omission. Equally unpersuasive is Tsutsui’s impression “Das Fehlen des Satzes scheint mir an sich wahrscheinlich, und dafür spricht auch der Parallelismus zwischen VV.22f. und V.26, der sich durch die Auslassung von V.23a noch deutlicher hervorheben läßt” (“Evangelium,” 82–83).

<sup>49</sup> It is possible that this conflation was present in Tertullian’s text of Matthew. However, though U, b, and c add οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν at the end of the verse (see NA<sup>27</sup>), k adds *fratres eorum*, and sy<sup>8</sup> replaces τοὺς πρὸς ὑμῶν with οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν (see von Soden), none of these witnesses reads the Lukan verb ποιέω instead of the Matthean διώκω. For this reason it seems more likely that the conflation is due to Tertullian himself.

*sic enim* appears to attest the influence of Matt 5:12b (οὕτως γὰρ), which would increase the likelihood that *secundum haec* in 4.15.1 reveals the presence of the Lukan reading of numerous manuscripts, κατὰ ταῦτα, in Marcion's text. In addition, Tertullian including *enim* in *Scorp.* 9.2 may indicate that Harnack's question "Ob γάρ mit D a ff<sup>2</sup> l Ambros. gefehlt hat?" could be answered in the affirmative.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, a simple omission by Tertullian cannot be ruled out. The inclusion of *et* in *Scorp.* 9.2,<sup>51</sup> but not in the citation of Marcion's text, may reinforce that the remainder of the verse in Marcion's text read as Harnack reconstructed: ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.<sup>52</sup>

### 3.1.12 Luke 6:25

4.15.13 – *Ingerit vae etiam saturatis, quia esurient, etiam ridentibus nunc, quia lugebunt... utique quia saturati estis,... utique ploraturi, qui nunc ridetis. Sicut enim in psalmo: Qui seminant in lacrimis, in laetitia metent, ita in evangelio: Qui in risu seminant, scilicet ex laetitia, in lacrimis metent. | Jejun. 15.6 – ... qui beatos non saturatos, sed esurientes et sitientes pronuntiarit,...*

Harnack reconstructed this verse οὐαὶ οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι, ὅτι πεινάσετε, οὐαὶ οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε.<sup>53</sup> Three issues need to be discussed. First, Harnack did not comment on the absence of ὑμῖν after both occurrences of οὐαὶ, but it is tenuous to assert its absence in Marcion's text.<sup>54</sup> Second, the absence of the first νῦν is likely since it is omitted in numerous manuscripts, including A, D, and all OL manuscripts, and the second νῦν is included. Finally, both Harnack and Tsutsui noted the omission of καὶ κλάσετε at the end of Tertullian's adaptation.<sup>55</sup> Neither of them noticed, however, that as Tertullian continues his argument he connects the Gospel

---

<sup>50</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*. A few additional witnesses to the omission are provided in IGNTF. Tsutsui agrees that the conjunction was absent in Marcion's text, but also notes that its omission was not due to Marcion ("Evangelium," 83).

<sup>51</sup> Attested elsewhere for Luke 6:23 only in the OL manuscripts b, f, and q.

<sup>52</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 173\*. In the second edition Harnack placed ὑμῶν in parentheses after αὐτῶν because of the testimony of Epiphanius (*Marcion*, 192\*).

<sup>53</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*.

<sup>54</sup> Though there is some manuscript evidence for the omission, as will be seen in the next chapter, Tertullian also does not include ὑμῖν in his citation of Luke 6:24. The manuscript evidence is much stronger for the omission of the second ὑμῖν in Luke 6:25.

<sup>55</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\* and Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 83. According to IGNTF the phrase is missing in X, 158, 179, 213, and I299.

text to two OT citations (Is 65:13 and LXX Ps 125:5), the second of which clearly includes a reference to this final element.<sup>56</sup> Thus, whether intentionally or unintentionally, it appears as though Tertullian withheld reference to weeping/tears in the first instance, but then drew an explicit parallel involving tears between LXX Ps 125:5 and the Gospel (4.15.13). Unfortunately, since Tertullian's allusion in *Jejun.* 15.6 seems to have harmonized elements of Luke 6:25 with Matt 5:6 and possibly Luke 6:21, no further insight into Marcion's text can be gained on any of these points.

### 3.1.13 Luke 6:27–28

4.16.1 – *Sed vobis dico, inquit, qui auditis ... Diligite inimicos vestros, et benedicite eos qui vos oderunt, et orate pro eis qui vos calumniantur.... Si enim qui inimici sunt et oderunt et maledicunt et calumniantur fratres appellandi sunt,<sup>57</sup> utique et benedici odientes et orari pro calumniatoribus iussit qui eos fratres deputari praecepit. |*

4.16.6 – *... et non modo non remaledicendi sed etiam benedicendi,... | 4.27.1 ... vetat remaledicere, multo magis utique maledicere,... | An. 35.2 – ... diligite enim inimicos vestros, inquit, et orate pro maledicentibus vos ... | Pat. 6.5 [sic, 6.6] – ... Diligite inimicos vestros et maledicentibus benedicite et orate pro persecutoribus vestris ut filii sitis patris vestri caelestis.<sup>58</sup>*

Luke 6:27–28 is also attested in *Adam*. The reading of these verses in Tertullian's citation in 4.16.1 is unattested in the extant evidence for the NT text. The opening of the verse and the first and last commands are relatively unproblematic as Harnack reconstructed Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω, τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (v. 27) and καὶ προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς (v. 28).<sup>59</sup> NA<sup>27</sup> and the Textus Receptus (TR) read identically here apart from the absence of καὶ before προσεύχεσθε.<sup>60</sup> Tertullian's lack of consistency regarding

<sup>56</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 199 rightly notes the reference.

<sup>57</sup> The reference to calling our enemies brothers is from Tertullian's citation of Isa 66:5 immediately prior to this sentence.

<sup>58</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 6:27–28/Matt 5:44–45 occur in 1.23.3; *Apol.* 31.2; *Or.* 3.4, 29.2; *Scap.* 1.3; *Spect.* 16.6; and probably *Apol.* 37.1 and *Idol.* 21.5.

<sup>59</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*–93\*.

<sup>60</sup> The readings of the TR are taken from IGNTP. For an explanation of that text see the introduction to vol. 1 of IGNTP, vi–vii.

conjunctions means that it ultimately cannot be determined whether he saw it in Marcion's text or not.

The second command, as attested by Tertullian in 4.16.1, however, creates difficulties in that it is a conflated form of the second and third element in Luke 6:27–28. Since both the initial citation and a second reference attest the conflation, Harnack stated “also war wirklich Glied zwei und drei (so Lukas) in eines zusammengezogen;”<sup>61</sup> yet, there are several problems with this view. First, in between these two attestations to a shortened form, Tertullian makes reference to those who curse, which is an element omitted in the references immediately preceding and following this comment. Harnack argued that Tertullian inserted *maledicunt* here due to his remembering the Catholic text, though this would require Tertullian, in the space of a few short lines, to have alternated between Marcion's text, the Catholic text, and then back to Marcion's text. Though not impossible, such rapid alteration should at least raise the question of probability, particularly when attention is given to the next points.

Though Harnack mentioned the reference to cursing in 4.27.1, where Tertullian explicitly says that Christ forbade “cursing in reply,” as further evidence of the influence of the Catholic text, Harnack did not mention the much closer occurrence in 4.16.6, where the same point is made. In addition, and perhaps most significantly, two other references to Luke 6:27–28 or its parallel in Matt 5:44 reveal how “imprecise” Tertullian is in his references to this passage. In *An.* 35.2 Tertullian reproduces the Matthean text, though instead of praying for those who persecute you, he has praying for those who curse you, a reading otherwise unattested.<sup>62</sup> It is the citation in *Pat.* 6.6, however, that is most telling. Here Tertullian has either conflated Luke 6:27–28 and Matt 5:44–45 or is following the “Western” text of Matt 5:44–45. In either scenario, Tertullian has omitted an element in the list: the command to do good to those who hate you. Of course, it could be argued that simply omitting an item is different from conflating the two items, which is what has occurred in 4.16.1. Nevertheless, Tertullian's habit of omitting elements in lists when citing them lends credence to the view already expressed by Pamelius in his 1583–1584 edition of Tertullian's works that the form of the text in *Adversus Marcionem* is due to

---

<sup>61</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 193\*.

<sup>62</sup> There are also various forms in Tertullian's allusions to this text listed in n. 58.

Tertullian himself.<sup>63</sup> At the very least, the confidence with which Harnack offered the reading εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς for the Marcionite text must be questioned. One final observation is that Tsutsui's inclusion of *oculum pro oculo et dentem pro dente* from Matt 5:38 at this point in Marcion's text must be rejected as it is based on a misunderstanding of both Tertullian and Harnack.<sup>64</sup>

### 3.1.14 Luke 6:29

4.16.2 – ... *alteram amplius maxillam offerri iubens, et super tunicam pallio quoque cedi.* | 4.16.6 – *Alioquin si tantum patientiae pondus non modo non reperiendi sed et aliam maxillam praebendi, ... et non modo non retinendi tunicam, sed et amplius et pallium concedendi, ...* | *Fug.* 13.1 – *Proinde inquit: qui tibi tunicam sustulerit, vel etiam pallium concede.* | *Pat.* 7.10 – ... *nisi idem sit qui auferenti tunicam etiam pallium offerre possit?* | *Pat.* 8.2 – ... *Verberanti te, inquit, in faciem etiam alteram genam obverte.*<sup>65</sup>

This verse is also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian's testimony to the second half of Luke 6:29a in 4.16.2 could be rendering the Lukan παρέχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην. That the Matthean στρέψον, found in several minuscules, is not in the Marcionite text is confirmed by Tertullian's use of *obvertere* in the citation of Matt 5:39 in *Pat.* 8.2, as opposed to *offerre/praebere* in 4.16.2, 6.<sup>66</sup>

Luke 6:29b is much more difficult to decipher. The main question concerns the order of the elements of clothing in the Marcionite text. Luke has the order ἱματίον then χιτῶν, whereas Tertullian appears to attest the Matthean order χιτῶν then ἱματίον.<sup>67</sup> According to IGNTP, in the manuscript tradition of Luke this

<sup>63</sup> See Braun's note in *Contre Marcion IV*, 201n2.

<sup>64</sup> In Matt 5:38–39 a reference to the *lex talionis* precedes the teaching on “turning the other cheek.” However, in 4.16.1 Tertullian gives no indication that an element from Matt 5:38 was in Marcion's Gospel text. Rather, he appears to be referring back to one of Marcion's antitheses in which the *lex talionis* was discussed (see 2.28.1–2 ; cf. 2.18.1), an antithesis which Harnack (*Marcion*, 193\*) and Braun (*Contre Marcion II*, 220) think may be cited here. In addition, when Tsutsui at this point in Luke 6:28 quotes Harnack's comment “Dann aber ist die Annahme unvermeidlich, daß M. einen aus Luk. und Matth. gemischten Text befolgt hat,” Tsutsui erroneously thinks that Harnack was referring to the presence of Matt 5:38 in Luke 6:28. In reality, Harnack was speaking of the conflation of Luke 6:29 with Matt 5:39 as found in the Greek text of *Adam*. 1.15.

<sup>65</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 6:29a/Matt 5:39 occur in 4.16.5 and *Spect.* 23.3.

<sup>66</sup> Though *obverte* is not found in the OL manuscripts, the reading of d and k in Matt 5:39 is *converte*. In addition, it must be admitted that the citation here is not precise as there is a general reference to striking *faciem*.

<sup>67</sup> For comments on the grammatical construction in 4.16.2 see Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 202n2.

reversed order is attested in 1542\*, b, ff<sup>2</sup>, g<sup>1</sup>, l, r<sup>1</sup>, and Irenaeus. At the same time, since Tertullian always offers the items in this order one cannot rule out the influence of the Matthean text on Tertullian’s rendering. In addition, it would appear that Tertullian’s use of the verbs *cedere/concedere* are closer to the sense of the Matthean reading than to the Lukan reading where the text states τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης.<sup>68</sup> In general, Tertullian’s testimony does not allow for any definitive conclusions.

### 3.1.15 Luke 6:30

4.16.8 – *Omni petenti te dato,...* | 4.27.1 – ... *iubet omni petenti dare ...* | *Bapt.* 18.1 – ... *Omni petenti te dato ...* | *Fug.* 13.1, 2 – *Sed et omni petenti me dabo in causa elemosinae, non in concussurae. Petenti, inquit.... Atque adeo omni petenti dari iubet, ipse signum petentibus non dat.* | *Mon.* 11.2 – ... *Omni petenti te dabis ...*<sup>69</sup>

Tertullian appears to attest Luke 6:30a in its Lukan form (παντὶ ἀιτοῦντί σε δίδου), though the Latin is unable to indicate whether the definite article, attested in numerous Greek manuscripts before ἀιτοῦντι, was present in Marcion’s text.<sup>70</sup> In addition, the Majority Text,<sup>71</sup> along with several other manuscripts including A, D, and several OL manuscripts, reads δὲ τῶ after παντί. Again, the Latin cannot indicate the presence or absence of the article, but the absence of the conjunction in Tertullian’s testimony could be due to a simple omission and cannot definitively be attributed to the reading in Marcion’s text. Finally, only manuscript 33 attests the Matthean δός here, and there is no good reason to doubt that Tertullian’s future imperative is rendering δίδου.<sup>72</sup> It is interesting to note that though Tertullian quotes 6:30a several times, 6:30b is never included in those citations. Thus, it is here particularly evident how precarious it is to posit omissions in Marcion’s text based solely on Tertullian’s silence.

---

<sup>68</sup> See also the comments of Braun, *ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 6:30a occurs in 4.16.10.

<sup>70</sup> In his reconstructed text Harnack wrote (τῶ?) (*Marcion*, 193\*).

<sup>71</sup> The term “Majority Text” is here used in the sense employed by NA<sup>27</sup> in its explanation of the Gothic “M” as a siglum in the apparatus (see the introduction to NA<sup>27</sup>, 14\*, 55\*).

<sup>72</sup> Note also the use of the future imperative in *Bapt.* 18.1 and a future indicative in *Mon.* 11.2. *dato* is not used in the OL manuscripts in either Luke 6:30 or Matt 5:42. Also worth noting is that Tertullian always includes the Lukan *omni* in his citations, though several OL manuscripts include it in Matt 5:42.

### 3.1.16 Luke 6:31

4.16.13 – *Et sicut vobis fieri vultis ab hominibus, ita et vos facite illis.* | 4.16.16 – *Satis ergo iam tunc me docuit ea [the Creator] facere aliis quae mihi velim fieri.* | *Scorp.* 10.3 – ... *Quomodo vultis ut faciant vobis homines, ita et vos facite illis.*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 6:31 καὶ καθὼς ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι θέλετε παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.<sup>73</sup> Tertullian's attestation of the Lukan opening to the verse is unproblematic, and it is interesting that *quomodo* in the citation of Matt 7:12 in *Scorp.* 10.3 may have arisen out of the Lukan phrasing.<sup>74</sup> It is also possible that ὑμῖν followed next in the text, though as already noted, Tertullian often alters the position of pronouns in verses that he cites. Overall, however, both Harnack and Tsutsui rightly commented on the singular nature of the reading attested in 4.16.13.<sup>75</sup> But, neither of them commented on the interesting points of contact with the readings of Matt 7:12 in k and h, where k reads *volueritis ut fiant vobis homines bona ita et vos facite illis* and h reads *volueritis bona vobis fieri ab hominibus similiter et vos illis facite*. Though, according to the apparatus of Tischendorf and von Soden, γίνομαι instead of ποιέω is unattested in the Greek manuscript tradition of Matthew, that the former underlies *fiant/fieri* in k and h is almost certain.<sup>76</sup> That Marcion's text read γίνεσθαι is likely, not only because of the double attestation of *fieri* (4.16.13, 16), but also because in *Scorp.* 10.3 Tertullian writes *faciant*. It is also probable that Marcion's text read the indicative θέλετε and that the use of the subjunctive *velim* in 4.16.6 is due to Tertullian's argument.<sup>77</sup>

If the reading with a deponent infinitive is correct, regardless of the mood of θέλω, then Harnack is also likely correct in rendering *ab* with παρὰ, though ἀνθρώπων could have appeared with or without the article in Marcion's text. Once

---

<sup>73</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 193\*–94\*.

<sup>74</sup> The apparatus of Tischendorf and von Soden list no attestation for καθὼς appearing in the Matthean text.

<sup>75</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 193\* and Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 84.

<sup>76</sup> Of the other 85 occurrences of ποιέω in Matthew, no OL manuscript ever renders it with *fieri*. In addition, the vast majority of the 75 occurrences of γίνομαι in Matthew are rendered by *fieri* in the OL, even if, unsurprisingly, on occasion verbs like *esse*, *efficere*, or *contingere* are employed.

<sup>77</sup> Note also that Tertullian uses an indicative instead of the Matthean subjunctive in *Scorp.* 10.3.

again, that Tertullian attests the expected *homines* in *Scorp.* 10.3 would tend to confirm Tertullian's attesting a different Greek text for Marcion than that of Luke.<sup>78</sup>

Tertullian's witness to the second half of the verse follows the Matthean word order verbatim. Since Tertullian is actually citing from Matthew in *Scorp.* 10.3 the comparison does not help at this point, though it reveals the possibility that Tertullian slipped into the Matthean version of the saying as he finished the verse. It cannot be ruled out, however, that Marcion's text read the Matthean οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.

### 3.1.17 Luke 6:37

4.17.9 – *Nolite iudicare, ne iudicemini; nolite condemnare, ne condemnemini; dimittite et dimittemini;... | Or. 7.3 – Iam et alibi ex hac specie orationis: Remittite, inquit, et remittetur vobis. | Pat. 10.7 – Cum enim dicit: Nolite iudicare ne iudicemini, nonne patientiam flagitat? | Pat. 12.3 – Quomodo remittes et remittetur tibi si tenax iniuriae per absentiam patientiae fueris? | Pud. 2.2 – ... non iudicantes, ne iudicemur.... Dimitte, et dimittetur tibi.*

Harnack reconstructed this verse μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· μὴ καταδικάζετε, ἵνα μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθ σεσθε [*sic*].<sup>79</sup> The first element is also referenced in *Pat.* 10.7 and *Pud.* 2.2, though apparently influenced by the parallel in Matt 7:1 (μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε). Given that numerous witnesses, including D, attest the Matthean reading in Luke 6:37, Tertullian's rendering in 4.17.9 may be reflecting a harmonization already in Marcion's text and not Tertullian's tendency to offer the Matthean form of a saying.<sup>80</sup> Since Tertullian also offers the second non-Matthean element with the same construction, a reading that is also attested in the manuscript tradition, it becomes more probable that Harnack's reconstruction is basically correct.<sup>81</sup> The third element concerning forgiveness is elsewhere always offered with a third person verb and

---

<sup>78</sup> Matthew and Luke are verbatim in ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Interestingly, at this point the Latin of Tertullian's attestation of Marcion's Luke 6:31 and the reading in h at Matt 7:12 both have *vobis fieri ab hominibus*.

<sup>79</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 194\*.

<sup>80</sup> Tertullian's own text of Luke could also have contained the Matthean reading. The clause initial καὶ and the καὶ before μὴ καταδικάζετε are also omitted in numerous witnesses.

<sup>81</sup> In addition to several church fathers and numerous versions, D and the OL manuscripts e, a, c, d attest the same text Tertullian offers for Marcion's Gospel.



pronoun (either *vobis* or *tibi*) by Tertullian, which increases the likelihood that the wording in 4.17.9 is being governed by the reading in Marcion's text: ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.

### **3.1.18 Luke 6:39**

3.7.1 – ... *caecus a caeco in eandem decidit foveam.* | 4.17.12 – *Sed caecus caecum ducit in foveam.* | 4.36.12 – *Sic enim caecus caecum deducere solet.* | *Praescr.* 14.8 – ... *caecus a caecis in foveam deducaris necesse est.*

In 4.17.12, Tertullian abruptly launches into the series of parables in Luke 6:39–45. Though there are several allusions to Luke 6:39/Matt 15:14 in Tertullian, and it is clear that the text was present in Marcion's text, no definite insight into the wording of that text can be gained.<sup>82</sup> Braun contends that in Tertullian's concluding comment in 4.17.12 (*Multo enim haec congruentius in ipsos interpretabimur quae Christus in homines allegorizavit, non in duos deos secundum scandalum Marcionis*) there is "without a doubt" an allusion to Luke 6:39a (εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς).<sup>83</sup> Even if Braun is correct, once again the allusion does not provide any grounds for positing the precise wording of Marcion's text.

### **3.1.19 Luke 6:40**

1.14.4 – *At tu si super magistrum discipulus et servus super dominum,...* | 4.4.5 – ... *cum et si discipulus Marcion, non tamen super magistrum ...* | 4.17.12 – *Sed non est discipulus super magistrum.* | *An.* 55.2 – ... *servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum,...* | *Praescr.* 34.5 – ... *ipse [Valentinus] faceret discipulos super magistrum.* | *Scorp.* 9.6 – ... *non est discipulus super magistrum ... nec servus super dominum suum,...* | *Val.* 33.1 – *Extiterunt enim de schola ipsius [Valentinus] discipuli super magistrum,...*<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Both Harnack and Tsutsui indicate that there is only an allusion to the text (*Marcion*, 194\* and "Evangelium," 85).

<sup>83</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 222n5.

<sup>84</sup> An additional allusion to this theme as it relates to Marcion and his followers occurs in *Carn. Chr.* 6.1.

The citation of Luke 6:40a is fairly straightforward: οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον.<sup>85</sup> Reinforcing its origin in the Lukan text is the absence of the mention of the servant and the master found in the Matthean text (cf. 1.14.4, *An.* 55.2, and *Scorp.* 9.6), even though it should be noted that Tertullian omits reference to the servant/master pairing at other points as well. Tsutsui rightly questions Harnack’s rendering ὑπὲρ τοῦ διδασκάλου (with the genitive instead of the accusative), as it is incorrect.<sup>86</sup> It is interesting that Tertullian never shows any interest in Luke 6:40b in conjunction with this saying, which reveals that he may be more familiar with the saying in its Matthean context or that it does not lend itself to Tertullian’s preferred use of the passage in reference to “heretics.”<sup>87</sup> Harnack’s following Luke 6:40a with “(sonst nichts)” probably meant that Harnack viewed the remainder of the verse as missing in Marcion’s text;<sup>88</sup> yet, this conclusion is unwarranted as Luke 6:40b is simply unattested.

### 3.1.20 Luke 6:43

1.2.1 – ... *in homines non in deos disponentis exempla illa bonae et malae arboris, quod neque bona malos neque mala bonos proferat fructus,...* | 2.4.2 – *Agnoscat hinc primum fructum optimum, utique optimae arboris, Marcion.* | 2.24.3 – ... *et quia et Marcion defendit arborem bonam malos quoque fructus non licere producere.* | 4.17.12 – *Proinde et arbor bona non proferat malum fructum, quia nec veritas haeresim, nec mala bonum, quia nec haeresis veritatem:...* | *An.* 21.4 – ... *quia arbor bona malos non ferat fructus nec mala bonos, et nemo de spinis metat ficus et de tribulis uvas.* | *An.* 21.5 – *Non dabit enim arbor mala bonos fructus,...* *et bona malos dabit,...* | *Herm.* 13.1 – *Certe nec bona arbor fructus malos edit,...* *nec mala arbor bonos,...*

---

<sup>85</sup> The absence of αὐτοῦ at the end of the phrase, with P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, B, D, and many other manuscripts is likely. Some manuscripts include αὐτοῦ after the first element, and in Matt 10:24 it is nearly uniformly present after the second (cf. *Scorp.* 9.6).

<sup>86</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 85. Braun, *Chronica Tertulliana*, 491 agrees. Harnack’s text is found in *Marcion*, 194\*.

<sup>87</sup> This preferred usage by Tertullian is also mentioned by Braun, *Contre Marcion I*, 166n6 [*sic n1*].

<sup>88</sup> One would expect “unbezeugt” if Harnack meant that the remainder of the verse was unattested.

This text is also attested by Hippolytus, Origen, Pseudo-Tertullian, Philastrius, and in *Adam*.<sup>89</sup> Concerning Tertullian’s testimony three observations are important. First, in 4.17.12 Tertullian attests the order in the saying as “good tree” followed by “bad tree” as it is found in canonical Luke. Second, Tertullian attests the singular καρπὸν, and not the plural καρπούς. Third, concerning the verb in the verse, Harnack observed “nicht ποιεῖν, sondern προενεγκεῖν und προενέγκαι im Text, der Tert. und Adamantius vorlag.”<sup>90</sup> But it is not at all clear that Tertullian read προφέρω in Marcion’s text. A brief glance at the other references to this verse reveals a tremendous amount of vocabulary variation as Tertullian attests *proferre*, *producere*, *ferre*, *dare*, and *edare* in his Latin renderings. It would be unlikely in the extreme that Tertullian was in each case rendering a different Greek lemma, especially since the Greek manuscript tradition does not attest any other verbs for Luke 6:43.<sup>91</sup>

### 3.1.21 Luke 7:2, 9

4.18.1 – *Proinde extollenda fide centurionis incredibile, si is professus est talem se fidem nec in Israhel invenisse ad quem non pertinebat fides Israhel<is>.... ‘Sed cur non licuerit illi alienae fidei exemplo uti?’* [a supposed argument against Tertullian’s interpretation] *Quoniam si ita esset, talem fidem nec in Israhel unquam fuisse. Ceterum dicens talem fidem debuisse inveniri in Israhel,... | Idol. 19.3 ... si etiam centurio crediderat,... | Val. 28.1 ... ubi adventum Soteris [the Demiurge] accepit, propere et ovanter accurrit cum omnibus suis viribus – centurio de evangelio – ...*

Luke 7:9 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian begins 4.18.1 with a general reference to the account in Luke 7:1–10; however, only 7:9 is given in any detail. After stating that the account concerns a centurion (v. 2), Tertullian’s adaptation of v. 9 at the outset of 4.18.1 attests that Jesus said τοιαύτην πίστιν οὐδὲ

---

<sup>89</sup> Harnack does not provide a word for word reconstruction of Luke 6:43 (cf. *Marcion*, 195\*) and Tsutsui refers to it as an “im Wortlaut nicht mehr genau festzustellendem Vers” (“Evangelium,” 85).

<sup>90</sup> *Marcion*, 195\*. The same point is made by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:463. Though the evidence from *Adam*. is not discussed here, it is worth pointing out that *Adam*. attests both ἐνεγκεῖν/ἐνεγκαι and προενεγκεῖν/ προενέγκαι. Harnack pointed out this fact in his apparatus, but not in the reconstruction of Marcion’s text from which this citation is taken.

<sup>91</sup> Possible, though unproveable, is that Tertullian is familiar with the variant reading ἐνεγκεῖν found in Matt 7:18 in B for the first instance and **N**\* in the second. Origen offers this reading in some of his references to the passage. Even if this were the case, the variation in Tertullian’s vocabulary renders the Greek verb behind the Latin, in any particular instance, unclear.

ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὔρον, with elements repeated in the subsequent discussion. Harnack stated that Tertullian definitely read *talem* (τοιούτην) in Marcion's text as Tertullian repeated it three times.<sup>92</sup> This view is possible, though the repetition in and of itself does not guarantee the reading. In addition, Harnack stated that the reading was otherwise unattested, when, in fact both e and r<sup>1</sup> read *talem*.<sup>93</sup> If Tertullian was familiar with the reading *talem*, also present in the African OL tradition, its use here may be due to Tertullian himself and not Marcion's text. More significantly, Harnack stated that Marcion's text read οὐδέποτε, a reading also found in D, "denn bei einer Wiederholung schreibt er [Tertullian]: „*talem fidem nec in Israhele umquam fuisse*“."<sup>94</sup> Yet, somehow Harnack overlooked that this phrase occurs when Tertullian is stating what Christ would have said if Marcion's interpretation were correct, but actually did *not* say.<sup>95</sup> Finally, unfortunately the general allusions to Luke 7:1–10/Matt 8:5–13 in *Idol.* 19.3 and *Val.* 28.1 do not provide further insight into Marcion's text.

### 3.1.22 Luke 7:18–20, 22–23

4.18.4 – ... *scandalizatur Iohannes auditis virtutibus Christi*,...<sup>96</sup> | 4.18.5 – *Hoc igitur metu et Iohannes: Tu es, inquit, qui venis, an alium expectamus?* | 4.18.6 – *Tu es, qui venis, id est qui venturus es, an alium expectamus? ... ut dominus per easdem operationes agnoscendum se nuntiaverit Iohanni.* | 4.18.7 – ... *interrogationis illius: Tu es, qui venis, an alium expectamus?* | 4.18.8 – ... *et qui sit maior tanto propheta, qui non fuerit scandalizatus in Christum, quod tunc Iohannem minuit.* | *Bapt.* 10.5 – ... *cum ipsum quod caeleste in Iohanne fuerat, spiritus [et] prophetiae, post totius spiritus in dominum translationem usque adeo defecerit ut quem praedicaverat, quem advenientem designaverat, postmodum, an ipse esset, miserit sciscitatum.* | *Carn. Chr.* 4.4 – ... *carnem ab omni vexatione restituit, leprosam emaculat, caecam reluminat, paralyticam redintegrat, daemoniacam expiat, mortuam resuscitat,*...

<sup>92</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 196\*.

<sup>93</sup> IGNTP states that the reading is also attested in sy<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>94</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 196\*.

<sup>95</sup> Braun rightly notes that Tertullian's argument here rests on the precise sense of the verb εὔρον (*Contre Marcion IV*, 229n4).

<sup>96</sup> Additional references to John being offended occur in 4.18.5–6.

For Luke 7:18–23, vv. 19 and 22–23 are attested in *Adam.*, v. 22 by Eznik, and v. 23 by Epiphanius and Ephrem. Tertullian begins his discussion with a comment attributed to Marcion that John was offended when he heard of Christ’s miracles (4.18.4). The comment seems to refer to the report given to John in v. 18, though no insight into the reading of the verse can be gained. The three citations of v. 19 reflect σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν for Marcion’s text.<sup>97</sup> The reference of a reply given to John by the two disciples (4.18.6) assumes vv. 20 and 22, though once again the allusion does not reveal anything about the text itself. Finally, the comment in 4.18.8, though coming after Tertullian’s discussion of vv. 24–28, appears to attest the concluding words by Jesus in v. 23: ὅς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῆ ἐν ἐμοί. Unfortunately, the allusions to Luke 7:19–23/Matt 11:2–6 in *Bapt.* 10.5 and *Carn. Chr.* 4.4 do not provide further insight on any of these points.

### 3.1.23 Luke 7:26

4.18.7 – *Multo perversius, si et testimonium Iohanni perhibet non Iohannis Christus, propheten eum confirmans, immo et supra ut angelum,...* | *Mon.* 8.1 – ... *in Ioanne antecursore,... alia plus praeferens quam propheten,...*

In 4.18.7, Tertullian introduces the quotation of Luke 7:27 with an allusion to Luke 7:26. Tertullian attests the presence of the words προφήτην and probably ναὶ ... καὶ περισσώτερον.<sup>98</sup> The allusion in *Mon* 8.1 also does not contribute to our knowledge of Marcion’s text.

### 3.1.24 Luke 7:27

4.18.4 – ... *spiritus sancti, quae ex forma prophetici moduli in Iohanne egerat praeparaturam viarum dominicarum,...* | 4.18.7 – ... *ingerens etiam scriptum super illo: Ecce ego mitto angelum meum ante faciem tuam, qui praeparet<sup>99</sup> viam tuam,...* |

---

<sup>97</sup> The only variant in the manuscript tradition of this phrase is the Matthean ἕτερον instead of ἄλλον. *qui venis* is the reading of e, whereas Tertullian’s gloss in 4.18.6 (*qui venturus es*) is the reading of a, aur, b, c, d, f, and l.

<sup>98</sup> Harnack’s reconstruction προφήτην, ναὶ καὶ περισσώτερον (*Marcion*, 197\*) is slightly misleading in that it could imply that Marcion’s text did not have λέγω ὑμῖν after ναὶ (the phrase appears in every extant witness). Matt 11:9 reads identical to Luke.

<sup>99</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *praeparet* with β, Gelenius, and Kroymann, rejecting the readings *praepararet* in *M* and *praeparabit* in Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans. There is no need to posit any difference in the Greek text in following Moreschini’s reading (In his citation of the passage from Tertullian, Harnack rightly noted “*praeparet* (=, *praeparabit*”)” [*Marcion*, 196\*]).

4.18.8 – *Praecursore enim iam functo officium, praeparata via domini,...* | 4.33.8 – *... si et Iohannes antecursor et praeparator ostenditur viarum domini ...* | *Adv. Jud. 9.23 – Ecce ego mitto angelum meum ante faciem tuam, id est Christi, qui praeparabit viam tuam ante te;...*<sup>100</sup>

Luke 7:27 is also attested by Epiphanius and possibly in *Adam*. Concerning Tertullian’s testimony, first, the phrasing of the opening of the verse in the quotation in 4.18.7 does not allow a precise reconstruction of Marcion’s text. Second, it is possible that ἐγώ was present in Marcion’s text as the TR reads ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω;<sup>101</sup> however, it is also possible that the presence of *ego* is due to the influence of Matt 11:10 or LXX Mal 3:1. The pronoun is included in the only other explicit quotation of the passage in *Adv. Jud. 9.23*. Third, the accuracy of the wording of 7:27b (ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου) is reinforced by Tertullian’s propensity to use the phrasing *via domini* in the allusions to the passage. Fourth, even though ἔμπροσθέν σου is unattested, the possibility of its absence must be entertained because it is present in Tertullian’s citation in *Adv. Jud. 9.23* and is also absent in D, a, aur d, l, and r.<sup>102</sup>

### 3.1.25 Luke 7:28

4.18.8 – *Praecursore ... maior quidem omnibus natis mulierum, sed non ideo subiectus ei qui minor fuerit in regno dei quasi alterius sit dei regnum in quo modicus quis maior erit Iohanne, alterius Iohannes qui omnibus natis mulierum maior sit.... creatori competit, et Iohannem ipsius esse, maiorem natis mulierum, et Christum vel quemque modicum, qui maior Iohanne futurus sit in regno aequae creatoris, et qui sit maior tanto propheta,...* | *Bapt. 12.5 – ... Nemo dicens maior inter natos feminarum Iohanne baptizatore.*

Harnack reconstructed this verse μείζων πάντων τῶν γεννητῶν γυναικῶν προφήτης Ἰωάννης ἐστίν· ὁ (δὲ) μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ?) μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.<sup>103</sup> Tsutsui comments “Die Wiederherstellung (und

<sup>100</sup> Possible additional allusions to Luke 7:27/Matt 11:10/Mark 1:2 occur in *Bapt. 6.1, 10.6*.

<sup>101</sup> Harnack placed the Greek pronoun in parentheses in his reconstructed text (cf. *Marcion, 197\**). The pronoun is omitted in numerous witnesses including P<sup>75vid</sup>, S, B, D, L, and W.

<sup>102</sup> See also Harnack, *Marcion, 196\**.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, 197\*. This is the first instance in the present work of Harnack’s reconstruction containing parentheses. It is not always clear what Harnack intended to communicate through the use of parentheses (with or without a question mark).

Auslegung) dieses Verses von Harnack, ist nicht einleuchtend. Es ist hier besser, auf die genaue Rekonstruktion des ursprünglichen Marcion-Textes zu verzichten.”<sup>104</sup>

There is considerable truth in Tsutsui’s objection. First, though Tertullian does not include *omnibus* in *Bapt.* 12.5, it is also not included in the third reference in 4.18.8, and was not necessarily present in Marcion’s Gospel.<sup>105</sup> In addition, though Tertullian writes *inter natos* in *Bapt.* 12.5, since he is discussing the general meaning of Luke 7:28 in 4.18.8, it is not necessary to view *natis* as rendering a different Greek reading. Finally, the reference to John as a prophet at the end of the discussion in 4.18.8 does not require προφήτης to have been present in Marcion’s text, even if it is the reading of the Majority Text and several other witnesses.<sup>106</sup> On the other hand, the fact that Tertullian includes *baptizatore* in *Bapt.* 12.5 and makes no mention of this designation in 4.18.8 may reveal that it was not present in Marcion’s text.<sup>107</sup> Luke 7:28b is not multiply attested and it is precarious to attempt to determine the precise wording from Tertullian’s discussion.

### **3.1.26 Luke 8:17**

4.19.5 – ... *omnia de occulto in apertum repromittit*,... | *Paen.* 6.10 – *Nihil occultum quod non revelabitur* ... | *Virg.* 14.3 – *Nihil occultum quod non revelabitur*:...

Harnack rightly noted that Tertullian only provides an allusion to this verse in 4.19.5, and his reconstruction offered κρυπτόν φανερόν γενήσεται.<sup>108</sup> That these Lukan words were probably in Marcion’s text is revealed by the observation that in *Paen.* 6.10 and *Virg.* 14.3 Tertullian prefers wording influenced by Matt 10:26. At the same time, since Tertullian has omitted the verb, the reading ἔσται, found in D, cannot be excluded.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 87.

<sup>105</sup> See also Wright, *Alterations*, 129.

<sup>106</sup> The reference could easily have come from Luke 7:26, which Tertullian discusses in 4.18.7.

<sup>107</sup> Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ is the reading of numerous “Western” witnesses, the Majority Text, and the reading in Matt 11:11.

<sup>108</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 198\*.

<sup>109</sup> φανερωθήσεται is found in several witnesses, including many OL manuscripts and Syriac versions, but Tertullian’s allusion implies that the adjective was found in the verse.

### 3.1.27 Luke 8:18

2.2.6 – ... *ideoque non habendo fidem etiam quod videbatur habere ademptum est illi,...* | 4.19.3 – *Et ideo per Christum adicit: Videte quomodo audiatis ... etiam dicendo: Videte, quomodo audiatis,...* | 4.19.4 – *Hoc probat etiam subiacens sensus: Ei qui habet dabitur, ab eo autem qui non habet etiam quod habere se putat auferetur ei.*<sup>110</sup> | *Fug. 11.2 – Etenim qui habet, dabitur ei; ab eo autem, qui non habet, etiam quod videtur habere auferetur.*

In 4.19.3 Tertullian twice attests Luke 8:18a without οὐν. Both Harnack and Tsutsui argued that the particle was absent in Marcion's text, though Harnack believed it was absent in the text received by Marcion, whereas Tsutsui believed it was deleted by Marcion for stylistic reasons.<sup>111</sup> If the particle was absent, Harnack's view, supported by the reading of a handful of manuscripts,<sup>112</sup> is more likely, since Tsutsui's is dependent on his unlikely contention that Marcion relocated v. 18.<sup>113</sup> It is difficult to be certain that the conjunction was missing as there was no need for Tertullian to include it for his argument in which he linked the thought of Luke 8:18a with Luke 8:8b and Isa 6:9.

In 4.19.4 Tertullian attests the opening of Luke 8:18b without γάρ. Once again Tsutsui believes Marcion deleted the conjunction.<sup>114</sup> This supposition, though, is not certain, for, despite its presence in *Fug. 11.2*, Tertullian may have simply omitted it at the outset of his citation here.<sup>115</sup> Once again Tertullian's freedom with pronouns can be observed as *ei* is at the outset of the 4.19.4 citation and after *dabitur*

---

<sup>110</sup> In 4.19.3–5 Tertullian comments on Luke 8:18 before referring to Luke 8:16–17. This fact leads Tsutsui to posit that Marcion moved v. 18 in his text ("Evangelium," 88). Harnack, however, kept vv. 16–17 before v. 18 in his reconstruction (*Marcion*, 198\*). This view is more likely as it appears that Tertullian discusses v. 18 in conjunction with v. 8 in the light of the similar content before briefly alluding to vv. 16–17 (vv. 9–15 are unattested).

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.* and Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 88.

<sup>112</sup> IGNTF lists 343, 716, 1229, several OL manuscripts, sy<sup>c</sup>, sy<sup>s</sup>, sy<sup>p</sup>, bo, and the Persian Diatessaron as attesting the omission.

<sup>113</sup> See n. 110.

<sup>114</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 88.

<sup>115</sup> According to IGNTF only the Persian Diatessaron, geo, and aeth omit γάρ. In addition, it is not clear whether γάρ would have preceded or followed ἄν. According to IGNTF, the former is the reading of  $\aleph$ , B, L,  $\Xi$ , 0202, and 157.



in *Fug.* 11.2. As the manuscript tradition is nearly uniform here, αὐτῶ was almost certainly present after δοθήσεται.<sup>116</sup>

For 8:18c Harnack reconstructed ὅς δ' ἄν μὴ ἔχη, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.<sup>117</sup> Harnack here has a curious combination of following and altering Tertullian's testimony and in his apparatus simply commented "Man braucht nicht anzunehmen, daß Tert. anders gelesen hat als oben steht; nur sein „*autem*“ ist sonst unbezeugt." Given that Tertullian writes *ab eo autem* at the outset of both 4.19.4 and *Fug.* 11.2, however, the wording could be attributable to Tertullian and does not necessitate either δέ or the preposition and pronoun here in Marcion's text.<sup>118</sup> In addition, though Tertullian writes *videtur habere* in *Fug.* 11.2, his *habere se putat* does not necessitate a word order change in Marcion's text, a change that Harnack also did not make.<sup>119</sup> Finally, despite the attestation of ἔχει (cf. Matt 13:12/Mark 4:25) in later manuscripts, Harnack was right to view Tertullian's *habet* as likely rendering the subjunctive.<sup>120</sup>

### 3.1.28 Luke 8:20

4.19.7 – *Nos contrario dicimus primo non potuisse illi adnuntiari quod mater et fratres eius foris starent quaerentes videre eum, si nulla illi mater et fratres nulli fuissent, quos utique norat qui adnuntiarat,...*<sup>121</sup> | *Carn. Chr.* 7.2 – *Primo quidem numquam quisquam adnuntiasset illi matrem et fratres eius foris stantes, qui non*

---

<sup>116</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 198\* places αὐτῶ in this position but in parentheses.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>118</sup> Harnack provides no rationale for including δέ but leaving out ἀπ' αὐτοῦ at the beginning of the phrase. Tertullian places *ei* at the end of the phrase, and though ultimately not provable, it could be that Tertullian wrote *ab eo autem* from memory at the beginning of the phrase and then saw ἀπ' αὐτοῦ at the conclusion of the verse leading to a redundant *ei* (*auferetur ei* is the reading of e in Matt 13:12). According to IGNTP there is one OL manuscript, l, and two manuscripts of sa that attest *autem*. καὶ ὅς is attested in the remainder of the manuscript tradition. Worth noting are the readings of e, *auferetur ab eo, quod videtur habere*, along with D (also d), ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν. Tertullian may have been familiar with a similar reading.

<sup>119</sup> Even the altered word order in the readings of D, d, and e cited in the previous note retain the otherwise uniformly attested order of these two words.

<sup>120</sup> Every OL manuscript (except a, which reads *habuerit*) here reads *habet*. IGNTP does not interpret these readings as evidence for Greek present indicatives. Alternatively, Tertullian may have been influenced by the reading in the Matthean parallel.

<sup>121</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 8:20 occur in 3.11.3; 4.19.10; and 4.36.9.

*certus esset et habere illum matrem et fratres et ipsos esse, quos tunc nuntiabat, vel retro cognitos vel tunc ibidem compertos...*<sup>122</sup>

Luke 8:20 is also attested by Epiphanius and Ephrem. From Tertullian's allusion in 4.19.7 it is clear that the verse contained a reference to the announcement of the presence of Jesus' mother and brothers standing outside. The allusion in *Carn. Chr.* 7.2 reveals that the use of a single possessive pronoun for both mother and brothers may not require the conclusion that only one possessive pronoun appeared in Marcion's Greek text (cf. Matt 12:46). In addition, Tertullian's placement of *foris* before the verb *stare* in both of these references shows that that was not necessarily the word order in Marcion's text. Nevertheless, ἔξω ἐστήκασιν is the reading of D, several OL manuscripts, and a handful of other manuscripts and could have been Marcion's reading. Finally, the placement of *illi* before the verb *adnuntiare* in 4.19.7, but after the verb in *Carn. Chr.* 7.2 reinforces the necessity for caution in attempting to determine Greek order from Tertullian's testimony at this point.<sup>123</sup>

The final element of Luke 8:20 unfortunately does not appear in *Carn. Chr.* 7.2, and therefore must be considered solely based on Tertullian's wording in 4.19.7. Tertullian's phrasing *quaerentes videre eum*, conflates Luke 8:20 and Matt 12:46, as in Luke Jesus' mother and brothers are standing outside ἰδεῖν θέλοντες σε, but in Matthew ζητούντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι. D and d read ζητούντες σε in Luke, though it is likely that the Matthean *quaerentes* is due to Tertullian slipping into Matthean wording. At the same time, simply assuming that Marcion's text read θέλοντες does not seem to be warranted.<sup>124</sup>

### **3.1.29 Luke 8:21**

4.19.6 – *Ipse*, [all who deny the birth of the Lord] *inquiunt, contestatur se non esse natum dicendo: Quae mihi mater,*<sup>125</sup> *et qui mihi fratres? | 4.19.10 – ... superest*

---

<sup>122</sup> Additional allusions to (contextually) Matt 12:47 occur in *Carn. Chr.* 7.3, 5, 7–8.

<sup>123</sup> The indication by IGNTF in its apparatus that Marcion attests the order θέλοντες ἰδεῖν σε at the close of the verse, apparently dependent on Tertullian's word order *quaerentes videre eum*, should be questioned.

<sup>124</sup> Thus, in addition to the problematic word order in IGNTF (see n. 123), it should not be assumed that θέλοντες is the attested reading. Though Harnack placed ἐστήκασιν ἔξω ἰδεῖν σε θέλοντες in parentheses, it is curious that he did not mention that Tertullian's testimony provides no direct warrant for θέλοντες.

<sup>125</sup> Moreschini's text reads *mater* with β rejecting the certainly erroneous reading *pater* found in *M*.

*dispicere sensum non simpliciter pronuntiantis: Quae mihi mater aut fratres? | 4.19.11 – Atque adeo cum praemisisset: Quis<sup>126</sup> mihi mater et qui mihi fratres? subiungens: Nisi qui audiunt verba mea et faciunt ea ... | 4.26.13 – ... Immo beati qui sermonem dei audiunt et faciunt [Luke 11:28], quia et retro sic reiecerat matrem aut fratres, dum auditores et obsecutores dei praefert. | Carn. Chr. 7.1 – ... [the Lord] dixerit, Quae mihi mater et qui mihi fratres? | Carn. Chr. 7.10 – Oro te Apelle, vel tu, Marcion, si forte tabula ludens vel de histrionibus aut aurigis contendens tali nuntio avocareris, nonne dixisses: Quae mihi mater, aut qui mihi<sup>127</sup> fratres?*

Luke 8:21, most clearly attested in 4.19.11, contains a curious combination of Matthean/Markan and Lukan elements. The question with which the verse appears to open is found in Matt 12:48/Mark 3:33, though Tertullian’s phrasing does not follow either text precisely.<sup>128</sup> The closing element of the verse is clearly dependent on Luke 8:21. That the Matthean/Markan question appeared in Marcion’s text is confirmed not only by Tertullian’s numerous references to it in 4.19, but also by his refutation of Apelles and Marcion in *Carn. Chr. 7*, where Tertullian refers back to his discussion in *Marc.*<sup>129</sup> It is worth noting Tertullian’s varying inclusion of *mihi* in his citations. In addition, that Marcion’s text read τούς λόγους μου and not the canonical τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ is unintentionally confirmed by Tertullian’s later reference back to this passage in 4.26.13. It seems that the wording of Luke 11:28 reminded Tertullian of the canonical wording of Luke 8:21, though he apparently

---

<sup>126</sup> Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read *quae*.

<sup>127</sup> Only one manuscript, codex Trecensis, includes *mihi*. Every other manuscript and editor simply reads *qui fratres*, which likely is correct.

<sup>128</sup> Geoffrey G. Dunn points out that the non-Lukan opening was missed by Aalders, Higgins, and O’Malley in their word studies (“Mary’s Virginity *in partu* and Tertullian’s Anti-Docetism in *De Carne Christi* Reconsidered,” *JTS* 58 [2007]: 473n32).

<sup>129</sup> In *Carn. Chr. 7.1* Tertullian, after the question as cited above, continues *audiat igitur et Apelles quid iam responsum sit a nobis Marcioni eo libello quo ad evangelium ipsius provocavimus, considerandam scilicet materiam pronuntiationis istius*. Harnack observed, “Die Umgestaltung des 20 f. Verses ergibt sich sicher aus den Wiederholungen Tert.s hier und in de carne 7” (*Marcion*, 198\*). Wright, however, argued that the use of the Matthean question in *Carn. Chr.* “gives rise to doubt concerning whose preference is involved” (*Alterations*, 129). The use of *subiungens* in 4.19.11 and the reference to Marcion’s Gospel in *Carn. Chr.* strongly connect the question to Marcion’s text and not to Tertullian’s own preference. It is also interesting to note how closely the wording of the citations (4.19.6 and *Carn. Chr. 7.1*) and the subsequent references (4.19.10 and *Carn. Chr. 7.10*) agree with each other. Tsutsui writes concerning the Latin rendering of the verse, “Singulär ist der Dative ‘mihi’ (bis), der uns wohl darauf aufmerksam machen will, daß ‘mater’ und ‘fratres’ hier im übertragenen Sinn verstanden werden müssen” (“Evangelium,” 89). This interpretation should be rejected, however, as *mihi* is attested in the OL manuscript b (for the first occurrence) and is often used by Ambrose in his commentary on Luke (cf., for example, *Exp. Luc.* 8.73 and 10.25). It is not even entirely certain that Marcion’s text read datives.

forgot that Marcion's text did not refer to the *auditores et obsecutores dei*.<sup>130</sup> In addition, though not certain, the absence of a pronoun in the latter instance may indicate that *ea* in the former is reflecting a pronoun in Marcion's text. Therefore, though the precise wording of some elements is unclear, Harnack was generally correct in his reconstruction τίς μοι μήτηρ καὶ τίνες μοι ἀδελφοί, εἰ μὴ οἱ τοῦς λόγους μου ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες αὐτούς.<sup>131</sup>

### 3.1.30 Luke 9:22

4.21.7 – ... *quia oporteret filium hominis multa pati, et reprobari a presbyteris et scribis et sacerdotibus, et interfici, et post tertium diem resurgere.* | *Carn. Chr.* 9.8 – *Sed quomodo, inquit, contemni et pati posset,...*

This verse is also attested by Epiphanius. Concerning Tertullian's testimony, the allusion in *Carn. Chr.* 9.8 likely reveals that *pati* and *reprobare* in 4.21.7 are being controlled by Marcion's text. The use of *contemnere* in the former demonstrates that Tertullian is giving the general sense of the verse without using its actual wording as "despise" does not occur in Luke 9:22 or its parallels in Matt 16:21/Mark 8:31.

### 3.1.31 Luke 9:24

4.21.9 – *Qui voluerit, inquit, animam suam salvam facere, perdet illam, et qui perdiderit eam propter me, salvam faciet eam.* | 4.21.10 – ... *sed illa [death] insignis et pro fide militaris, in qua qui animam suam propter deum perdit, servat illam,...* | *Scorp.* 11.1 – ... *qui animam suam invenerit, perdet illam qui vero perdiderit mei causa, inveniet illam.*<sup>132</sup>

Luke 9:24 appears to be the verse driving the citation in 4.21.9, and it is worth noting that in *Scorp.* 11.1 Tertullian cites Matt 10:39.<sup>133</sup> For Luke 9:24 Tertullian does not attest the presence of γάρ at the beginning of the verse. Harnack

---

<sup>130</sup> This point is not taken into consideration by Wright when he suggested that the reading may be attributed to Tertullian (*Alterations*, 130).

<sup>131</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 198\*.

<sup>132</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 9:24 occurs in *Cor.* 11.5 and to Matt 10:39 in *Pat.* 7.11.

<sup>133</sup> Matt 16:25 reads slightly differently from both the Lukan and the other Matthean occurrence, with σῶζω as the first verb and εὐρίσκω as the second.

placed the conjunction in parentheses;<sup>134</sup> however, Tsutsui argues that Marcion deleted it and uses its absence to argue that Marcion also deleted Luke 9:23.<sup>135</sup> It is true that Tertullian does not make any direct reference to v. 23, but using the absence of a conjunction, even if it were not a common occurrence in Tertullian's writings, is a speculative basis on which to construct the argument for the absence of v. 23. Its absence could very well be a simple omission or the result of influence from Matt 10:39 where no conjunction occurs. Second, Harnack also noted the omission of οὗτος before σώσει. Though this omission occurs in numerous OL manuscripts, other versions, and church fathers, once again its absence may be a simple omission or due to Matthean influence as the demonstrative pronoun does not appear in Matt 10:39, 16:25/Mark 8:35.

Third, Harnack rendered *et qui* as καὶ ὅς, though incorrectly considering it otherwise unattested as it is also the reading of a and geo. It would appear, however, that without the assumption that Tertullian is following the text precisely there is no good reason why *et qui* cannot be his rendering of ὅς δέ. Furthermore, though Tertullian reads *perdiderit eam propter me* where Luke has ἀπολέση τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, Harnack perhaps incorrectly reconstructed ἀπολέση αὐτὴν ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ.<sup>136</sup> Though this reading may be reflected in e, reading *illam* instead of *eam*, it is interesting that in the allusion back to the verse in 4.21.10 Tertullian has *qui animam suam propter deum perdit* and in *Scorp.* 11.1 Tertullian simply leaves the noun to be understood despite the fact that Matt 10:39 has an overt reference to τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. In other words, in three attestations to this element common to both Luke and Matthew, Tertullian once offers a pronoun, once the entire phrase, and once nothing at all. Thus, it is difficult to know how accurately Tertullian is representing the actual reading of Marcion's text at this point. Finally, Tertullian's reference to an otherwise unattested *propter deum* in 4.21.10 makes it more likely that *propter me* in 4.21.9 has arisen out of Marcion's text.

---

<sup>134</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 201\*.

<sup>135</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 92.

<sup>136</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 201\*.

### 3.1.32 Luke 9:26

4.21.10 – *Qui confusus, inquit, me<i><sup>137</sup> fuerit, et ego confundar eius,<sup>138</sup> ...* | 4.21.12 – [Marcion’s Christ] *Non poterat itaque dixisse: Qui mei<sup>139</sup> confusus fuerit.* | *Carn. Chr.* 5.3 – *Qui mei, inquit, confusus fuerit, confundar et ego eius.* | *Fug.* 7.1 – *Qui mei confusus fuerit, et ego confundar eius coram patre meo.* | *Idol.* 13.6 – *Qui autem confusus super me fuerit penes homines, et ego confundar super illo, inquit, penes patrem meum, qui est in caelis.* | *Scorp.* 9.13 – *Plus est autem quod et confusioni confusionem comminatur: qui me confusus fuerit coram hominibus, et ego confundar eum coram patre meo, qui est in caelis.*

Based on Tertullian’s citation in 4.21.12 Harnack stated “Dieser Vers ist nicht nur verkürzt, sondern auch verändert, und 26b und 27 fehlen ganz.”<sup>140</sup> Once again, it is very difficult to determine whether γάρ was missing in Marcion’s text at the outset of the verse.<sup>141</sup> Harnack has it in parentheses and Tsutsui, as in Luke 9:24, speculatively argues that Marcion deleted it because he had deleted the previous verse (v. 25).<sup>142</sup>

Second, for the first half of 9:26a, apart from the absent conjunction, Tertullian appears closely to follow Marcion’s text, attesting ὅς ἂν ἐπαισχυσθῆ με. In every other reference to the verse, apart from the conflated citation in *Idol.* 13.6 where Tertullian employs the preposition *super*, Tertullian places the pronoun (*mei/me*) before the verb, thus increasing the likelihood that 4.21.10 is reflecting the word order in Marcion’s text. The converse, however, is true for the second half of v. 26a, for which Harnack offered κ’γὰρ ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι αὐτόν.<sup>143</sup> If Tertullian is rendering Marcion’s wording, that Tertullian tends to prefer placing *et ego* before the verb in this verse (only in *Carn. Chr.* 5.3 does it follow the verb) may mean that it is

---

<sup>137</sup> *Mei* is the reading in Ursinus’s note, Rigalti, Oehler, Kroymann, and Evans. *Me* is the reading in θ, Gelenius, and Pamelius.

<sup>138</sup> Pamelius’s edition reads *eum*.

<sup>139</sup> Pamelius’s edition reads *me confuses*.

<sup>140</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 202\*. The statement is followed by Harnack’s argument concerning the theological reason for the omission by Marcion, namely that v. 27 would imply that some among the original apostles would experience the parousia, which is a recognition of Jewish Christians that Marcion could not allow.

<sup>141</sup> IGNTF indicates that its absence is elsewhere only attested in one manuscript of bo.

<sup>142</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 201\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 92.

<sup>143</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 201\*.

just as likely that the order was that of Matt 10:33 (ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτόν), though with the Lukan verb. More important, however, is the observation that it is not clear that either of these otherwise unattested readings was found in Marcion's text instead of the Lukan τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται. In Tertullian's second citation of the passage in 4.21.12, he only cites the first half of v. 26a, indicating that his primary interest and focus in this section is on someone being ashamed of Christ. In the immediate context of 4.21.10, Tertullian introduces the citation with *Sed et zeloten deum mihi exhibit, malum malo reddentum*, a point which can be made with any number of phrasings of the second half of v. 26a. Since Tertullian in his other writings reveals the strong influence of Matt 10:33 on his reproduction of this saying,<sup>144</sup> it is at least possible that Tertullian sees the verse in Marcion's text, begins to cite it accurately, and then slips into a rendering of the verse influenced by Matthew. This possibility is further confirmed when Tertullian cites the verse in a nearly identical manner in *Carn. Chr.* 5.3, where there is no indication that he would be utilizing Marcion's text.<sup>145</sup> Therefore, hesitancy concerning Tertullian's testimony at this point is necessary.

Finally, even though v. 26b is technically unattested, its omission is possible. It is interesting to note that in *Carn. Chr.* 5.3, where Tertullian is also arguing against Marcion, once again only Luke 9:26a is referenced. In both cases Tertullian focuses, though with slightly different emphases, on "shame" in his argument, which may indicate that v. 26b simply is not of interest to him. At the same time, however, it is noteworthy that in the references to this verse in *Fug.* 7.1, *Idol.* 13.6, and *Scorp.* 9.13, in every case the citation has some additional element as Tertullian apparently conflates Luke 9:26a and Matt 10:33b.<sup>146</sup> Tsutsui argues, "Die unbezeugte zweite Hälfte des Verses ... scheint gestrichen worden zu sein, da Marcion aus 12,8f. 'die Engel' und aus 21,27 'die Herrlichkeit' ausgestoßen hat."<sup>147</sup> Tsutsui may be right;

<sup>144</sup> See below and the comments in n. 146.

<sup>145</sup> This point was also recognized by Wright, *Alterations*, 130.

<sup>146</sup> Tertullian's interest in the issue of "shame" (it appears in every one of the contexts, and concludes *Scorp.* 9 where Tertullian also focuses on the issue of "denying") apparently leads him to use the Lukan ἐπαισχύνομαι and not the Matthean ἀρνέομαι in these citations. According to Tischendorf and von Soden, ἐπαισχύνομαι does not appear in the manuscript tradition for Matt 10:33. That Tertullian is aware of the Matthean reading is evidenced by the citations below under 3.1.60 Luke 12:8–9. Despite using the verb from Luke 9:26/Mark 8:38 Tertullian uses elements from the conclusion to Matt 10:33 (ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς) to complete these three citations.

<sup>147</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 92.

yet, the argument ultimately must interpret the silence of Tertullian, which remains methodologically problematic.

### **3.1.33 Luke 9:28**

4.22.1 – ... *quod illum [Christ] cum Moyse et Helia in secessu montis conspici pateris,...* | 4.22.7 – *Tres de discentibus arbitros futurae visionis et vocis adsumit.... In montem secedit.* | *Carn. Chr.* 24.3 – ... *alium in secessu montis in ambitu nubis sub tribus arbitris clarum ...* | *Prax.* 14.7 – ... [Jesus] *est in montis secessu, ...* | *Prax.* 15.8 – ... *neque Petrus et Iohannes et Iacobus sine rationis et amentia, qui, si non passuri Filii gloriam sed Patrem vidissent, credo, morituri ibidem.* | *Res.* 55.10 – *Dominus ... in secessu montis ...*

Tertullian only alludes to the content of this verse in *Adversus Marcionem*. It is not unusual for him generally to mention the “three” as only in *Prax.* 15.8 does he actually name them. In addition, there is no need to posit that Marcion’s text had a Greek equivalent of *secedere* as the idea of withdrawing to the mountain is Tertullian’s preferred way of describing Jesus’ going up on the mountain (cf. *Carn. Chr.* 24.3; *Prax.* 14.7; *Res.* 55.10). Therefore, it appears that the only certain reading of Marcion’s text is εἰς τὸ ὄρος; the singular *in montem* in 4.22.7 seems to be governed by the precise wording of Marcion’s gospel since in every other reference Tertullian writes *in montis*.

### **3.1.34 Luke 9:29**

4.22.13 – ... *et splendor eius ut lux erit [Hab 3:4], utique qua etiam vestitus eius [Jesus] refulsit.* | *Res.* 55.10 – *Dominus quoque in secessu montis etiam vestimenta luce mutaverat, sed liniamenta Petro agnoscibilia servaverat; ubi etiam Moyses et Helias, alter in imagine carnis nondum receptae, alter in veritate nondum defunctae, eandem tamen habitudinem corporis etiam in gloria perseverare docuerant.*

Based on Tertullian’s allusion in 4.22.13, Harnack reconstructed the end of this verse καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ ἐξαστράπτων.<sup>148</sup> The reference in *Res.* 55.10 seems to draw from the wording of Matt 17:2 where Jesus’ clothes become white as light (ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς). Though Hab 3:4 contains a clear reference to “light,” Tertullian does not offer the Matthean wording, but the Lukan *refulsit*

---

<sup>148</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 202\*.



(ἐξαστράπτων). Therefore, in all likelihood, the wording is here being controlled by Marcion's text. At the same time, however, the omission of λευκός before the participle in Marcion's text is likely a simple omission by Tertullian as it is nearly universally attested in the manuscript tradition and also is missing in *Res.* 55.10.

### 3.1.35 Luke 9:30-32

4.22.1 – ... *quod illum cum Moyse et Helia in secessu montis conspici pateris*,... | 4.22.2 – *Nunc et si praesentia illorum fuit necessaria, non utique in conloquio ostenderentur ... nec in consortio claritatis ...* | 4.22.3 – *cum illis loqui qui eum fuerant locuti? cum eis gloriam suam communicare ...* | 4.22.4 – *Petrus ... contubernium Christi ... agnoscens ...* | 4.22.12 – ... *ostensis prius cum illo Moyse et Helia in claritatis praerogativa, ... societatem esse etiam claritatis Christi cum Moyse et Helia.* | 4.22.16 – *Nam et si Marcion noluit eum conloquentem domino ostensum, sed stantem, tamen et stans os ad os stabat et faciem ad faciem—cum illo, inquit, non extra illum—, in gloria[m] ipsius, nedum in conspectu.* | *Praescr.* 22.6 – *Quid eos [Peter and John] ignorasse voluit quibus etiam gloriam suam exhibuit, et Moysen et Helian [sic] et insuper de caelo patris vocem?* | *Prax.* 14.7 – *Igitur cum Moysi servat conspectum suum et colloquium facie ad faciem in futurum, nam hoc postea adimpletum est in montis secessu, sicut legimus in evangelio visum cum illo Moysen colloquentem ...* | *Prax.* 15.8 – ... *neque Petrus et Iohannes et Iacobus sine rationis et amentia, qui, si non passuri Filii gloriam sed Patrem vidissent, credo, morituri ibidem.* | *Res.* 55.10 – *Dominus quoque in secessu montis etiam vestimenta luce mutaverat, sed liniamenta Petro agnoscibilia servavera; ubi etiam Moyses et Helias,...*

Luke 9:30–31a is also attested by Epiphanius and Ephrem. From Tertullian's testimony throughout 4.22 it is clear that Moses and Elijah were on the mountain, and that they appeared with Christ “in glory.”<sup>149</sup> Tertullian, however, appears to provide contradictory evidence concerning whether Moses and Elijah were conversing with Jesus (4.22.2, 3) or simply standing there (4.22.16).<sup>150</sup> Harnack contended that Marcion's Gospel read καὶ ἶδου δύο ἄνδρες συνέστησαν αὐτῷ in v. 30, and that the initial references by Tertullian were due to an erroneous

---

<sup>149</sup> References to “Moses and Elijah,” in this order, also occur in *Praescr.* 22.6 and *Res.* 55.10.

<sup>150</sup> Tertullian also refers to Moses speaking with Jesus in *Prax.* 14.7.

recollection of his own text of Luke.<sup>151</sup> Tsutsui argues that one should consider the possibility that there was no change in Marcion’s text and that Tertullian’s error is found in the second reference.<sup>152</sup> Though a final decision would need to incorporate the evidence from Epiphanius, a third possibility, already hinted at by Evans, should be considered. It could be that v. 30 did read *συνελάλουν*, and that in 4.22.16 Tertullian is no longer discussing v. 30, but vv. 31–32. On this understanding *nam et si Marcion noluit eum conloquentem domino ostensum* would refer to Marcion having omitted v. 31b (which includes *ἐλεγον τὴν ἕξοδον αὐτοῦ*),<sup>153</sup> and *sed stantem* would refer to v. 32 where Peter and the other two disciples *εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῶ*. Further confirmation of the view that v. 32 is in view when Tertullian speaks of the “standing” is that he concludes 4.22.16 with references to *cum illo* and *in gloriam ipsius nedum in conspectu*. Though vv. 30–31 also contain references to “with him” and “in glory,” only in v. 32 is the reference to “his glory.” In addition, Tertullian’s reference to *nedum in conspectu* may be referring to v. 32 where the three disciples are said to have seen his glory. If this whole line of thought is correct, then Tertullian perhaps provided unclear, but not erroneous, testimony to Marcion’s text in 4.22.2, 3, and 16.

### 3.1.36 Luke 9:35

4.22.1 – ... *vox illa de caelo: Hic est filius meus dilectus, hunc audite...* | 4.22.8 – *Itaque nec nunc muta nubes fuit, sed vox solita de caelo, et patris novum testimonium super filio...* | 4.22.10 – *Hunc igitur audite ... dicendo scilicet: Hic est filius meus dilectus, hunc audite.* | 4.22.12 – *Quem magis quam vocis caelestis illius: Hic est filius meus dilectus, hunc audite?* | *Praescr. 22.6 – Quid eos [Peter and John] ignorasse voluit quibus etiam gloriam suam exhibuit, et Moysen et Helian [sic] et insuper de caelo patris vocem?* | *Prax. 19.4 – ... Hic est Filius meus dilectus, hunc*

<sup>151</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 202\*–3\*. Agreeing with Harnack is Braun, who suggests that Marcion, after deleting the second half of v. 31, harmonized the verb of v. 30 with the verb of v. 32 (*Contre Marcion IV*, 291n4).

<sup>152</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 93–94. This was also the position of Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:466–67.

<sup>153</sup> In a note to Tertullian’s comment Evans wrote “Marcion excised the second half of Luke 9:31” (*Adversus Marcionem*, 2:385n3). Harnack viewed the entire verse as “unannehmbär” for and therefore omitted by Marcion (*Marcion*, 203\*).

*audite. | Prax. 23.3 – ... Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene sensi, audite illum;...*<sup>154</sup>

This verse is also attested by Epiphanius and Ephrem. Tertullian's testimony to what the voice said attests the reading of several witnesses and the Majority Text: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.<sup>155</sup> The likelihood of this citation accurately reflecting Marcion's text is increased by both the numerous repetitions of the wording (cf. 4.22.1, 10, 12) and the absence of influence of the Matthean *in quo bene sensi* as found in *Prax. 23.3*. Luke 9:35a, however, has engendered a bit of discussion as Tertullian states that the voice came *de caelo*. Harnack reconstructed φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης wahrscheinlicher) and then observed in the apparatus, "Dem „*de caelo*“ Tert.s ist nicht zu trauen, da er hier referiert."<sup>156</sup> Similarly, Tsutsui notes Tertullian's allusion and indicates that *caelo* is an unlikely reading by placing it in brackets.<sup>157</sup> Harnack and Tsutsui are correct in their assessment, though neither mentioned that 4.22.8, 13 clearly indicate that the voice did come from the cloud and that *Praescr. 22.6* confirms Tertullian's inclination to refer to the "customary voice"(4.22.8) coming *de caelo*.

### **3.1.37 Luke 9:57–62**

4.23.9 – *At enim humanissimus deus cur recusat eum qui se tam individuum illi comitem offert? Si quia superbe vel ex hypocrisi dixerat: Sequar te quocumque ieris.*

---

<sup>154</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 9:35/Matt 17:5/Mark 9:7 occur in 4.22.9, 13; 4.34.15; *An. 17.14*; and *Prax. 24.3*.

<sup>155</sup> Williams states that Tertullian read *hic est filius meus delictus, hunc audite* and comments "Epiphanius in reading 7 [this number refers to the list of readings at the end of the article] has ἀγαπητός, 'beloved,' with D W lat and sy<sup>(c)p</sup> for Luke against Tertullian's *delictus*, which corresponds to ἐκλελεγμένος, 'chosen,' in the majority text of Luke" ("Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel, 486, 481n13). Apart from the Majority Text of Luke not reading ἐκλελεγμένος, Williams has unfortunately followed a misprint of 4.22.10 in CCSL. In his M.A. thesis Williams noticed that CCSL here offers *delictus* with no recorded variants, whereas Evans in his edition offers *dilectus* with no recorded variants ("Marcion's Gospel: Reconsidered," 91n66). In the same note Williams continues by stating "we have followed the text of Corpus Christianorum at this point against that of Evans. It is evident that the two words are extremely close in form, with only the inversion of 'e' and 'i' separating them: *deligere/dilegere*." Apart from the fact that no reason is given for why Williams followed the CCSL reading, and even granting the possibility of some type of exchange of an 'e' and 'i' (though it is not entirely clear what Williams's comment on the Latin means: one would expect *delictus* to have been formed from *delinquere*; "chosen" to be *delectus* from *deligere*; and "beloved" to be *dilectus* from *diligere*), a quick glance at 4.22.1 and 4.22.12, where CCSL rightly reads *dilectus*, would probably have helped Williams avoid this error.

<sup>156</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 202\*–3\*.

<sup>157</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 93.

| 4.23.10 – *Illi autem causato patris sepulturam cum respondet: Sine mortui sepeliant mortuos suos, tu autem vade et adnuntia regnum dei,...* | 4.23.11 – *Cum vero et tertium illum prius suis valedicere parantem prohibet retro respectare,...* | *Bapt.* 12.9 – ... *patris exequias despexit;...* | *Idol.* 12.3 – ... *cum etiam sepelire patrem tardum fuit fidei.* | *Mon.* 7.8 – *Nam et illum adolescentem festinantem ad exsequias patris ideo revocat,...*

In the series of exchanges in Luke 9:57–62, v. 60 is also attested by Clement of Alexandria. Tertullian’s testimony to these verses begins in 4.23.9 with a general reference to Jesus not accepting (presumably alluding to v. 58) a man who had said ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ (v. 57).<sup>158</sup> In 4.23.10 Tertullian adapts the almost uniformly attested θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου (v. 59), and follows it with a citation of Jesus’ response. Harnack reconstructed v. 60 ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς νεκροὺς ἑαυτῶν, σὺ δὲ ἄπελθε καὶ διάγγελε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>159</sup> Most of the verse is unproblematic; however, it is not clear that Marcion’s text did not read the much more common τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς and ἀπελθῶν. For the word order in the former, IGNTP only lists W, 349, and 1195 as attesting Harnack’s reconstructed order, and it is worth noting that *mortuos suos* is the reading of all OL manuscripts and the Vulgate. The possibility of the Latin rendering simply not placing *suos* in an emphatic position must be considered. The imperative rather than the participle and the addition of καὶ could also be a stylistic choice by Tertullian.<sup>160</sup> The allusions in *Bapt.* 12.9, *Idol.* 12.3, and *Mon.* 7.8 unfortunately do not provide further insight into vv. 59–60. In 4.23.11 the adaptation attests ἀποτάξασθαι [and implies something like τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου] (v. 61) and the prohibition of βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (v. 62).

---

<sup>158</sup> Marcion’s text possibly could have read ἑάν.

<sup>159</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 204\*.

<sup>160</sup> The IGNTP apparatus curiously lists only certain Ethiopic manuscripts as attesting this reading, when it is also the reading of *aur*, *d*, and *e*. In fact, Tertullian’s entire citation follows the reading in *e* verbatim.

### 3.1.38 Luke 10:5

4.24.4 – *Sic et dominus ut in quam introissent domum <praescribat>*<sup>161</sup> *pacem ei dicere,...*<sup>162</sup> | *Or. 26.2 – Aut quomodo secundum praeceptum pax huic domui dices,...*

Harnack reconstructed this verse εἰς ἣν (δ') ἄν εισέλθητε οἰκίαν ... (λέγετε)· εἰρήνην (τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ).<sup>163</sup> Such a reconstruction is possible, though Tertullian's allusion to the opening elements of the verse does not allow a definite decision concerning the presence or absence of δέ, and given Tertullian's occasional change of word order and shift of tenses no great amount of confidence can be given to Harnack's reconstruction of 10:5a. Nevertheless, Marcion's text may have read εισέλθητε οἰκίαν with several early witnesses, including P<sup>75</sup>, **S**, and B, instead of οἰκίαν εισέρχησθε. In the apparatus Harnack stated that Marcion's text read οἰκίαν and not οἰκίαν πρῶτον, citing a few of the handful of witnesses in which the adverb is missing. The absence of the adverb, however, may be a simple omission as Tertullian is not handling the verse with any particular precision. This fact is clearly seen in the wording *pacem ei*, where Tertullian has replaced the reference to the house with a pronoun. That Tertullian knows the canonical reading is evident from *Or. 26.2*, and Harnack rightly does not contend that Marcion's text read εἰρήνην αὐτῇ or αὐτῷ. Tertullian's argument is concerned with the "peace" element of the pronouncement, and it is therefore not really possible to determine the precise reading of Marcion's text in v. 5b.<sup>164</sup>

### 3.1.39 Luke 10:19

4.24.9 – *Quis nunc dabit potestatem calcandi super colubros et scorpios?* | 4.24.12 – *... tunc et scorpios et serpentes sanctis suis [the Creator God's] subdidit,...*<sup>165</sup>

Tertullian adapts Luke 10:19 in the question he poses in 4.24.9, which attests the reading δίδωμι/δέδωκα ... τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ

---

<sup>161</sup> *Praescribat* is indicated as supplied by Braun (*Contre Marcion IV*, 306).

<sup>162</sup> Ursinus's note and Kroymann's edition read *dicerent*.

<sup>163</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 205\*.

<sup>164</sup> Tertullian focuses on the pronouncement of "peace" to connect Christ with Elisha as he follows the reference to Luke 10:5 with a loose citation of 2 Kgs 4:26.

<sup>165</sup> There is a reference to Luke 10:20 in 4.7.13; however, Tertullian gives no indication that he is drawing the allusion from Marcion's text.

σκορπίων.<sup>166</sup> It is not clear whether the present or perfect form underlies Tertullian's *dabit*, though in either case Tertullian has altered the tense to the future. In addition, *calcandi* renders the Greek infinitive in numerous OL manuscripts. Finally, though the verse is not multiply cited outside of *Adversus Marcionem*, that the adaptation is following the word order in Marcion's text appears to be confirmed by the alteration of the order of numerous elements in the allusion back to the verse in 4.24.12.

### 3.1.40 Luke 10:21

4.25.1 – *Quis dominus caeli invocabitur qui non prius factor ostenditur? Gratias enim, inquit, ago, et confiteor, domine caeli, quod ea quae erant abscondita sapientibus et prudentibus, revelaveris<sup>167</sup> parvulis. Quae ista? et cuius? et a quo abscondita? et a quo revelata?* | 4.25.3 – ... *ita nec dominus caeli nec pater Christi ...* | *Prax.* 26.8 – ... *Confiteor, inquit, tibi, Pater, quod absconderis haec a sapientibus.*<sup>168</sup>

Luke 10:21 is also attested by Epiphanius. Focusing simply on Tertullian's testimony, prior to citing the verse Tertullian mentions *dominus caeli* and sets up his argument concerning this Lord being the Creator. The canonical text indicates that this Lord is not only Lord of Heaven but also καὶ τῆς γῆς, and the fact that neither Tertullian's introductory question nor the citation of the verse has this element increases the likelihood of its absence in Marcion's text. Harnack viewed the omission as tendentious, and Marcion may have had theological reason for doing so; yet, the words are also missing in P<sup>45</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> century minuscule 27\*.<sup>169</sup> Gregory, following Klijn, rightly notes "although the omission of καὶ τῆς γῆς *can* be explained as the result of a particular Marcionite tendency, nevertheless this is not a

---

<sup>166</sup> Tertullian's Latin cannot reveal whether τῶν was present before ὄφρων as attested in P<sup>45</sup>, D, and a few other witnesses.

<sup>167</sup> Moreschini's text reads *revelaveris* with R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub>, rejecting *revelaverit* in M, γ, and R<sub>1</sub>.

<sup>168</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 10:21 occur in 4.25.5, 14.

<sup>169</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 206\*. Blackman, *Marcion*, 46 also saw a tendentious omission. Of course, Harnack did not have access to P<sup>45</sup> when he wrote his work on Marcion. It is curious, however, that Tsutsui offers a theological rationale for Marcion's omission (the earth symbolizes all of creation and the Creator God), but does not mention the reading of P<sup>45</sup>. Williams simply writes "In X, 21 together with the Chester Beatty papyrus, P<sup>45</sup>, he [Marcion] omitted καὶ τῆς γῆς" (*Alterations*, 14).

necessary explanation.”<sup>170</sup> Second, the unexpected *gratias ago* at the beginning of the citation is not present in *Prax.* 26.8, once again increasing the likelihood that it has come from Marcion’s text.<sup>171</sup> Third, the presence of *tibi* in *Prax.* 26.8 could increase the probability that σοί was not present in Marcion’s text as it does not appear after *gratias ago* or after *confiteor*, but it may be a simple omission on the part of Tertullian.<sup>172</sup>

Fourth, the absence of πάτερ in Marcion’s text may gain some credence through its presence in *Prax.* 26.8, though it should be noted that Tertullian omits “Lord of heaven and the earth” in the latter reference, once more revealing that Tertullian can easily omit elements in his citations. Harnack again sees a tendentious omission on Marcion’s part, but it is difficult to find a rationale for this view.<sup>173</sup> Tsutsui rightly asks what tendency necessitated the deletion of πάτερ,<sup>174</sup> and his question is particularly poignant because Harnack himself, based on the allusion in 4.25.3, believed that πατήρ was present in Marcion’s text in the final clause of Luke

---

<sup>170</sup> Gregory, *Reception of Luke and Acts*, 181. Cf. A. F. J. Klijn, “Matthew 11:25 // Luke 10:21” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee; Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 13–14.

<sup>171</sup> *Gratias ago* (εὐχαριστῶ), according to IGNTP, is not attested for either Luke 10:21 or, according to Tischendorf and von Soden, Matt 11:25. Klijn, however, provides evidence from several church fathers and witnesses to the diatessaron for this reading (“Matthew 11:25 // Luke 10:21,” 6–9). Though the evidence of other witnesses is necessary before coming to a conclusion, Klijn states that the addition of *confiteor* after *gratias ago* “is possibly from the hand of Tertullian, which means that Marcion’s text probably read εὐχαριστῶ” (“Matthew 11:25 // Luke 10:21,” 9). In support of this view Klijn cites Plooiij, who argued “‘*Confiteor*’ is the common Latin version. Accordingly the addition of ‘*et confiteor*’ by TERTULLIAN appears rather one of his frequent remarks in which he explains or corrects a reading divergent from the Greek Text he is acquainted with; he seems to regard ‘*gratias ago*’ as an incorrect rendering of ἐξομολογούμεναι” (*Further Study*, 82). It should be noted that Plooiij’s view requires Tertullian to have been reading Marcion’s Gospel in Latin. In addition, it is not clear how a simple *et* before Tertullian’s supposed clarification functions as a signal for a gloss. That Tertullian glosses citations is clear, though he often is quite transparent in indicating that he is doing so by using *id est* (see, for example, Luke 11:39–40 in 4.27.2 and Luke 18:20 in 4.36.4) or *utique* (see the comments in chapter 4, n. 352). Klijn seems to have changed his position a little over a decade later when he implied that the whole phrase appeared in Marcion’s text as he commented on “the use of *Gratias...ago et confiteor* in Marcion, according to Tertullian” (A. F. J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* [VCSup 17; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992], 111). Harnack’s explanation was that εὐχαριστῶ καὶ was “der Deutlichkeit wegen hinzugesetzt,” presumably by Marcion (*Marcion*, 206\*).

<sup>172</sup> Harnack noted that the omission is “sonst unbezeugt; vielleicht zufällig bei Tert.” (*Marcion*, 206\*).

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>174</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 96.

10:21.<sup>175</sup> Therefore, the possibility must be entertained that if the word was absent it was not due to an excision by Marcion.<sup>176</sup>

Fifth, Tsutsui notes that in Tertullian's citation God is the subject of the "revealing" but not of the "hiding."<sup>177</sup> Harnack, who reconstructed the text as ὅτι ἄτινα ἦν κρυπτὰ σοφοῖς καὶ συνετοῖς ἀπεκάλυψας νηπίοις, contended that this wording was a tendentious alteration.<sup>178</sup> Tsutsui agrees, noting "Hier liegt wohl ein merkwürdiger Querschnitt der Gottes- bzw. der Erlösungslehre Marcions vor."<sup>179</sup> Braun, however, states that the statement *ea quae ... parvulis* "paraît avoir été remodelée par le citeur [Tertullian]."<sup>180</sup> Indeed, Harnack's attempt to support this formulation and its passive voice by invoking Tertullian's discussion of the passage is not persuasive.<sup>181</sup> The primary reason for this shortcoming is that, as seen in the citation of 4.25.1 above, Tertullian attests both *abscondere* and *revelare* in the passive as he continues the argument. In fact, Tertullian begins his refutation *Si a deo Marcionis abscondita et revelata ... satis inique* (4.25.1), and concludes that it is easier to believe that the same God who revealed things to babes kept them hidden before.<sup>182</sup> If this were the end of the argument, Braun's position would appear more tenable; yet, Tertullian makes a final point, which reveals that Harnack and Tsutsui may be right, even if they themselves did not mention the strongest point in favor of their view. Tertullian's closing thoughts deal with the proposition that if Marcion's god revealed the things previously kept hidden by the Creator, then the former would have done a service for the latter.<sup>183</sup> Interestingly, Tertullian then states *Sed in destructionem, inquis, uti traduceret eas* (4.25.6). Of course, one cannot be certain

---

<sup>175</sup> Harnack here reconstructed ναὶ ὁ πατήρ (ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου) (*Marcion*, 206\*). Braun also contends that the final element, though not cited by Tertullian, was present in Marcion's text (*Contre Marcion IV*, 315n2, 317n5).

<sup>176</sup> IGNTF notes that it may possibly have been omitted by the OL manuscript a, with Athanasius being the only other witness omitting it. Tsutsui offers the rather weak argument that Marcion may have deleted the first reference to "father" out of stylistic reasons because he did not want to keep two terms of address in the text ("Evangelium," 96). Braun, on the other hand, argues it was Tertullian "qui a supprimé aussi l'apostrophe (πάτερ)" (*Contre Marcion IV*, 315n2).

<sup>177</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 97.

<sup>178</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 206\*.

<sup>179</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 97.

<sup>180</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 315n2. See also Wright, *Alterations*, 131–32.

<sup>181</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, 206\*.

<sup>182</sup> Tertullian makes this point in 4.25.5.

<sup>183</sup> See 4.25.5.



that Tertullian actually knows the argument Marcion made concerning the interpretation of this verse, but the presence of this statement at least increases the likelihood that Tertullian is reflecting the wording of Marcion's text in his original citation. Otherwise, since this final argument is only possible if the subject of the two verbs is different in the text, one would have to posit that Tertullian created a reading, then created a Marcionite interpretation of that reading, only to create a reply to that interpretation.

### 3.1.41 Luke 10:22

2.27.4 – *Ceterum quia Patrem nemini visum etiam commune testabitur evangelium, dicente Christo: Nemo cognovit Patrem nisi Filius.* | 4.25.7 – *Omnia sibi tradita dicit a patre.* | 4.25.10 – *Sed nemo scit qui sit pater, nisi filius, et qui sit filius, nisi pater [nemo enim scit patrem nisi filius et filium nisi pater]*<sup>184</sup> *et cuicumque filius revelaverit ...* | *Praescr.* 21.2 – *... quia nec alius patrem novit nisi filius et cui filius revelavit,...* | *Prax.* 8.3 – *Apud nos autem solus Filius Patrem novit,...* | *Prax.* 24.4 [sic, 24.5] – *...Omnia mihi Pater tradidit ...* | *Prax.* 26.9 – *Hic quoque Patrem nemini notum nisi Filio adfirmat.*<sup>185</sup>

Luke 10:22 is attested by Eznik, in *Adam.*, and possibly by Irenaeus. Before addressing specifics of Tertullian's testimony to the verse, a few comments first need to be made concerning the bracketed reading in 4.25.10. Braun rightly agrees with previous editors that these words, which agree with the reading of Matt 11:27, do not come from the hand of Tertullian but are an interpolation by a later copyist.<sup>186</sup> Quispel's attempt to explain the reference as it stands, by seeing Tertullian first cite the orthodox text of Luke and then the Marcionite text, is unpersuasive, primarily because it must read far too much into the conjunction *enim* and it overlooks the Matthean character of the bracketed text.<sup>187</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup> Pamelius, Rigalti, Kroymann, and Evans viewed the elements in brackets as unoriginal and arising from a copyist's interpolation.

<sup>185</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 10:22 occurs in 4.25.11.

<sup>186</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 322n2. See also Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:470.

<sup>187</sup> Gilles Quispel, *De Bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem* (Leiden: Burgersdijk & Niermans Templum Salomonis, 1943), 117. On his interpretation he notes "De beteekenis van „enim” is dan: „deze tekst mag wel aldus worden weergegeven, want in den marcionitischen Bijbel staat juist als in onzen Bijbel”: οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός” (*Bronnen*, 117n3). Braun rightly states that Quispel's contention is not convincing (*Contre Marcion IV*, 322n2).

The citation of Luke 10:22a here attests πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς for Marcion's text.<sup>188</sup> Given Tertullian's propensity to move pronouns, however, the TR reading παρεδόθη μοι, though unlikely, cannot be completely ruled out. In addition, the absence of μου, though supported by the readings in D and several OL manuscripts,<sup>189</sup> may be a simple omission in that Tertullian's citation in *Prax.* 24.5 also refers only to "the Father" and not "my Father."

In Luke 10:22b, three points must be made. First, the absence of καί at the outset is almost certainly a simple omission by Tertullian.<sup>190</sup> Second, though Harnack reconstructed οὐδεὶς γινώσκει (ἔγνω?),<sup>191</sup> the present tense reading should be accepted as Tertullian uses the perfect indicative in 2.27.4, *Praescr.* 21.2, and *Prax.* 8.3 and a perfect passive participle in *Prax.* 26.9.<sup>192</sup> Third, the inversion of "father" and "son" in Marcion's text so that it read τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, an inversion also attested in numerous other manuscripts and church fathers, may be confirmed by Tertullian citing the Matthean/Lukan order in *Praescr.* 21.2.<sup>193</sup>

Finally, Harnack reconstructed Luke 10:22c καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ.<sup>194</sup> The absence of βούληται is attested by several other church fathers, but Harnack's belief that it was absent in Marcion's text should be questioned since Tertullian omits the verb in *Praescr.* 21.2 as well.<sup>195</sup> The subjunctive ἀποκαλύψῃ is attested in several church fathers for Luke 10:22/Matt 11:27, and may have been

---

<sup>188</sup> This is also Harnack's reconstruction (*Marcion*, 206\*).

<sup>189</sup> IGNTF also lists certain Vulgate manuscripts, sy<sup>s</sup>, the Persian Diatessaron, and Eusebius as omitting the possessive pronoun.

<sup>190</sup> Harnack placed the conjunction in parentheses (*Marcion*, 206\*).

<sup>191</sup> Ibid.

<sup>192</sup> It is interesting that Tertullian attests the present tense for Marcion and the perfect tense for his own text when Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.6.1 takes pains to argue for the present tense against the perfect tense preferred by the heretics (cf. Braun, *Contre Marcion I*, 163n8).

<sup>193</sup> Tertullian only cites part of the verse here, though that he has the "father" before the "son" leading into the final element of the verse reveals the Matthean/Lukan order. 2.27.4 and *Prax.* 26.9 reveal that Tertullian prefers to simply speak of no one knowing the Father except the Son, but this preference in a general allusion does not bear on the issue of the reversal of the elements when Tertullian cites the entire verse. Tsutsui's attempts to read great theological significance into the change of word order (see "Evangelium," 97) is questionable since numerous church fathers also reverse the order.

<sup>194</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 206\*.

<sup>195</sup> It is also omitted in the allusion in 4.25.11 (see n. 185)

present in Marcion's text. Tertullian, however, wrote *revelavit* in *Praescr.* 21.2 revealing that he may again be taking some liberty with verb tense and mood.<sup>196</sup>

### 3.1.42 Luke 10:25

4.19.7 – ... *Ecce legis doctor adsurrexit temptans eum;*... | 4.25.15 – *In evangelio veritatis legis doctor dominum adgressus: Quid faciens, inquit, vitam aeternam consequar? In haeretico 'vita' solummodo posita est, sine 'aeternae' mentione,*... | 4.25.18 – *Viderit nunc, si 'aeternam' nostri addiderunt:*... | *Carn. Chr.* 7.3 – ... *Ecce, inquit, surrexit legis doctor temptans eum,*...

Luke 10:25–28 is also attested by Epiphanius. Concerning Tertullian's testimony, first, he does not provide any insight into the precise wording of 10:25a, though it is clear that a νομικός approached Jesus.<sup>197</sup> Second, Harnack contended that, with D, Marcion's text did not read διδάσκαλε at the outset of the question.<sup>198</sup> There is, however, no way to know if this was indeed the case as its absence may be a simple omission on the part of Tertullian. Third, one finds here one of the few places where Tertullian explicitly notes an omission in Marcion's text. In addition, Tertullian not only notes that the "heretical gospel" does not contain ἀϊώνιον, in 4.25.18 he indicates that the Marcionite view would be that the "orthodox" have added the word to the text. As no other extant manuscript attests this omission, it would appear that Marcion removed the adjective from his text.<sup>199</sup>

### 3.1.43 Luke 10:27

4.25.15 – ... *ut doctor de ea vita videatur consuluisse quae in lege promittitur a creatore longaeva [aeterna], et dominus ideo illi secundum legem responsum dedisse: Diliges dominum deum tuum ex toto corde tuo et ex tota anima tua et totis viribus tuis, quoniam de lege vitae sciscitabatur.* | 4.27.4 – ... *dicenti: Diliges dominum deum tuum, ex toto corde et ex tota anima tua et ex totis viribus tuis, qui te vocavit ex Aegypto.* [Deut 6:5, 12] | 5.4.11 – ... *et hoc Creatoris est: Diliges Deum ex*

---

<sup>196</sup> Nearly all witnesses read ἀποκαλύψαι in Luke 10:22/Matt 11:27, though the OL manuscript a reads *revelavit*.

<sup>197</sup> Harnack reconstructed νομικός (τις ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν), but there is no good reason for suggesting the omission of ἀνέστη or the absence of καὶ ἰδοὺ at the outset of the verse.

<sup>198</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 207\*. d and the Arabic Diatessaron also attest the absence of the vocative.

<sup>199</sup> See also Harnack, *Marcion*, 207\* and Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 98.

*toto corde tuo et ex tota anima tua et ex totis viribus tuis [Deut 6:5], sive quae in proximum, et: Proximum tuum tamquam te Creatoris est. [Lev 19:18] | 5.8.9 – Apostolum instruxerit principali praecepto quod probavit et Christus: Diliges Dominum de totis praecordiis et totis viribus et tota anima et proximum tibi tamquam te. | Scorp. 6.11 – ... quae deum scilicet diligens ex totis viribus suis, ... ex tota anima qua, ...*<sup>200</sup>

Continuing to focus only on Tertullian’s testimony, several issues arise out of his comments on Luke 10:27. First, Tertullian’s statement *dominus ideo illi secundum legem responsum dedisse* in 4.25.15 led Harnack to conclude that Marcion put the following words into Jesus’ mouth.<sup>201</sup> Harnack combined the omission of ἀϊώνιον in v. 25 and this form of the text to contend that one should not even consider Zahn’s view that the truncated references are due to Tertullian himself, “da die Tendenz so offenkundig ist und da Tert. hier den Text genau ins Auge gefaßt hat. (Er bemerkt ja sonst eine Auslassung höchst selten ausdrücklich).”<sup>202</sup> The logic of this argument, however, is not at all clear. Why does Tertullian’s explicit reference to a missing element of the verse mean that he must copy all the present elements in the text? Braun also doubts the certainty of Harnack’s assertion and rightly notes, “Même si celle-ci [the words of the reply] est énoncée par le légiste, elle est assumée par le Christ comme réponse à la consultation [emphasis original].”<sup>203</sup> Thus, Harnack’s reconstruction (ὁ δὲ κύριος ἀποκριθεὶς (εἶπεν)· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ (γέγραπται) should be questioned.

Second, in the citation of how one is to love the Lord your God, Harnack reconstructed the text with the preposition ἐξ for the first two elements, and ἐν for the third element. Both prepositions are found in the manuscript tradition for each element, but it is not entirely clear why Harnack opted for the latter preposition in the

---

<sup>200</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 10:25/Matt 22:37/Mark 12:30 or Deut 6:5 occur in 2.13.5; *Jejun.* 2.8; and *Res.* 9.3.

<sup>201</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 207\*. Tsutsui agrees (“Evangelium,” 98). An additional implication of this view is that Marcion would have excised the questions in Luke 10:26. Braun questions Harnack’s view and Lukas questions the relevance of either position stating, “Ob *Dtn* 6,5 gemäß Marcions Evangelium von Jesus selbst zitiert wird (so HARNACK, *Marcion*, 206\*) oder ob Jesus den Gesetzeslehre zur Zitation anleitet (so BRAUN, *Contre Marcion* 4, 327 Anm. 2), ist nicht entscheidbar und auch nicht so wichtig” (*Rhetorik*, 283n1320).

<sup>202</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 207\*. Zahn’s comments are found in *Geschichte*, 2:470–71.

<sup>203</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 327n2. The same point can be made concerning Tertullian’s comments in 4.25.16.

third element. Though it is possible that Tertullian's *ex* attests the Greek ἐξ for the first two elements, it is worth noting that whenever Tertullian uses a preposition in quoting this passage from either testament, he always uses *ex*. Therefore, it is possible that the use of *ex* is due to Tertullian's own proclivity and it therefore does not allow a definite conclusion concerning the reading of Marcion's text.

Finally, Tsutsui is convinced that the final element of loving your neighbor was deleted by Marcion, and that therefore, because of the loss of the link to "neighbor," the parable of the Good Samaritan was also deleted. Tsutsui's reasoning, however, is not convincing and he makes no mention of the fact that Tertullian also does not cite the fourth element in the series: καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου.<sup>204</sup> Though this phrase is also missing in D, several OL manuscripts, and a few other witnesses, given Tertullian's propensity to omit elements in a list, the possibility that he simply breaks off the citation, means that the remainder of v. 27 should be considered unattested, and not omitted.

### 3.1.44 Luke 11:1

4.26.1 – *Cum in quodam loco orasset ... adgressus eum [Jesus] ex discipulis quidam: Domine, inquit, doce nos orare, sicut et*<sup>205</sup> *Iohannes discipulos suos docuit. | Or. 1.3 – Docuerat et Iohannes discipulos suos adorare;... Ideo nec extat, in quae verba docuerit Iohannes adorare,...*<sup>206</sup>

The reading of Marcion's text in the opening of Luke 11:1 cannot be constructed from Tertullian's allusion, though the *cum* may be representing ἐν τῷ εἶναί.<sup>207</sup> It is interesting that Harnack reconstructed the first two clearly attested elements of the verse as ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ προσευχόμενον and (εἶπέν) τις τῶν μαθητῶν (πρὸς αὐτόν), in neither case inverting the Greek word order according to Tertullian's Latin. Given the extremely weak or nonexistent manuscript evidence for

---

<sup>204</sup> Concerning "love your neighbor as yourself," Tsutsui speculates "Marcion sympathisiert mit diesem Gebot und hat es in Gal 5,14 und Rom 13,9b stehen lassen. Ebendeshalb paßt es in diesen Zusammenhang, wobei vom irdischen Leben die Rede ist, nicht hinein" ("Evangelium," 98). Harnack stated that the words "haben vielleicht gefehlt" (*Marcion*, 206\*).

<sup>205</sup> R<sub>3</sub> and Gelenius read *sicut* and *sicut et* was restored by Pamelius.

<sup>206</sup> An additional reference to Christ teaching the disciples how to pray occurs in 4.36.2.

<sup>207</sup> Placed by Harnack in parentheses (*Marcion*, 207\*).

Tertullian's order, Harnack was probably correct in these decisions;<sup>208</sup> however, under the influence of Tertullian placing *docuit* at the end of the clause, Harnack placed ἐδίδαξεν at the very end of the verse, noting that this position is otherwise unattested.<sup>209</sup> Apart from Harnack's haphazard derivation of Greek word order from the Latin, it is worth noting that Tertullian twice puts the "teaching" verb before his reference to John in two allusions to this verse in *Or.* 1.3. According to IGNTF, only 1 and one Georgian manuscript attest this position for the verb, and it is highly unlikely that Tertullian's phrasing here is being influenced by the actual word order of the verse as known to him. Thus, it is much more likely that in all these cases the word order is due to Tertullian, and in 4.26.1 is not reflecting Marcion's text. Second, though apart from the word order most of the verse is relatively unproblematic, the conflicting testimony in the manuscript tradition of Tertullian's works probably means that no firm decision is possible on whether Marcion's text read καθὼς καί or simply καθὼς, with several OL and other manuscripts. Of course, if Moreschini's reconstruction is correct, and it likely is, the presence of the conjunction becomes more likely.

### 3.1.45 Luke 11:2

4.26.3 – *Cui dicam 'pater'?* | 4.26.4 – *A quo spiritum sanctum postulem?... Eius regnum optabo venire ...* | *Fug.* 2.5 – *Sed in legitima oratione, cum dicimus ad patrem.* | *Or.* 2.1 – ... *Pater qui in caelis es.* | *Or.* 3.2 – *Id [the Father's name] ergo ut sanctificetur postulamus ...* | *Or.* 3.4 – ... *sanctificetur nomen tuum,...* | *Or.* 5.1 – *Veniat quoque regnum tuum...* | *Prax.* 23.4 – ... *et nos erectos docebat orare: Pater noster, qui es in caelis,...*

An important initial observation concerning Tertullian's attestation of the Lord's Prayer in Marcion's text is that he has rephrased the petitions as questions, which clearly creates additional challenges for reconstructing Marcion's wording.<sup>210</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> According to IGNTF, the order τινὶ τῷπῳ is attested in several OL manuscripts and the 13<sup>th</sup> century minuscule 2766 and the order τῶν μαθητῶν τις is otherwise unattested.

<sup>209</sup> Harnack reconstructed the remainder of Luke 11:1 κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐδίδαξεν (*Marcion*, 207\*).

<sup>210</sup> Concerning these questions, Jacob van Bruggen rightly observes, "Tertullian gives a free reproduction. He utilizes the petitions rhetorically in order to attack Marcion" ("The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism," *CTJ* 17 [1982]: 81). The challenges of reconstructing Marcion's text here have also been noted by T. Baarda, "De korte tekst van het Onze Vader in Lucas 11:2-4: een Marcionitische corruptie?," *NedTT* 44 (1990): 277-78.

Nevertheless, some insight can be gained from Tertullian's questions.<sup>211</sup> The first question asks about the identity of the one addressed as *pater* (4.26.3). In the other two instances where Tertullian cites the opening address he includes elements, albeit not in an identical manner, from the Matthean form of the prayer (*Or.* 2.1 and *Prax.* 23.4). Though Tertullian does not include any of the Matthean elements in the allusion in *Fug.* 2.5, their presence in the citations could lend credence to Marcion's text reading simply *πάτερ*, with P<sup>75</sup>, **S**, and B.

Tertullian's second question is the curious *A quo spiritum sanctum postulem?* (4.26.4), which implies that the first supplication in the form of the prayer in Marcion's text was for the Holy Spirit.<sup>212</sup> In *Or.* 3.2, 4 Tertullian reveals that his text read the expected petition for the name of the Father to be sanctified, and gives no indication of a petition for the Holy Spirit. Some later textual evidence for a petition for the Holy Spirit, though in an expanded form,<sup>213</sup> led Harnack to reconstruct Marcion's text as (ἐλθάτω) τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα (σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς).<sup>214</sup> Though some have followed Harnack in viewing this reading as that of

---

<sup>211</sup> Frederic Henry Chase thought that in 4.26 Tertullian probably was attesting "the text common to himself and Marcion" (*The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church* [TS 1.3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891], 26). Recognizing that such a position is highly questionable are Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:471 and Rudolf Freudenberger, "Zum Text der zweiten Vaterunserbitte," *NTS* 15 (1968–1969): 420n6, 423. See also chapter 2, n. 82.

<sup>212</sup> Jean Magne argues that Marcion's text read "Père soit sanctifié ton Nom," and that Tertullian did not mention the remainder of the phrase because his understanding of it, as found in *Or.* 3, would have played into Marcion's hands concerning the newness of the revelation of God in Christ ("La réception de la variante «vienne ton esprit saint sur nous et qu'il nous purifie» (Lc 11,2) et l'origine des épicleses, du baptême et du «Notre Père»,» *ELit* 102 [1988]: 84). However, this argument, based on the silence of Tertullian, must be rejected on the basis of its faulty methodological premise (see the critique in n. 215). Equally unpersuasive is Jacob van Bruggen's reasoning that the petition for the Spirit actually attests the presence of the petition for the Father's name to be sanctified ("Lord's Prayer," 81; cf. the critical comments in Andrew J. Bandstra, "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism: A Response," *CTJ* 17 [1982]: 92). A similar unconvincing claim had already been made by J. Rendel Harris: "Here Tertullian has certainly explained the second clause of the Lord's prayer in harmony with the peculiar form preserved by Gregory of Nyssa" (*Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament* [TS 2.1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891], 227).

<sup>213</sup> The four witnesses are 700, 162, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus. For the readings and discussion see Joël Delobel, "The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition: A Critique of Recent Theories and Their View on Marcion's Role," in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif* (ed. Jean-Marie Sevrin; BETL 86; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 295 and Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 130–31.

<sup>214</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 207\*. Though Harnack placed some elements in parentheses, in the apparatus he stated that because Tertullian's testimony establishes that the first petition was for the Holy Spirit, Marcion's text would have read the way he reconstructed it, consonant with other sources (Harnack's list "Minusc. 700 al. 604, Cod. Vatic., olim Barb. IV, 31, Gregor v. Nyssa" is admittedly somewhat difficult to understand, which apparently led Wright astray when, instead of recognizing

Marcion's text,<sup>215</sup> Delobel is right in noting that there are several reasons for questioning this reconstruction.<sup>216</sup> First, it is important to note that in all the other witnesses, this phrase replaces the second petition ("thy kingdom come") and not the first petition.<sup>217</sup> Second, as will be seen, in all the other questions Tertullian poses concerning the elements of the prayer, he appears to preserve the original verb. Though not necessarily proving that the same is the case for *postulem* here, as Delobel correctly notes, it is "at least hypothetical to suppose a verb like 'advenire' (ἐλθέτω)." <sup>218</sup> Finally, there is no hint in Tertullian's argument of any of the elements placed in parentheses in Harnack's reconstruction. Thus, Harnack's reconstruction

---

Harnack having given both the Gregory and Scrivener number for the first minuscule and the written reference to manuscript 162, thought a minuscule 604 and *Codex Vaticanus* attested this reading [*Alterations*, 130]). Harnack's conclusion may have been influenced by his belief that the original reading of Luke was πάτερ, ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου [ἐφ' ἡμᾶς] καὶ καθαρῶς ἡμᾶς followed by the petition for daily bread ("Über einige Worte Jesu, die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen, nebst einem Anhang über die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vater-Unsers," *SKPAW* [1904]: 200 and idem, "Der ursprüngliche Text des Vater-Unsers und seine älteste Geschichte," in *Erforschtes und Erlebtes* [Reden und Aufsätze 4; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1923], 28). It is interesting to note how far Harnack moved from the view of his youth where he contended that Tertullian's question was exegetical to the petition "Your kingdom come" and that therefore "Eine Veränderung anzunehmen, ist unnöthig" (Harnack, *Adolf Harnack: Marcion: die Dorpater Preisschrift* (1870), 148). Tsutsui calls the view of the mature Harnack concerning the originality of the reading "textkritisch unannehmbar" ("Evangelium," 99). Zahn, though reconstructing the text very similarly to Harnack, likewise stated that the reading has no claim to originality (*Das Evangelium des Lucas* [4<sup>th</sup> ed., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3; Leipzig: Deichert, 1913], 767). For discussion and arguments against the authenticity of the logion see Delobel, "Lord's Prayer," 293–301 and Gerhard Schneider, "Die Bitte um das Kommen des Geistes im lukanischen Vaterunser (Lk 11,2 v.l.)," in *Studien zum Text und Ethik des Neuen Testaments: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven* (ed. Wolfgang Schragel; BZNW 47; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 344–73; repr. in *Jesusüberlieferung & Christologie: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970–1990* (NovTSup 57; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 86–115.

<sup>215</sup> Delobel references several commentators accepting this view ("Extra-Canonical Sayings," 108–11). Jean Magne, arguing that Tertullian only incorporates elements from Marcion's text that are useful for his argument, boldly states, "Il [Tertullian] n'avait rien à tirer de ces deux phrases pour sa démonstration; il n'y a donc pas lieu de douter de leur existence" ("La réception," 85). Consonant with concerns expressed in the discussion in chapter 1, Delobel rightly observes "such a procedure to reconstruct Marcion's text ... could lead into pure arbitrariness, and it seems safer to prudently stick to the elements which are actually present in Tertullian's text" ("Lord's Prayer," 297–98n15; cf. idem, "Extra-Canonical Sayings," 111n12[cont.]).

<sup>216</sup> Delobel, "Lord's Prayer," 296 and idem, "Extra-Canonical Sayings," 110. See also F. C. Burkitt, Review of B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, *JTS* 26 (1925): 289–90.

<sup>217</sup> Freudenberger highlights this point in concluding that Harnack's reading is "nicht ganz legitim" ("Zum Text," 421). In n. 2 on the same page, Freudenberger also correctly notes the error in Williams's contention that the petition for the Spirit replaced the petition for the kingdom in Marcion's text (see Williams, *Alterations*, 14). Delobel mentions an issue related to this point in that if Marcion replaced the first petition with the text from 700, it would have the first two demands begin with ἐλθέτω, which "would not fit very well with the overall literary form of the Lord's Prayer" ("Lord's Prayer," 296; see also the literature referenced by Delobel on the same page in n. 11 and idem, "Extra-Canonical Sayings," 110).

<sup>218</sup> Delobel, "Lord's Prayer," 296.



rightly recognizes that Marcion's text had some type of request for the Spirit in place of the first petition, but is wrong as to the suggested form of that request.<sup>219</sup> The unfortunate reality, as Chase had already observed, is that "Tertullian gives no evidence as to the precise wording of the clause."<sup>220</sup>

The opening to the third question contains a reference to both βασιλεία and the verb ἔρχομαι; therefore, Harnack reconstructed ἐλθάτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.<sup>221</sup> Given that Tertullian's argument is progressing with references to the Father in the third person, and that IGNTP lists only 565 as omitting σου, there is no reason to assume that the second person possessive pronoun was not present in Marcion's text.

### 3.1.46 Luke 11:3

4.26.4 – *Quis mihi dabit panem cotidianum?* | *Or.* 6.2 – ... *panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie ... petendo panem cotidianum ...* | *Or.* 6.4 – *Merito autem adiecit: da nobis hodie...*<sup>222</sup>

This petition is also attested by Origen. Tertullian's question reflects both ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος and the verb δίδωμι. In *Or.* 6.2, 4 Tertullian includes *nobis* in his citation, though once again, given the manner in which Tertullian frames his

---

<sup>219</sup> See also Bandstra, "Lord's Prayer: Response," 92, 92n8 and Delobel, "Lord's Prayer," 296–97. Amphoux rejects Harnack's reading, and offers the reconstruction ἀγιασθήτω τὸ πνεῦμα σου ("La révision marcionite du «Notre Père» de Luc (11, 2-4) et sa place dans l'histoire du texte," in *Recherches sur l'histoire de la Bible latine: Colloque organisé à Louvain-la-Neuve pour la promotion de H. J. Frede au doctorat honoris causa en théologie le 18 avril 1986* [ed. R. Gryson and P. Bogaert; CRTL 19; Louvain-la-Neuve: la Faculté de Théologie, 1987], 106, 110). Though this reconstruction may be possible, Amphoux's argumentation is somewhat tenuous as he states, "*Sanctum* est, en effet, un rappel possible de l'impératif de la première demande (lat. *sanctificetur*), surtout si l'on comprend *spiritum sanctum* comme une proposition infinitive dependant de *postule*m: «à qui demanderai-je (que ton) esprit (soit) saint?»" ("La révision," 110). Delobel calls Amphoux's suggestion an "interesting hypothesis," and ultimately concludes "that an unqualified reference to Marcion in the critical apparatus at this point, suggesting that he had the same text as MS 700 and Gregory of Nyssa, is misleading" ("Extra-Canonical Sayings," 111).

<sup>220</sup> Chase, *Lord's Prayer*, 26–27. Interestingly, Harnack earlier admitted as much, yet still held that Marcion's text read as he reconstructed it (see n. 214), noting "Wie die Bitte [in Marcion's text] formuliert war, lässt sich nach Tertullian's verkürzenden Mittheilungen nicht entscheiden. Nichts spricht dagegen, dass sie wie bei Gregor, Maximus und in den beiden Minuskel-Codices gelautet hat" ("Einige Worte," 197n3). A similar point is made by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:471.

<sup>221</sup> Harnack's view of the original form of the Lord's Prayer in Luke (see n. 214) led him to posit that the presence of this petition was a pre-Marcionite intrusion from Matthew into the text used by Marcion (*Marcion*, 208\* and idem, "Der ursprüngliche Text," 28). Harnack without comment offered the spelling ἐλθάτω as found in **Σ** and several other manuscripts, instead of ἐλθέτω.

<sup>222</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 11:3/Matt 6:11 occurs in *Jejun.* 15.6.

discussion there is no reason to posit anything in Marcion's text corresponding to Tertullian's *mihi*.

### 3.1.47 Luke 11:4

4.26.4 – *Quis mihi delicta dimittet?... Quis non sinet nos deduci in temptationem?* | *Fug. 2.5 – Sed in legitima oratione, cum dicimus ad patrem: ne nos inducas in temptationem ... ab eo illam profitemur accidere a quo veniam eius deprecamur. Hoc est enim quod sequitur: sed erve nos a maligno, id est: ne nos induxeris in temptationem permittendo nos maligno. Tunc enim eruimur diaboli manibus, cum illi non tradimur in temptationem.* | *Or. 7.1 – Docet itaque petamus dimitti nobis debita nostra.* | *Or. 7.2 – ... quod remittere nos quoque profitemur debitoribus nostris.* | *Or. 8.1–3 – Ne nos inducas in temptationem, id est ne nos patiaris induci, ab eo utique qui temptat. Ceterum absit ut Dominus temptare videatur, quasi aut ignoret fidem cuiusque aut deicere <sit> [ge]stiens. Diaboli est et infirmitas et malitia ...* | *Or. 8.6 – Eo respondit clausula, interpretans quid sit: ne nos deducas in temptationem; hoc est enim: sed devehe nos a malo.* | *Pud. 2.10 – Debitoribus denique dimissuros nos in oratione profitemur,...*

The question alluding to Luke 11:4a refers to ἀμαρτία and the verb ἀφίημι. The other references by Tertullian to this petition in *Or. 7.1, 2* and *Pud. 2.10* all reflect the Matthean wording (*debitum* rendering ὀφείλημα), confirming that Marcion's text contained the Lukan wording. As was the case above, *mihi* does not reflect an element in Marcion's form of the petition. Thus, Harnack's reconstruction, (καὶ) ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας (ἡμῶν), is generally acceptable, even if it would be slightly more accurate to also enclose ἡμῖν within parentheses or to omit the unattested elements entirely.<sup>223</sup> Somewhat curiously, in the running text of his reconstruction Harnack followed this phrase with an ellipsis, but in the note he stated that it is "wahrscheinlich" that Marcion's text continued with καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. Nevertheless, the second half of the phrase is unattested and further speculation is inadvisable.

Tertullian's final question concerning the Lord's Prayer attests πειρασμός and a passive form of the verb εἰσφέρω. In addition, only in this final petition does Tertullian use the pronoun *nos*. Harnack believed that Marcion had tendentiously

---

<sup>223</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 207\*.

altered the passage to read (καὶ) μὴ ἄφες ἡμᾶς εἰσενεχθῆναι εἰς πειρασμόν.<sup>224</sup> This reading has often been cited for Marcion's text,<sup>225</sup> but Schmid has recently questioned this view.<sup>226</sup> Schmid rightly reiterates the point made above that Tertullian did not cite this, or any, petition from the Lord's Prayer but remodeled Marcion's text into questions.<sup>227</sup> In addition, when Tertullian makes reference to this petition in *Fug.* 2.5 and *Or.* 8.1–3, Tertullian glosses the active reading with a passive explanation. In other words, Tertullian himself has a theological tendency to avoid the impression that the Lord was the tempter.<sup>228</sup> Schmid correctly concludes that serious doubts must be raised concerning Harnack's reconstruction and a Marcionite textual emendation, precisely because the form of Tertullian's question reflects his own theological concerns.<sup>229</sup>

---

<sup>224</sup> Ibid., 207\*–8\*. Harnack believed that Marcion was convinced that the “falsifiers” of the Gospel had often replaced a passive reading with an active one, which Marcion then restored to the passive (ibid., 62). Tsutsui also argued that Marcion here intentionally changed the text (“Evangelium,” 99).

<sup>225</sup> See, for example, Amphoux, “La révision,” 106, 110; Andrew J. Bandstra, “The Original Form of the Lord's Prayer,” *CTJ* 16 (1981): 15–37; and D. Plooi, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron: The Liège Manuscript of a Mediaeval Dutch Translation, A Preliminary Study* (Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmij, 1923), 39–40, 79.

<sup>226</sup> Schmid, “How Can We Access?,” 143–44 discusses the petition in the light of *Or.* 8.1–3. The additional evidence from *Fug.* 2.5 presented here only serves to confirm his view.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid., 143.

<sup>228</sup> Chase, recognizing that Tertullian “is eager to justify God's ways to men,” already noted “in both places he adopts the same view as to ‘ne nos inducas ...’ In the *de Oratione* his gloss is ‘ne nos patiaris induci ab eo’; in the *de Fuga* it is ‘ne nos induxeris ... permittendo nos maligno’ (*Lord's Prayer*, 134–35). For discussion of the passive construction of this petition see ibid., 63–66 and A. J. B. Higgins, “‘Lead Us Not Into Temptation’: Some Latin Variants,” *JTS* 46 (1945): 180–82. That a passive construction occasionally was believed to be the reading of the biblical text is evident not only from the citations in Cyprian (*Dom. or.* 25 [CSEL 3.1.285]) and Ambrose (*Sacr.* 5.4.29 and 6.5.24), but also by Matt 6:13 reading *ne passus fueris induci nos in temptationem* in k and *ne passus nos fueris induci in temptationem* in c. There is, however, no textual evidence for the passive reading ever appearing in Luke 11:4. Though Higgins helpfully provided data on this reading, his conclusion concerning the reading is highly unlikely. He wrote, “In *De Oratione* 8 ... Tertullian is using Marcion's text as an explanation of the usual one. The text in Marcion's Gospel, which must have been the form in use in Marcionite services, found its way, as seen in k, into the Old Latin Gospels (which probably arose about that time) by way of Tertullian's use of it as an explanation of the usual text” (“Latin Variants,” 181; a similar view had already been expressed by Plooi, *Tendentieuse Varianten in den Text der Evangelien: Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het hoogleraarsambt aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam op 1 Maart 1926* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1926], 6). This view not only requires Tertullian to have approvingly used a despised heretical text in his own work, but also simply assumes that Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's text is correct (Higgins accepts Harnack's reconstruction on p. 181), which is the very point in question. Given the broader discussion of this petition in the church fathers and the general concern to avoid describing the Father as the tempter, surely it is much simpler to conclude that Tertullian is expressing a generally held concern.

<sup>229</sup> Schmid, “How Can We Access?,” 144.

### 3.1.48 Luke 11:5

4.26.8 – *Sic et praemissa similitudo nocturnum panis petitozem amicum facit, non alienum, et ad amicum pulsantem, non ad ignotum.... ad eum pulsat ad quem ius illi erat, cuius ianuam norat, quem habere panes sciebat,...* | 4.26.9 – ... *sero pulsatur,...* | *Or.* 6.3 – *Sed et nocturnes ille pulsator panem pulsabat.* | *Praescr.* 11.5 – *Panem vicinus non habebat et ideo pulsabat: ubi apertum est ei et accepit, pulsare cessavit.* | *Praescr.* 12.3 – ... *etiam pulsator ille vicini ianuam tundeat,...*

Luke 11:5 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's allusion in 4.26.8 gives only a few hints at the wording in Marcion's text. The use of a general time frame (*nocturnum*) is also found in *Or.* 6.3 and the mention of *panis* without an indication of the number of loaves appears in both *Or.* 6.3 and *Praescr.* 11.5, indicating that these phrasings are likely due to Tertullian's own hand. In addition, it is noteworthy that in every reference to Luke 11:5 Tertullian uses the verb *pulsare* even though "knocking" is not explicitly mentioned in Luke's text. Thus, κρούω did not appear at this point in Marcion's Gospel.

### 3.1.49 Luke 11:9

4.26.5 – *Proinde a quo petam, ut accipiam? apud quem quaeram, ut inveniam? ad quem pulsabo, ut aperiatur mihi? quis habet petenti dare,...* | 4.26.6 – *Denique si[c] accipere et invenire et admitti laboris et instantiae fructus est illi qui petiit<sup>230</sup> et quaesivit et pulsavit,...* | *Bapt.* 20.5 – *Petite et accipietis inquit: quaesistis enim et invenistis, pulsastis et apertum est vobis.* | *Or.* 10 – ... *Dominus ... seorsum post traditam orandi disciplinam, petite, inquit, et accipietis,...* | *Praescr.* 11.7–10 – *Adeo finis est et quaerendi et pulsandi et petendi. Petenti enim dabitur, inquit, et pulsanti aperiatur et quaerenti invenietur. Viderit qui quaerit semper quia non invenit; illic enim quaerit ubi non invenietur. Viderit qui semper pulsat quia numquam aperiatur: illuc enim pulsat ubi nemo est. Viderit qui semper petit quia numquam audietur; ab eo enim petit qui non audit.*<sup>231</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> Moreschini's text reads *petiit* with R<sub>3</sub> (paralleling the perfect tense of *quaesivit* and *pulsavit*), rejecting *petit* in M, γ, R<sub>1</sub>, and R<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>231</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 11:9/Matt 7:7 occur throughout *De praescriptione haereticorum*: *petite et accipietis* (8.11), *quaerite et invenietis* (8.2, 4, 15; 9.1, 6; 10.7, 9; 43.2), and *pulsate et aperiatur vobis* (8.7).

Luke 11:9 is also partially attested by Epiphanius. Curiously, though Harnack reconstructed the phrasing of the Lord’s Prayer in Marcion’s text based on Tertullian’s questions, he did not do so for Luke 11:9.<sup>232</sup> The imperative verb in each of the elements remains constant throughout Tertullian’s references to this verse, and there appears to be no good reason to doubt that Marcion’s text read αἰτεῖτε, ζητεῖτε, and κρούετε.<sup>233</sup> The situation is different, however, for the second verb in each element. Only *invenire* (attesting εὐρίσκω) remains constant in Tertullian’s citations, though the reformulation into a question in 4.26.5 does not allow a definitive decision on whether Marcion’s text read εὐρήσετε or εὐρήσεται.<sup>234</sup> That the counterpart to κρούετε was ἀνοιγήσεται<sup>235</sup> also appears established, not only because the manuscript tradition here attests no lemma other than ἀνοίγω, but also because *admittere* in 4.26.6 is rather obviously Tertullian’s own word.<sup>236</sup> The counterpart to αἰτεῖτε in Tertullian’s testimony is slightly less certain. In 4.26.5 he first uses *accipere*, though immediately after the three questions he uses *dare*. Tertullian’s other attestations also vary as he uses *accipere* in 4.26.6, *Bapt.* 20.5, and *Or.* 10; *dare* in *Praescr.* 11.7; and *audire* in *Praescr.* 11.10. Given the variation and that IGNTF indicates that only a handful of church fathers attest λήψεσθε, it may well be that this reading is due to Tertullian and was not the reading of Marcion’s text.<sup>237</sup>

### 3.1.50 Luke 11:11–13

4.26.10 – *Ipse [the Creator] est qui scit quid filii postulent. Nam et panem petentibus de caelo dedit manna, et carnem desiderantibus emisit ortygommetram, non serpentem pro pisce nec scorpium pro ovo.... Ita et spiritum sanctum is dabit ... | Or. 6.3 – ... Numquid filio panem poscenti lapidem tradit?*

<sup>232</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, 208\*.

<sup>233</sup> Tertullian also cites the elements in this order in *Bapt.* 20.5. It is interesting that in *Praescr.* 11.7–10 Tertullian introduces the quotation with the order “seek, knock, ask,” has the order “ask, knock, seek” for the quotation itself, and following the quotation discusses the elements in the order “seek, knock, ask.”

<sup>234</sup> Numerous witnesses, including **S** and D, read the latter.

<sup>235</sup> The form could also be ἀνοιχθήσεται as in D and numerous other witnesses.

<sup>236</sup> *Aperire* is used in all of Tertullian’s other citations and allusions.

<sup>237</sup> λαμβάνω appears in v. 10, which may have influenced the rendering of v. 9. The same phenomenon occurs in the Matthean version. Von Soden lists sy<sup>s</sup> and sy<sup>c</sup> as reading λήψεσθε in Matt 7:7, noting the influence from v. 8.

Luke 11:11–13 are also attested by Epiphanius and possibly in *Adam*. Tertullian’s testimony reveals the presence of ὁ υἱός and the phrases dealing with “instead of a fish giving a serpent” (v. 11) and “instead of an egg giving a scorpion” (v. 12). In *Or.* 6.3 Tertullian refers to the giving of the stone instead of bread as found only in Matt 7:9,<sup>238</sup> which may increase the likelihood that in 4.26.10 the reference is being governed by Marcion’s text. For v. 13 Tertullian alludes to the statement δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

### 3.1.51 Luke 11:15

4.26.11 – ... *in Belzebule*<sup>239</sup> *dictus eicere daemonia:...* | 4.28.2 – ... *scilicet super ipso dicentes: Hic non expellit daemonia nisi in Belzebule ...*

In 4.26.11 Tertullian adapts Luke 11:15 and the accusation of the Pharisees ἐν βεελζεβούλ<sup>240</sup> ... ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (v. 15). The verse is not cited outside of *Adversus Marcionem*, but when Tertullian makes a reference back to this accusation in 4.28.2 he cites it in one of its Matthean forms (Matt 12:24).<sup>241</sup> Thus, the likelihood that Tertullian’s adaptation is following Marcion’s text in 4.26.11 is increased. Also, Tertullian’s omission of the description of Beelzebul as ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων in both references perhaps reveals that the descriptor is not important for him.<sup>242</sup>

### 3.1.52 Luke 11:21-22

4.26.12 – *Merito igitur adplicuit ad parabolam fortis illius armati, quem validior alius oppressit,...* | 5.6.7 – *Etiam parabola fortis illius armati, quem alius validior oppressit et vasa eius occupavit,...*

---

<sup>238</sup> It should be noted, however, that the Matthean reading also appears in numerous manuscripts of Luke.

<sup>239</sup> In the interaction with Luke 11:14–22, the manuscripts and editions of Tertullian offer variant spellings of Beelzebul. Moerschini follows the spelling found in Gelenius, Pamelius, and Kroymann. The Greek rendering here will follow the spelling found in the Majority Text without implying that this definitely was the orthography in Marcion’s text.

<sup>240</sup> On the spelling of Beelzebul, see n. 239.

<sup>241</sup> The reading in Matt 9:34 is much closer to Luke 11:15.

<sup>242</sup> In 4.26.12 Tertullian does mention that Jesus connected *principem daemoniorum, quem Beelzebub et satanam supra dixerat* with the parable of the strong man, but it is not entirely clear from where Tertullian draws the term and the fact remains that he does not refer to the ‘prince of demons’ in his other references.

Luke 11:21–22 also is not multiply cited outside of *Adversus Marcionem*, but Tertullian does reference the text in 4.26.12 and then again in 5.6.7. The Lukan provenance of the saying is confirmed by the description of the strong man as *armati* (καθωπλισμένος), as it is not found in the parallel Matt 12:29/Mark 3:27. Though none of the Synoptics explicitly identify the illustration as a parable, Tertullian twice cites it as such. The *illius* appearing in both adaptations is clearly Tertullian’s own addition, as is *alius*, which Tertullian inserts in two different places. For Marcion’s text, Tertullian therefore attests ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος (v. 21) and ἰσχυρότερος ... νικήση [νικήσει is attested in several manuscripts, but is less likely] (v. 22).<sup>243</sup>

### 3.1.53 Luke 11:27–28

3.11.3 – *Nam et mulier quaedam exclamaverat: Beatus venter qui te portavit, et ubera quae hausisti.* | 4.26.13 – *Exclamat mulier de turba, beatum uterum qui illum portasset, et ubera quae illum educassent. Et dominus: Immo beati qui sermonem dei audiunt et faciunt,...* | *Carn. Chr.* 7.13 – *Eodem sensu denique et illi exclamationi respondit, non matris uterum et ubera negans, sed feliciores designans, qui verbum dei adiunt [sic].*

V. 27 is also attested by Ephrem. Tertullian’s testimony to v. 27 in 3.11.3 and 4.26.13 indicates that his use of *exclamare* does not appear to render a single Greek verb, but the idea expressed by the woman ἐπάρασα φωνήν. There is also a rather unproblematic reference to the womb that bore Jesus and the breasts that nursed him being called blessed (μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας).<sup>244</sup>

Harnack believed Tertullian’s testimony to reveal two specific readings in v. 28: (1) ἀκούοντες after τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ instead of before it and (2) ποιῶντες instead of φυλάσσοντες.<sup>245</sup> The first reading is suspect because in *Carn. Chr.* 7.13

---

<sup>243</sup> Though Harnack, *Marcion*, 209\* cited Tertullian’s allusions to these verses he provided no reconstruction of them.

<sup>244</sup> Harnack offered the same reconstruction, though placing οὓς ἐθήλασας in parentheses. The OL manuscripts render the Greek with both *sugere* and *lactare*, and there is no reason to posit that Tertullian’s rendering reflects any other Greek text, particularly as the Greek is almost uniform in the manuscript tradition.

<sup>245</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 209\*. Plooi, *Further Study*, 84 also assumes the latter reading in Marcion’s text.

Tertullian also places *audiunt* after the reference to the word of God, revealing that this otherwise unattested order is most likely due to Tertullian's own hand. Concerning the second point, IGNTP does reveal slight manuscript evidence for this reading; however, as was seen in the discussion above of Luke 8:21, Tertullian immediately refers back to 8:21 after citing Luke 11:28. It is worth noting that Luke 8:21 concludes with a reference to "hearing" and "doing" the word of God. Therefore, it is possible that the connection between Luke 8:21 and 11:28 in Tertullian's argument has led him to write *audiunt et faciunt*, thus rendering it unclear whether Marcion's text really read as Harnack thought.<sup>246</sup>

### **3.1.54 Luke 11:29**

4.27.1 – ... *iubet omni petenti dare, et ipse signum petentibus non dat*;... | *Fug.* 13.2 – *Atque adeo omni petenti dari iubet, ipse signum petentibus non dat.*

Luke 11:29 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's testimony in 4.27.1 indicates a reference to the phrase σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται. That there is no need to posit a direct reference in the text of someone "asking" for a sign is clear from Tertullian's use of *petere* in *Fug.* 13.2 as well.

### **3.1.55 Luke 11:33**

4.27.1 – ... *negat lucernam abstruend~~a~~ndam, sed confirmat super candelabrum proponendam, ut omnibus luceat*;... | *Cult. fem.* 2.13.2 – *Si lucernam tuam sub modio abstruseris*,... | *Praescr.* 26.4 – *Ipse docebat lucernam non sub modium abstrudi solere sed in candelabrum constitui ut luceat omnibus qui in domo sunt.*

Tertullian's use of this verse in his argument provides little insight into the actual wording of Marcion's Gospel. That it included some mention of hiding a λυχνός and the idea of ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν is obvious; however, Harnack also believed that the end of the verse in Marcion's text was Matthean.<sup>247</sup> Once again it may simply be that Tertullian slipped into the, for him, more familiar Matthean wording (he cites Matt 5:15 in *Praescr.* 26.4), which works equally well for the purposes of Tertullian's argument: Marcion's Christ hid his light from men for ages even though

---

<sup>246</sup> In *Carn. Chr.* 7.13 Tertullian makes no reference to the second element.

<sup>247</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 209\*. It is not entirely clear why Harnack included the unattested ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον in his reconstruction, but not the attested ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν.



he commanded a lamp not to be hidden but placed on a lampstand in order to give light to all.

### 3.1.56 Luke 11:52

4.27.9 – *Quam vero clavem habebant legis doctores nisi interpretationem legis? ad cuius intellectum neque ipsi adibant, non credentes scilicet—nisi enim credideritis, non intellegitis* [Isa 7:9]—, *neque alios admittebant:...* | 4.28.2 – ... *quae clavem agnitionis habens nec [in] ipsa[m] introiret nec alios sineret,...*

Though not multiply cited outside of *Adversus Marcionem*, a second allusion to v. 52 in 4.28.2 provides some insight into Tertullian’s testimony. In 4.27.9 Tertullian makes reference to τοῖς νομικοῖς and 4.28.2 reveals that not only τὴν κλεῖδα, but probably also τῆς γνώσεως were present in the verse.<sup>248</sup> The phrasing of Tertullian’s reference to v. 52 in 4.27.9 has been shaped by the citation of LXX Isa 7:9, with which Tertullian glossed the verse, and there is no reason to posit that Marcion read a Greek term more closely approximating the Latin adjective *intellectus* (4.27.9). In addition, a comparison of the references also reveals the fluidity with which Tertullian renders v. 52b, making its reconstruction with any degree of certainty impossible.<sup>249</sup> Finally, *sineret* in 4.28.2 may well have arisen from the parallel in Matt 23:13.

---

<sup>248</sup> In 4.28.2 Tertullian applies the words spoken to the lawyers to the Pharisees (Luke 12:1). Tsutsui rightly notes “Das Wort ‘agnitio’, das Tertullian in dem Zitat bezeugt, ist nicht das genaue Äquivalent des griechischen ‘γνώσις’, das gewöhnlich mit ‘scientia’ übersetzt wird” (“Evangelium,” 102). However, his conclusion that Marcion may have replaced the Greek word in his text is problematic. First, his argument by analogy “Aus Röm 11,33 hat Marcion ‘γνώσις’ gestrichen (s. Harnack109\* [sic])” is questionable as Harnack simply assumed that the unattested elements in Tertullian’s citation of the verse were deleted by Marcion. Second, the assumption that because Tertullian deviated from “normal” translation words a different Greek text was present is hazardous precisely because Tertullian constantly varies the vocabulary he employs in biblical citations (for further discussion on this point see Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess?,” [forthcoming]).

<sup>249</sup> After the reference to the lawyers, Harnack reconstructed τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως κτλ. It is not entirely clear what Harnack meant to indicate with his κτλ.; however, the most straightforward implication that the remainder of the verse read as canonical Luke is an unprovable assertion.

### 3.1.57 Luke 12:2

4.28.2 – ... *adicit: Nihil autem opertum, quod non patefiet, et nihil absconditum, quod non dinoscetur...*<sup>250</sup> | *Paen.* 6.10 – *Nihil occultum quod non revelabitur:...* | *Virg.* 14.3 – ... *Nihil occultum quod non revelabitur...*

Harnack reconstructed this verse οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ οὐδὲν κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.<sup>251</sup> This reconstruction follows the text of NA<sup>27</sup> with two exceptions. First, ἐστὶν after συγκεκαλυμμένον has been omitted.<sup>252</sup> It is not clear, however, that this omission should be posited for Marcion's text because in both Luke 12:2 and Matt 10:26 ἐστὶν appears in the text, and yet Tertullian does not offer it in either of his other two citations.<sup>253</sup> Second, an additional οὐδὲν has been inserted before κρυπτόν. Unfortunately, this element of the verse is not multiply cited, but its complete absence in the textual tradition of both Matthew and Luke may lend some credence to the supposition that the repetition is due to Tertullian himself.<sup>254</sup>

### 3.1.58 Luke 12:3

4.28.2 – ... *cum subiciat etiam quae inter se mussitarent vel inter se tractarent ... in apertum processura et in ore hominum futura ex evangelii promulgatione.* | *Praescr.* 26.2 – ... *ipse praeceperat si quid in tenebris et in abscondito audissent, in luce et in tectis praedicarent.*

Luke 12:3 is another case where little concerning the precise wording of Marcion's text can be gleaned from Tertullian's allusion. Apart from the likely

---

<sup>250</sup> Moreschini's text reads *dinoscetur* with Rhenanus's editions, rejecting *dinosceretur* in *M* and *γ*.

<sup>251</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 211\*.

<sup>252</sup> IGNTF lists a few manuscripts that attest ἐστὶν before συγκεκαλυμμένον. In addition, a variant spelling συγκεκαλυμμένον is attested in P<sup>75</sup>, D, W, Θ, and 2766, whereas κεκαλυμμένον is attested in P<sup>45</sup>, **Σ**, C\*, and 1241. For this reason the precise rendering of *opertum* is uncertain.

<sup>253</sup> Though Harnack believed the textual tradition to unanimously include ἐστὶν in Luke, IGNTF lists two minuscules, one lectionary, and Hilary as omitting it, along with Tertullian and Marcion. In any case, the evidence is scant.

<sup>254</sup> According to IGNTF, numerous OL manuscripts, and manuscripts of other ancient versions, attest οὐδέ instead of καὶ. It is curious, however, to find Marcion also listed as a witness for this reading as one would not expect *neque* of the OL manuscripts and *et nihil* to be listed as evidence for the same Greek reading.

presence of κηρυχθήσεται, the only insight is that the use of *mussitare* in 4.28.2 may have arisen from a closer rendering of the text (πρὸς τὸ οὐς ἐλάλησατε) than offered in the general *audire* in *Praescr.* 26.2.<sup>255</sup>

### 3.1.59 Luke 12:4–5

4.28.3 – *Deinde conversus ad discipulos: Dico autem, inquit, vobis amicis, nolite terri ab eis qui vos solummodo occidere possunt, nec post hoc ullam in vobis habent potestatem ... demonstrabo autem vobis quem timeatis: timete eum qui postquam occiderit potestatem habeat*<sup>256</sup> *mittendi in gehennam—creatorem utique significans—; ita<que>*<sup>257</sup> *dico vobis, hunc timete.* | 4.28.4 – *Hi ergo erunt quos supra praemonet ne timeant tantummodo occidi, ideo praemittens non timendam occisionem,...* | *Fug.* 7.2 – *Nolite timere eos, inquit qui occidunt corpus, animae autem nihil valent facere, sed timete eum, qui et corpus et animam perdere potest in gehennam.* | *Pud.* 2.7 – *... non solum corpus, verum et animas occidens in gehennam.* | *Res.* 35.1 – *Sed et praecipit eum potius timendum, qui et corpus et animam occidat in gehennam,... non qui corpus occidant, animae autem nihil nocere possint,...* | *Scorp.* 9.6 – *... non eos timendos, qui solum corpus occidant, animam autem interficere non valeant, sed illi potius metum consecrandum, qui et corpus et animam occidere et perdere possit in gehennam.* | *Scorp.* 10.8 – *... timorem eorum, qui solum corpus occidunt, animae autem nihil faciunt:...* | *Scorp.* 12.5 – *Qua poena timorem puniat, nisi quam negator relaturus est cum corpore et anima occidendus in gehenna?*<sup>258</sup>

These verses are also attested by Epiphanius. Since Tertullian's citations of this saying in his other works are all based on the parallel in Matt 10:28, several Lukan elements are not multiply attested. Among them is the opening phrase in 4.28.3, *dico autem vobis amicis*, rendering λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις (Luke

---

<sup>255</sup> Plooiij, *Further Study*, 82 argued that *mussitare* was rendering a different text than that found in any general tradition and that the *in apertum* reflects the same reading behind the Liège Diatessaron's *openbare*. This suggestion is interesting, though to posit the language here as further evidence for a close relation between Tatian's and Marcion's text of the Gospel seems tenuous at best.

<sup>256</sup> Moreschini's text reads the subjunctive *habeat* against the indicative *habet* in X, Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.

<sup>257</sup> R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub> read *itaque*, whereas R<sub>1</sub>, M, γ, and Latinius's note read *ita*.

<sup>258</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 12:4–5 occur in 4.28.5 and *An.* 13.3.

12:4a).<sup>259</sup> At the end of the phrase Harnack placed the canonical μου in parentheses with a question mark, but contended that Marcion removed the pronoun to purposely negate the thought that Jesus considered the twelve disciples to be friends.<sup>260</sup> Tsutsui, however, rightly responds “ob ‘μου’ hier steht oder fehlt, die Anrede verändert sich inhaltlich nicht.”<sup>261</sup> Once again, however, μου is simply unattested.

The remainder of Luke 12:4 presents numerous challenges in interpreting Tertullian’s testimony. Following the Latin of Tertullian’s citation given above, Harnack reconstructed μη φοβηθητε ἀπο τῶν ὑμᾶς μόνον ἀποκτείνειν δυναμένων καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μηδεμίαν εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐχόντων ἐξουσίαν.<sup>262</sup> The first four words follow the nearly universally attested Lukan text, but then the reading diverges rather radically, following no known Lukan reading. Harnack rightly saw no advantage for Marcion’s interests in this wording, but also contended that one could not assume that Tertullian arbitrarily changed the text.<sup>263</sup> Yet, one finds several indications pointing to a possible argument for the view that Tertullian is largely responsible for this unique text.

First, the addition of the adverb *solummodo* clearly reflects a common addition by Tertullian to the idea of Luke 12:4/Matt 10:28, as *solum* appears in *Pud.* 2.7 and *Scorp.* 9.6; 10.8. Second, the idea of *possunt occidere* is easily explained as a Matthean influence on Tertullian’s rendering, as it has already been noted that Tertullian elsewhere always references Matt 10:28 (cf. *Fug.* 7.2; *Res.* 35.1; and *Scorp.* 9.6). Third, Braun notes that the omission of *corpus* (τὸ σῶμα) is not significant, as Tertullian has used the expression of Luke 12:5, where the canonical text also simply mentions killing without the verb having an object.<sup>264</sup> It is possible,

---

<sup>259</sup> Harnack’s placement of ὑμῖν in parentheses with a question mark is due to Epiphanius’s testimony (*Marcion*, 211\*).

<sup>260</sup> Ibid. This comment was an addition to the second edition. In *Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 193\* Harnack did not question the presence of μου.

<sup>261</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 102. According to IGNTP, μου is omitted in X, 131, 213, and 1242\*.

<sup>262</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 211\*.

<sup>263</sup> Ibid. Tsutsui apparently believes that Marcion was responsible for this form of the text contending that the key to the changes is the idea that “der nicht zu fürchtende (V. 4a) und der zu fürchtende (V. 5) bezeichnen nach Marcions Auffassung denselben, nämlich den Schöpfergott” (“Evangelium,” 103). Apart from this view not explaining all the variants, it requires the plural subject of v. 4 and the singular subject of v. 5 to be identical.

<sup>264</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 357n6.

though not provable, that Tertullian replaced *corpus* with *vos*. Finally, though *nec post hoc* could be rendering the Lukan καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, Tertullian again may well have inserted a second person plural pronoun and drawn the idea of *potestas* from Luke 12:5. For these reasons it is at least open to question that Marcion's text read in the manner it is offered by Tertullian, and more likely that Tertullian began by rendering the verse more accurately and then simply referred to the concepts of Luke 12:4 influenced by his own emphases, Matt 10:28, and the following verse.

For v. 5, once again the opening element is not multiply cited since Tertullian elsewhere references Matt 10:28; however, he attests the relatively unproblematic ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθήτε. Most of the remainder of the verse does not present significant challenges, though it is worth noting that Tertullian attests the order ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα and could be attesting βαλεῖν, found in P<sup>45</sup>, W, and a few other witnesses, instead of ἐμβαλεῖν. Further comment on this verse, however, requires incorporating the testimony of Epiphanius.

### 3.1.60 Luke 12:8–9

4.28.4 – *Sed habeo et de sequentibus sumere: Dico enim vobis, omnis qui confitebitur <in> me<sup>265</sup> coram hominibus, confitebor in illo coram deo.... Et omnis qui negavit me coram hominibus, denegabitur coram deo,... | Cor. 11.5 – ... Iesus negaturus omnem negatorem et confessurus omnem confessorem ... | Fug. 7.1 – Qui confessus fuerit me et ego confitebor illum coram patre meo. | Idol. 13.6 – Qui autem confusus super me fuerit penes homines, et ego confundar super illo, inquit, penes patrem meum, qui est in caelis. | Prax. 26.9 – Est Patris Filius confessurus confessores et negaturus negatores suos apud Patrem,... | Scorp. 9.8 – Omnis igitur, qui in me confessus fuerit coram hominibus, et ego confitebor in illo coram patre meo, qui in caelis est. Et omnis, qui me negaverit coram hominibus, et ego negabo illum coram patre meo, qui in caelis est. [in 9.9 Tertullian makes the point that Christ did not say *qui me confessus fuerit* and in 9.11 that Christ did say *qui me negaverit* and not *qui in me*] | Scorp. 9.13 – Plus est autem quod et confusioni confusionem comminatur: qui me confusus fuerit coram hominibus, et ego confundar eum coram patre meo, qui est in caelis. | Scorp. 10.4 – [Jesus did not say] *qui in me confessus**

---

<sup>265</sup> R<sub>3</sub> reads *in me*, whereas R<sub>1</sub>, R<sub>2</sub>, M, and γ read *me*.

*fuerit coram hominibus in caelis, et ego in illo confitebor coram patre meo, qui in caelis est.*<sup>266</sup>

Luke 12:8 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's other citations appear to be drawn from Matt 10:32, so once again the opening words in Luke are not multiply cited. Harnack reconstructed λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν and contended that Marcion replaced δέ with γάρ because he had omitted vv. 6–7.<sup>267</sup> Braun rightly points out, however, that Epiphanius's testimony only explicitly indicates that v. 6 was omitted, and Braun even argues that the manner in which Tertullian introduces his citation of v. 8 may reveal that it did not follow directly after v. 5 in Marcion's Gospel.<sup>268</sup> In any case, since Luke 12:7 is unattested it is precarious to build an argument for a textual emendation based on its omission.

Numerous difficulties also arise in the elements of Luke 12:8 that are multiply cited. First, the disagreement in the editions concerning whether Tertullian wrote *in me* or *me* means that Harnack's insistent, though unclear, “der Unterschied von μέ und ἐν αὐτῷ ist beabsichtigt” cannot be accepted.<sup>269</sup> Second, Harnack reconstructed πᾶς ὃς ὁμολογήσει, which certainly is possible.<sup>270</sup> Tertullian's use of the future perfect in other citations tends to confirm Harnack's reconstruction, though a possible influence due to the Matthean future cannot be entirely ruled out. Third, Harnack believed Marcion's text twice employed the preposition ἐνώπιον in v. 8.<sup>271</sup> Although Epiphanius attests ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ for the end of the verse, Tertullian's testimony cannot be used to posit the prior reading ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, for this would require the assumption that *coram* renders ἐνώπιον in the second instance (if Epiphanius can be trusted) and therefore must do so in the first.<sup>272</sup> Apart from the fact that there is no other manuscript evidence for ἐνώπιον

---

<sup>266</sup> A probable allusion to Luke 12:8/Matt 10:32 occurs in *Scorp.* 15.6. On the influence of the idea of being ashamed from Luke 9:26 on *Fug.* 7.1, *Idol.* 13.6, and *Scorp.* 9.13 see n. 146.

<sup>267</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 212\*. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 103 makes the same point.

<sup>268</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 359n4.

<sup>269</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 212\*.

<sup>270</sup> A, B\*, D, Γ, Δ, and numerous minuscules read the future active indicative of Matt 10:32 instead of the Lukan aorist active subjunctive.

<sup>271</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 212\*.

<sup>272</sup> Thus it is at best questionable for IGNTP to state “Marcion ap TE” as attesting the reading ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

appearing in Luke 12:8, in *Scorp.* 9.8 *coram* renders ἔμπροσθεν.<sup>273</sup> Additionally, Tertullian apparently has no problem rendering the same Greek preposition with *penes* (*Idol.* 13.6) or *apud* (*Prax.* 26.9). Fourth, in the discussion above on Luke 9:26 it was already noted that Tertullian’s phrasing of the concept of confessing and being ashamed/denying is strongly shaped by Matt 10:32–33. Therefore, once again it is possible that the attested ὁμολογήσω does not actually reflect Marcion’s text, but Tertullian’s proclivities.<sup>274</sup> Finally, Tertullian does not attest τῶν ἀγγέλων at the end of v. 8.<sup>275</sup> That Tertullian is following Marcion’s text to some degree is evident by the presence of *deus* and not *pater*, as found in Matt 10:32 and Tertullian’s other citations. The evidence of Epiphanius, however, must be included before drawing a final conclusion.

Harnack reconstructed Marcion’s text of 12:9 as καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἠρνήσατό με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>276</sup> First, Harnack noted that καί instead of δέ, and πᾶς ὃς ἠρνήσατό instead of ὁ ἀρνησάμενος are otherwise unattested. Even if *et* attests καί and not δέ, Tertullian uses *et* in *Prax.* 26.9, *Scorp.* 9.8, and, though with the elements in reverse order, in *Cor.* 11.5. In addition, Tertullian, apart from the placement of *me*, renders the opening in essentially the same way in *Scorp.* 9.8, and he also uses the adjective *omnis* in *Cor.* 11.5. Therefore, the entire opening seems to be reflecting Tertullian’s own manner of citation rather than elements in Marcion’s text.<sup>277</sup> Second, concerning the conclusion of the verse, as above, *deus* instead of *pater* (Matt 10:33), reveals a likely point of contact with Marcion’s text, though the omission of τῶν ἀγγέλων is in some ways dependent upon the decision concerning its omission at the end of Luke 12:8.

---

<sup>273</sup> Tischendorf, von Soden, and NA<sup>27</sup> attest no manuscript variation for the preposition in Matt 10:32.

<sup>274</sup> Harnack recognized that it is the Matthean reading, yet also placed it in his reconstruction of Marcion’s text (*Marcion*, 212\*). IGNTP indicates that though no other witnesses attest this precise reading, the minuscules 1338 and 2757, along with aeth attest ὁμολογήσω κἀγώ.

<sup>275</sup> Tischendorf, von Soden, and NA<sup>27</sup> indicate that **S**\* also omits these words; however, IGNTP indicates that τῶν ἀγγέλων was present and wrongly states that τοῦ θεοῦ was omitted by the corrector.

<sup>276</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 212\*.

<sup>277</sup> In addition, it is worth noting that the entire OL manuscript tradition offers *qui ... negaverit* (*abnegaverit* in r<sup>1</sup>) for the opening of Luke 12:9. The rendering can easily be understood as a translation of an articular participle. IGNTP does not view Marcion or the OL manuscripts attesting a Greek finite verb.

Finally, the same uncertainty of whether *coram* is rendering ἐνώπιον or ἔμπροσθεν in Luke 12:8 also occurs in 12:9.<sup>278</sup>

### 3.1.61 Luke 12:10

4.28.6 – ... *Qui dixerit in filium hominis, remittetur illi, qui autem*<sup>279</sup> *dixerit in spiritum sanctum, non remittetur ei.* | *Pud.* 13.19 – *Hymenaei autem et Alexandri* [1 Tim 1:20] *crimen si et in isto et in futuro aevo inremissibile est, blasphemia scilicet,...*

Tertullian's testimony in 4.28.6, as already noted by Harnack,<sup>280</sup> renders a text that has elements of both Luke 12:10 and Matt 12:32. The fact that such harmonization is attested in the manuscript tradition, reveals that harmonization could have been present in Marcion's Gospel. Further confirmation for this view may be found in the observation that there is no mention of the clearly Matthean *in futuro aevo* in Tertullian's work against Marcion, which Tertullian highlighted in *Pud.* 13.19.<sup>281</sup> Nevertheless, there are numerous challenges to unravelling the precise reading of Marcion's text and the possibility of Matthean readings arising from Tertullian cannot be excluded completely.

Harnack reconstructed this verse (καὶ) ὅς ἂν εἴπη εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὅς δ' ἂν εἴπη εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.<sup>282</sup> First, Harnack contended that, as in Matthew, πᾶς at the sentence opening was missing. IGNTP lists only Marcion and Pacianus as attesting this omission, and since Tertullian begins his citation with *qui*, it is precarious to conclude, as Harnack apparently does, that καί may have been present but πᾶς was not. Both words are simply unattested.

Second, *dixerit* is likely a future perfect indicative, which Harnack understood as rendering a Greek aorist subjunctive (εἴπη). IGNTP, however,

---

<sup>278</sup> Both prepositions are attested in both occurrences in the Greek manuscript tradition.

<sup>279</sup> Some disagreement exists among the manuscripts and editors of Tertullian as Rigalti, Oehler, Kroymann, and Evans read *qui autem* but θ, Gelenius, and Pamelius read *autem qui*.

<sup>280</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 212\*.

<sup>281</sup> According to IGNTP this Matthean element is found in D, c, d, e, 827 and some Ethiopic manuscripts.

<sup>282</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 212\*–13\*.



interprets the OL manuscripts in which it appears as rendering a Greek future.<sup>283</sup>

Further complicating the issue is that Matt 12:32 twice reads ὅς ἐάν εἴπῃ and D, in the first occurrence in Luke 12:10, reads ὅς ἂν ἐρεῖ. Given that the OL manuscript tradition uniformly offers *qui dixerit* for both occurrences in Matt 12:32, Harnack's view, reading Greek subjunctives, may be more likely.

Third, Harnack's reconstruction omits λόγον after the first εἴπῃ, even though it is never absent in any of the extant evidence of Luke 12:10. It is more likely that this omission is due to Tertullian himself, an omission which creates a perfect parallel between the two elements of the verse.

Fourth, Luke speaks of “blaspheming” the Holy Spirit where Tertullian's quote repeats the idea of “speaking against.” Once again, it is true that this reading creates a better parallel, and it is also the reading of Matthew; however, it is also attested in numerous OL manuscripts. In addition, Tertullian mentions blasphemy/blaspheming six times in the immediate context of the quote and it is unlikely that he would have avoided a reference to a term factoring so prominently in his discussion. Thus, this reading may have been that of Marcion's text.

Fifth, with D and numerous other manuscripts it is possible that Marcion's text read τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον instead of τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, though Tertullian's own proclivity of altering the word order must also be taken into account. Finally, though αὐτῷ at the conclusion of the verse again creates a perfect parallel, its presence in numerous manuscripts means that Tertullian may have read it in Marcion's text.

### **3.1.62 Luke 12:16, 19–20**

4.28.11 – *Ab eo ergo erit et parabola divitis blandientis sibi de proventu agrorum suorum, cui deus dicit: Stulte, hac nocte animam tuam reposcent; quae autem parasti, cuius erunt? | Or. 6.4 – Cui rei parabolam quoque accommodavit illius hominis, qui provenientibus fructibus ampliationem horreorum et longae securitatis spatia cogitavit ea ipsa nocte moriturus.*

---

<sup>283</sup> IGNTF lists only Marcion, Athanasius, and 170 as attesting εἴπῃ. It should be noted, however, that the IGNTF apparatus for this verse is problematic. It views a, c, d, r<sup>1</sup>, and e (all reading *dixerit*) as attesting ἐρεῖ at the beginning of the verse and for the second occurrence sees b, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, q, r<sup>1</sup>, and e (again all reading *dixerit*) as attesting ἐροῦντι (instead of τῷ βλασφημήσαντι). IGNTF lists these OL manuscripts, in the latter instance, as attesting ἐροῦντι λόγον, when none of them, according to *Itala*, here uses *verbum* or *sermo*.

In 4.28.11 Tertullian makes a reference to Luke 12:16 that seems to require the unproblematic words παραβολήν and [ἀνθρώπου τινὸς implied] πλουσίου. Harnack apparently believed that *de proventu agrorum suorum* was referring to εὐφόρησεν ἡ χώρα (v. 16), though Tertullian introducing the phrase with *blandientis sibi* more likely points to v. 19 being in view.<sup>284</sup> Even if this suggestion is correct, the precise wording remains elusive. Based on the citation of v. 20 Harnack reconstructed εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός· ἄφρων, τάυτη τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν (ἀπὸ σοῦ)· ἃ δὲ ἠτοίμασας, τίνος ἔσται;<sup>285</sup> Tertullian provides a nearly verbatim rendering of the Greek text, here identical in the Majority Text and NA<sup>27</sup>, though a few points warrant mention. First, the omission of δέ is almost certainly due to Tertullian. Second, his use of a future (*reposit*) once again is attributable to his citation habit and therefore does not necessitate a future in Marcion's text.<sup>286</sup> Third, Harnack placed ἀπὸ σοῦ in parentheses, and though it is absent in a few other witnesses, it may well have been a simple omission by Tertullian. Finally, τίμος is attested by D, most OL manuscripts, and numerous church fathers, and likely was Marcion's reading. Though Tertullian has an allusion to this parable in *Or.* 6.4, it unfortunately does not provide insight into the phrasing of Marcion's text on any of these points.

### 3.1.63 Luke 12:24

4.21.1 – ... *qui et corvos alit ...* | 4.29.1 – ... *cuius et corvi non serunt nec metunt nec in apothecas condunt, et tamen aluntur ab ipso,...* | *Mon.* 16.2 – *Habet Deum etiam corvorum educatorem, etiam florum excultorem.* | *Ux.* 1.4.7 – ... *qui volatilia caeli nullo ipsorum labore pascit,...*

Concerning Tertullian's discussion of Luke 12:24, 27 Braun notes, "Dans tout ce passage, T. ne s'astreint pas à une fidélité littérale: il récrit le texte évangélique en lui imprimant un certain rythme rhétorique (triple anaphore de *cuius*,

---

<sup>284</sup> In v. 19 the rich man addresses his own soul telling it ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου. It would also make sense contextually for Tertullian to be referring to this statement right before citing God's response.

<sup>285</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 213\*.

<sup>286</sup> Thus, IGNTF questionably lists Marcion along with Irenaeus as reading ἀπαιτήσουσιν.

parallélismes).”<sup>287</sup> Though this observation is correct, some insight into Marcion’s text can still be gained. First, *corvi* attests the Lukan κόρακας, which likely was the reading in Marcion’s text even if elsewhere Tertullian makes reference to both *corvus* (4.21.1, *Mon.* 16.2) and *volatilia caeli* (*Ux.* 1.4.7; cf. Matt 6:26).<sup>288</sup> Second, Tertullian’s allusion to the words σπείρουσιν and θερίζουσιν is unproblematic.<sup>289</sup> Third, Harnack notes that *nec in apothecas condunt* is Matthean and then leaves unanswered the question of whether Tertullian’s memory of Matt 6:26 has influenced the wording or whether Marcion’s text had been harmonized to Matthew. The fact that, according to IGNTP, only 903 attests this harmonization may make the former view more likely. Finally, there is also an allusion to the phrase καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς. Harnack’s contention that this final phrase was not present in Marcion’s Gospel despite Tertullian’s testimony, and Tsutsui’s suggestion that it was present, but in an altered and passive form,<sup>290</sup> can only be considered once Luke 12:27–28 has also been discussed.

### 3.1.64 Luke 12:27–28

4.21.1 – ... *et flores agri vestit*,... | 4.29.1 – ... *cuius et lilia et foenum non texunt nec nent, et tamen vestiuntur ab ipso, cuius et Salomon gloriosissimus, nec ullo tamen flosculo cultior?* | 4.29.3 – *Interim cur illos modicae fidei incusat, id est cuius fidei?* | *Idol.* 12.2 – *Et vestitus habemus exemplum lilia.* | *Ux.* 1.4.7 – ... *qui lilia agri tanta gratia vestit*,...

The omission of Luke 12:28a is attested by Epiphanius. Here, several points concerning Tertullian’s testimony need to be made. First, that Tertullian is to some extent following Marcion’s text in 4.29.1 is supported by the absence of the Matthean *agri* (cf. Matt 6:28) found in 4.21.1 and *Ux.* 1.4.7. Second, Tertullian’s allusion to Luke 12:27 attests not only κρίνα, but also the verbs ὑφαίνει and νήθει. Unfortunately these elements are not multiply cited, but that this may have been the

<sup>287</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 367n4. Lukas refers to a “Stück kunstvoller Prosa” (*Rhetorik*, 293n1346). Harnack, *Marcion*, 214\* rightly rejects the contention of Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:475 that vv. 24, 27–28 were excised from Marcion’s text.

<sup>288</sup> Only a few witnesses, though they include D and a handful of OL manuscripts, attest the Matthean τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in Luke 12:24.

<sup>289</sup> The negation of the action by Tertullian (*non ... nec*) does not definitively reveal whether the Greek read οὐ ... οὐδέ (with P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, A, B, W, and most other manuscripts) or οὐτε ... οὐτε (with **Σ**, D, L, Q, 579, 892, and e).

<sup>290</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 214\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 104.

reading in Marcion's Gospel is confirmed by these verbs also appearing in D, d, Clement of Alexandria, sy<sup>s</sup>, and sy<sup>c</sup>.<sup>291</sup> Harnack believed that Marcion's text read οὐχ ὑφαίνει οὔτε νήθει,<sup>292</sup> though the fact that these other witnesses attest οὔτε νήθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει may mean that the slightly different phrasing, possibly under the influence of 12:24 and νήθει being the second action in both Matthew and Luke, is due to Tertullian.

Third, Harnack attempted to support his view that Tertullian committed an error due to his remembering the canonical text in the reference to "feeding" in Luke 12:24 noted above, stating "Dies [an error] ist umso wahrscheinlicher, als er gleich darauf [4.29.1] ein sicher inkorrektes Referat bringt, sofern bei Luk. von den Lilien nicht gesagt wird, daß Gott sie bekleidet, sondern nur vom Gras."<sup>293</sup> It is worth noting that not only does Luke not make the statement that the lilies are clothed, neither does Matthew (cf. Matt 6:28–30); yet, in both *Idol.* 12.2 and *Ux.* 1.4.7 Tertullian speaks of the clothing of the lilies. Therefore, it does seem that Tertullian tends to collapse the reference to the lilies with the opening phrase of Luke 12:28/Matt 6:30 (εἰ δὲ ἐν ἀγρῶ τὸν χόρτον ... ὁ θεὸς ἀμφιέζει) and it is likely that Tertullian's general references to vv. 24 and 27 include elements not arising from Marcion's text, but rather from how Tertullian remembers and tends to cite this pericope.<sup>294</sup> Fourth, Tertullian's reference to Solomon attests the final phrase of v. 27, though the allusion does not offer the precise wording. Finally, in 4.29.3 Tertullian's argument requires the presence of ὀλιγόπιστοι at the end of Luke 12:28.

### 3.1.65 Luke 12:31

3.24.8 – *Et evangelium vestrum quoque habet: Quaerite primum regnum Dei, et haec adicientur vobis.* | 4.29.5 – *Quaerite enim, inquit, regnum dei, et haec vobis adicientur,...* | *Or.* 6.1 – *Nam et edixerat Dominus: Quaerite prius regnum et tunc vobis etiam haec adicientur.*

<sup>291</sup> Luke reads οὐ κοπιᾷ οὐδὲ νήθει. "Toil" and "spin" is also the reading in Matt 6:28.

<sup>292</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 214\*.

<sup>293</sup> Ibid.

<sup>294</sup> Therefore, though the charts in chapter 2 reveal that Tertullian alludes to Luke 12:28a in 4.29.1 and Epiphanius attests its omission, Tertullian may have created the allusion due to the manner in which he tends to refer to the passage rather than by seeing v. 28a in Marcion's text.

This verse is also attested by Epiphanius. Concerning Tertullian’s testimony, first, in both 3.24.8 and 4.29.5 Tertullian appears to be interacting with Marcion’s text. It is interesting to note, therefore, that *enim* is not present in the former, *primum* is not present in the latter, and, once again revealing Tertullian’s tendency to move pronouns, *vobis* follows the verb in the former but precedes the verb in the latter. Second, in *Or.* 6.1, Tertullian does not use a conjunction at the opening of the citation raising the possibility that *enim*, like *nam* in *Or.* 6.1, is not part of the citation in 4.29.5, but part of the flow of Tertullian’s argument.<sup>295</sup> Third, the absence of *dei* in *Or.* 6.1, possibly under the influence of Matt 6:33,<sup>296</sup> increases the likelihood of the reading βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in Marcion’s text.<sup>297</sup> A final observation is that in all of these citations Tertullian writes *haec*, never including the πάντα found in Matt 6:33.

### 3.1.66 Luke 12:57

4.29.15 – *Merito exprobrat etiam quod iustum non a semetipsis iudicarent.* | 4.29.16 – ... *mandaret iuste iudicare ...* | *Cor.* 4.5 – ... *dicente domino: cur autem non et a vobis ipsis quod iustum iudicatis?*

Harnack contended that due to the wording of Tertullian’s reference to Luke 12:57 in 4.29.15 the unattested τί δέ was missing in Marcion’s text.<sup>298</sup> Even though D, b, d, and sy<sup>c</sup> omit these words, and they are attested in Tertullian’s citation in *Cor.* 4.5, the omission could easily have occurred due to the flow of Tertullian’s argument.<sup>299</sup> Also, Harnack offered καὶ τὸ δίκαιον οὐκ ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν κρίνετε for Marcion’s text, noting “die Wortstellung sonst: ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον.”<sup>300</sup> Tertullian, however, always places the reference to that which is “just” before the

---

<sup>295</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:476 and Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2:427 also viewed *enim* as part of Tertullian’s argument. The Moreschnini/Braun text has *enim* in italics, indicating that they consider it part of the citation (*Contre Marcion IV*, 370–71).

<sup>296</sup> NA<sup>27</sup> places τοῦ θεοῦ in brackets in Matt 6:33.

<sup>297</sup> This reading is also attested by P<sup>45</sup>, A, D<sup>1</sup>, many OL manuscripts, along with numerous other manuscripts (see NA<sup>27</sup>).

<sup>298</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 217\*.

<sup>299</sup> Thus, Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:477 correctly noted that it is unclear whether τί δέ was present or absent.

<sup>300</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 217\*.

verb (cf. 4.29.16 and *Cor.* 4.5).<sup>301</sup> Thus, Harnack's inversion of the elements in the allusion to Marcion's text is questionable.

### 3.1.67 Luke 12:58–59

4.29.16 – *Nam et iudicem, qui mittit in carcerem nec ducit inde nisi soluto etiam novissimo quadrante,...* | *An.* 35.1 – ... *exsoluat novissimum quadrantem ...* | *An.* 35.2 – ... *ne aliquo commercio negotiorum iniuria provocatus abstrahat te ad suum iudicem, et ad custodiam delegatus ad exsolutionem totius debiti arteris.*

Part of Luke 12:58 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's testimony to v. 58 attests κριτής and the words βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακήν. For v. 59 Tertullian attests οὐ μὲν ἐξέλθης ἐκεῖθεν ἕως καί and the Matthean τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην, which may be due to Tertullian's own familiarity with the Matthean phrasing (cf. *An.* 35.1). According to IGNTP, the reading also occurs in D and, in a slightly different order, in nearly every OL manuscript, Irenaeus, and Ambrose. ἀποδῶς is also attested and may have preceded the phrase, as in D (cf. Matt 5:26);<sup>302</sup> however, Tertullian's proclivity to Matthew's reading may once again be the reason for the phrasing here (cf. *An.* 35.1).<sup>303</sup>

### 3.1.68 Luke 13:28

1.27.2 – ... *cui nullus dentium frendor horret in exterioribus tenebris:...* | 4.30.4 – ... *illic erit fletus et dentium frendor.*<sup>304</sup> | 4.30.5 – *Ergo erit poena a quo fit exclusio in poenam, cum videbunt iustos introeuntes in regnum dei, se vero detineri foris.* | *Res.* 35.12 – *Ceterum unde erit fletus et dentium frendor, nisi ex oculis et ex dentibus?*

Luke 13:28 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian multiply cites the elements of v. 28a attested in 4.30.4: ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. The adaptations in 1.27.2 and *Res.* 35.12 reveal that the word order *dentium frendor* is due to Tertullian and does not reflect a change of order in

---

<sup>301</sup> According to IGNTP Hillary is the only other witness for a change of order to τὸ δίκαιον κρίνετε.

<sup>302</sup> D also reads the irregular form of the subjunctive (ἀποδοῖς).

<sup>303</sup> This is another instance where Harnack did not follow Tertullian's word order as he reconstructed τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην ἀποδῶς (*Marcion*, 217\*).

<sup>304</sup> Moreschini follows the reading of *M* and Kroymann. *F*, *R*, and the other editors read *frendor dentium*, and *X* reads *stridor dentium*.

Marcion's text.<sup>305</sup> The remainder of the verse is not multiply cited, and Tertullian's adaptation reflects the reading ὅταν ὄψεσθε τοὺς δικαίους εἰσερχομένους εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ κρατουμένους ἔξω. There are several readings here worth discussing. First, ὄψεσθε is the reading of B\*, D, and numerous other manuscripts. Second, τοὺς δικαίους instead of Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας is a unique reading. Third, εἰσερχομένους is also attested in most OL manuscripts, and according to IGNTP, two Vulgate manuscripts, Faustus of Mileve, and Lucifer. Fourth, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν is also attested by a<sup>2</sup>, c, ff<sup>2</sup>, q, Ambrose, Faustus of Mileve, and Lucifer. Fifth and finally, κρατουμένους is a unique reading. Once again, the evidence of other sources must be included before reaching conclusions.

### 3.1.69 Luke 14:14

4.31.1 – [Answering the question “what sort of people must be invited?”] ... *quiscilicet [et] humanitatis*<sup>306</sup> *istius vicem retribuere non possint. Hanc si Christus captari vetat, in resurrectione eam repromittens,...* | *Res. 33.7 – ... Retribuetur tibi in resurrectione iustorum.*

Luke 14:14a is not multiply cited, and Harnack offered the reconstructed phrase οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναι.<sup>307</sup> It is likely that *non possint* renders οὐκ ἔχουσιν, though all OL manuscripts read *non habent*, and it is clear that *retribuere* is rendering ἀνταποδοῦναι.<sup>308</sup> Tertullian's allusion to 14:14b reflects the universally attested ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει. Though Tertullian includes *iustorum* in his citation on this verse in *Res. 33.7*, this fact does not increase the likelihood of its omission in Marcion's text as Tertullian not attesting the genitive can easily be explained as a

<sup>305</sup> Every occurrence of the phrase ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων in the Gospels is identical (cf. Matt 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30; and Luke 13:28). Thus, though the reference to *in exterioribus tenebris* reveals that Matt 8:12; 22:13; or 25:30 has influenced the reference in 1.27.2, the wording of the phrase in question remains identical.

<sup>306</sup> R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub> read *humanitatis*, whereas R<sub>1</sub>, M, and γ read *et humanitatis*.

<sup>307</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 218\*.

<sup>308</sup> According to IGNTP, no verb other than ἔχω is attested in the extant witnesses. Braun notes, “le mot *retribuere* vient directement du v. 14 (ἀνταποδοῦναι)” (*Contre Marcion IV*, 388n4). Also, the same Latin lemma is used to render the same Greek word in Luke 14:14b in *Res. 33.7*. Tsutsui erroneously provides a truncated reference to Tertullian's wording, which resulted in *retribuere* not being attested in his text (“Evangelium,” 109).

simple omission due to the general allusion to the verse in 4.31.1. In addition, merely mentioning the resurrection suffices for Tertullian's argument.

### 3.1.70 Luke 15:3–10

4.32.1 – *Ovem et dracmam perditam quis requirit?... is perdidit qui habuit, is requisivit qui perdidit, is invenit qui quaesivit, is exultavit qui invenit.* | 4.32.2 – *utriusque parabolae ... Atque adeo exultare illius est de paenitentia peccatoris, id est de perditione recuperatione,...* | *Pud.* 9.4 – *Et duo utique filii illuc spectabunt, quo et drachma et ovis* | *Pud.* 9.20 – ... *ovem et dracmam ...*

In 4.32 Tertullian alludes to the two parables found in Luke 15:3–10.<sup>309</sup> Only a handful of words from these verses are attested: παραβολήν (v. 3); πρόβατα and δραχμάς (vv. 4, 8); and the series of verbs ἀπόλλυμι (vv. 4, 8), ζητέω (v. 8), εὑρίσκω (vv. 5, 9), and συγχαίρω (vv. 6, 9). In addition there is a reference to the idea of χαρά ... ἐπὶ ... ἁμαρτωλῶ μετανοοῦντι (vv. 7, 10) in 4.32.2. The fact that Tertullian refers to the Creator himself rejoicing may reveal that τῶν ἀγγέλων was missing in v. 10.<sup>310</sup> Unfortunately, Tertullian's allusions to Luke 15:3–10 in *Pud.* 9.4, 20 are even more general than in *Adversus Marcionem* and do not provide further insight into Marcion's text.

### 3.1.71 Luke 16:9

4.33.1 – *Admonens enim nos de saecularibus suffragia nobis prospicere amicitiarum ... Et ego, inquit, dico vobis, facite vobis amicos de mamona iniustitiae,...* | *Fug.* 13.2 – *Facite autem vobis amicos de mammona: quomodo intellegendum sit,...* | *Pat.* 7.10 – *Quomodo amicos de mammona fabricabimus nobis si eum in tantum amaverimus ut amissum non sufferamus?*

Only Luke 16:9a is attested for Marcion's text and Harnack reconstructed καὶ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν, ποιήσατε ὑμῖν φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας.<sup>311</sup> The likelihood that the citation in 4.33.1 is generally following Marcion's text is increased by the more abbreviated citation in *Fug.* 13.2 and the allusion in *Pat.* 7.10

---

<sup>309</sup> On the structure and argument of 4.32 see the comments in Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 398–99n3.

<sup>310</sup> This is the view of Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:479 and Harnack, *Marcion*, 219\*, though the latter's statement that the excision "ist nicht zweifelhaft" may be an overstatement.

<sup>311</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 219\*.



where Tertullian twice reveals that his primary interest in the verse is restricted to the main idea of making friends through mammon. Though Marcion's text may have read λέγω ὑμῖν,<sup>312</sup> Tertullian's propensity to alter the position of pronouns makes the order no more than possible. The same point is relevant for the placement of the pronoun associated with ποιήσατε in Marcion's text, particularly as it follows the verb in A, D, and several other witnesses along with the Majority Text but precedes it in NA<sup>27</sup>.<sup>313</sup> In addition to the question regarding the position of the second pronoun, Harnack himself observed that this ὑμῖν is "nicht sicher."<sup>314</sup> Given that Tertullian writes *vobis* in *Fug.* 13.2 and *nobis* in *Pat.* 7.10 it seems more likely that Tertullian is rendering ἑαυτοῖς with datives whose person is being governed by the main verb.<sup>315</sup>

### 3.1.72 Luke 16:13

4.33.1 – *Quibus duobus dominis neget posse serviri, quia<sup>316</sup> alterum offendi sit necesse, alterum defendi, ipse declarat, deum proponens et mammonam.* | 4.33.2 – ... [Christ] *amentavit hanc sententiam: Non potestis deo servire et mammonae.... denique non potestis deo servire ... et mammonae,...* | *An.* 16.7 – ... *non potestis duobus dominis servire,...* | *Cor.* 12.4 – ... *hoc erit non potestis deo servire et mammonae [sic],...* | *Idol.* 12.2 – ... *nemo duobus dominis servire potest.* | *Spect.* 26.4 – *Nemo enim potest duobus dominis servire.*<sup>317</sup>

This verse is also attested in *Adam*. According to 4.33.1, the opening of the verse had some negation of the idea δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν, but no further insight into the wording of Marcion's text here can be gained. The fact that in *An.* 16.7, *Idol.* 12.2, and *Spect.* 26.4 Tertullian cites the Matthean parallel (Matt 6:24)

---

<sup>312</sup> IGNTP lists D, M, several minuscules, several OL manuscripts, numerous versions, and Hilary as attesting this order.

<sup>313</sup> NA<sup>27</sup> follows P<sup>75</sup>, **8**\*, B, L, and a few other manuscripts. It is worth noting that Tertullian places the pronoun after *facere* in all three references, though given the divided manuscript tradition and Tertullian's citation habit, this fact does not provide additional insight into Marcion's text.

<sup>314</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 220\*.

<sup>315</sup> Additionally, all OL witnesses read *facite vobis* here and IGNTP lists 1215 and 1295 as the only Greek manuscripts attesting ὑμῖν instead of ἑαυτοῖς (230, 348, 477, 1216, and 1579 apparently have both pronouns).

<sup>316</sup> Moreschini's text reads *quia* with Rhenanus's editions, rejecting the reading *qui* in *M* and *Υ*.

<sup>317</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 16:13/Matt 6:24 occur in *Cor.* 1.1, 12.5; *Fug.* 12.6; *Idol.* 19.2; and *Ux.* 2.3.4.

means that the omission of οἰκέτης may very well be a simple omission by Tertullian. Though Harnack did not offer the phrase for Marcion's text, he did wonder whether τὸν ἕνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει was omitted by chance.<sup>318</sup> Regardless of whether it was or not, the phrase is simply unattested for Marcion's text by Tertullian. Based on Tertullian's testimony, Harnack reconstructed the remainder of the verse as ἐνὸς γὰρ (καταφρονήσει) καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου ἀνθέξεται· οὐ δύνασθε θεῶ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾶ, though again wondering if ἦ was really missing and whether Marcion had a word other than καταφρονήσει.<sup>319</sup> Three points must be made here. First, surely the omission of the disjunctive particle cannot be determined from Tertullian's allusion, but it is also not possible to establish the presence of γὰρ from Tertullian's *quia*. Second, Harnack argued, "ἀνθέξεται und καταφρονήσει hier umgestellt,"<sup>320</sup> but this is reading too much into Tertullian's allusion. In addition, Braun rightly observes that the use of *offendere* and *defendere* is due to Tertullian using etymologically related words in his antithesis, rendering Harnack's question about a different word in Marcion's text unnecessary.<sup>321</sup> Third, the final element of the verse is quoted in 4.33.2. The Greek of Luke and Matthew are identical, and Tertullian cites the verse with the same word order in *Cor.* 12.4 confirming that Harnack's reconstruction is correct at this point.

### 3.1.73 Luke 16:16

4.33.7 – ... *dicens: Lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem, ex quo regnum dei adnuntiatur.* | 5.2.1 – ... *Lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem ...* | 5.8.4 – ... *Lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem ...* | *Adv. Jud.* 8.14 – ... *lex et prophetae, inquit, usque ad Iohannem baptistam.* | *Adv. Jud.* 13.26 – ... *lex et prophetae usque ad Iohnnem fuerunt,...* | *Jejun.* 2.2 – ... *lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem.* | *Jejun.* 11.6 – ... *lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem.* | *Prax.* 31.1 – *Quod opus evangelii, quae est substantia novi testamenti statuens legem et prophetas usque ad Iohannem, si non exinde Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus, tres crediti, unum deum sistunt?* | *Pud.* 6.2 – ... *lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem ...*<sup>322</sup>

<sup>318</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 220\*.

<sup>319</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>321</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 401n3.

<sup>322</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 16:16 occurs in 3.23.3.

Elements of Luke 16:16 are also attested by Epiphanius. As is evident from the numerous citations of this verse in Tertullian, he is usually exclusively interested in the first element of the verse, which is also the element paralleled, though with differences in word order and the verb, in Matt 11:13. It is notable that Tertullian is extremely consistent in his citation of this element with each occurrence appearing practically verbatim.<sup>323</sup> Harnack reconstructed ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου, though whether Marcion's text read ἕως or μέχρι cannot definitively be determined from Tertullian's Latin alone.<sup>324</sup> Luke 16:16b is not multiply cited, and Luke 16:16c is unattested for Marcion's text by Tertullian. For v. 16b Harnack wrote ἐξ (ἀφ') οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, and he is right to note the challenge of attempting to determine what Greek preposition stood in Marcion's text.<sup>325</sup> It is worth noting, however, that the clearly Lukan ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, which, given Tertullian usually only being interested in v. 16a, has probably arisen out of Marcion's text.<sup>326</sup>

### 3.1.74 Luke 16:22

3.24.1 – ... *apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium*. | 4.34.10 – ... *subsequens argumentum divitis apud inferos dolentis et pauperis in sinu Abrahae requiescentis*. | 4.34.11 – ... *sinum et portum.... Abrahae sinum pauperi ... Abrahae sinus*. | An. 7.4 – ... *in sinu Abrahae,...* | An. 55.2 – ... *in Abrahae sinu ...*

Luke 16:22 is also attested by Epiphanius and in *Adam*. Tertullian's allusion in 4.34.10, 11 includes a reference to ὁ πτωχός and to εἰς τὸν κόλπον

<sup>323</sup> The only differences among the 10 citations/allusions are the addition of *baptistam* in *Adv. Jud.* 8.14 and *fuertunt* in *Adv. Jud.* 13.26.

<sup>324</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 220\*. The OL witnesses all read *usque ad* in Luke 16:16. μέχρι only occurs elsewhere in the Gospels in Matt 11:23 and Matt 28:15, where most OL witnesses render it *usque in*. However, Matt 11:23 is particularly interesting in that earlier in the verse ἕως occurs where *aur*, *b*, *d*, *f*, *ff*<sup>2</sup>, *h*, *l*, and *q* render it *usque ad* and *a*, *c*, *ff*<sup>1</sup>, and *g*<sup>1</sup> render it *usque in* (*k* reads *quomodo in*).

<sup>325</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 220\*. IGNTP states that Marcion, along with *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *ff*<sup>2</sup>, *gat*, *i*, *l*, *r*<sup>1</sup>, Ambrosiaster, and Rufinus attest ἐξ ὅπου. Though *quo* could be understood in this way, the meaning in context seems to make Harnack's ἐξ οὗ preferable.

<sup>326</sup> This reading is quite significant for the discussion concerning the relationship between Marcion's Gospel and Luke. Concerning the presence of Lukan redactional material in Marcion's text Wolter notes "Ein besonders augenfälliges Beispiel dafür ist das typisch lukanische Syntagma βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ κηρύσσειν/εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (Lk. 4,43; 8,1; 16,16; Apg 20,25; 28,23.31; sonst nirgends im Neuen Testament), das nach Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4,8,9; 33,7 bei Lk 4,43; 16,16 auch im „Evangelium“ Markions stand" (*Lukasevangelium*, 3). The point is important, though Acts 28:23 employs the verbs ἐκτίθημι and διαμαρτύρομαι.

Ἄβραάμ.<sup>327</sup> The references in 3.24.1 and *An.* 7.4, 55.2 once again reveal Tertullian's own proclivity to vary word order, which indicates that *Abrahae sinum* and *Abrahae sinus* in 4.34.11 should not be used to place the word order in Marcion's Gospel in question.

### 3.1.75 Luke 16:29

4.34.10 – ... *Habent illic Moysen et prophetas, illos audiant.* | 4.34.14 – [Abraham's bosom] *admonens quoque vos haereticos, dum in vita estis, Moysen et prophetas unum deum praedicantes, creatorem, et unum Christum praedicantes eius,...* | 4.34.17 – *Apud inferos autem de eis dictum est: Habent illic Moysen et prophetas, illos audiant,...*<sup>328</sup> | *Praescr.* 8.6 – *Habent, inquit, Moysen et Heliam, id est legem et prophetas Christum praedicantes ...*

This verse is also attested by Epiphanius and in *Adam*. Assuming that Moreschini's text is correct, Tertullian provides two identical citations from Marcion's text in 4.34.10, 17. Even if the alternate word order in 4.34.17 is accepted, the only difference becomes the position of a pronoun, which is unremarkable given how often it has been noticed that Tertullian alters the position of pronouns in his citations. Along the same lines, despite Tertullian twice writing *illos audiant*, one must be cautious in concluding that Marcion's text read αὐτῶν ἀκουσάτωσαν, as Harnack did, based on Tertullian's testimony alone.<sup>329</sup> Noteworthy, however, is the presence of *illic*, which would appear to have been in Marcion's text as attested by Tertullian, not only because of the repeated citation, but also because it is absent in *Praescr.* 8.6 and therefore less likely to have come from Tertullian's own hand.

### 3.1.76 Luke 17:4

4.35.3 – *Sed et veniam des fratri in te delinquenti iubet, etiam septies.* | *Or.* 7.3 – *Et cum interrogasset Petrus, si septies remittendum esset fratri, Immo, inquit, septuagies septies,...*

---

<sup>327</sup> Luke 16:23, which is not multiply cited and therefore discussed in the next chapter, also seems to be in view in the references in 4.34.10, 11.

<sup>328</sup> Moreschini's text follows the order *illos audiant* attested in *M* and Kroymann's edition, rejecting the reading *audiant illos* in  $\beta$  and the other editors. This latter reading may have been influenced by the word order in the canonical text.

<sup>329</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 222\*.

Tertullian's allusion to Luke 17:4 in 4.35.3 attests ... ἐὰν ἐπτάκις ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σε and ἀφήσεις.<sup>330</sup> IGNTP lists only a few witnesses omitting τῆς ἡμέρας, and it could be a simple omission by Tertullian. Though the reference is quite general, that the allusion likely arises from Marcion's text may be confirmed by the observation that Tertullian's reference in *Or.* 7.3 is clearly drawn from the loosely parallel Matt 18:21–22.

### 3.1.77 Luke 18:10–14

4.36.2 – *Et tamen cum templum creatoris inducit, et duos adorantes diversa mente describit, Pharisaicum in superbia, publicanum in humilitate, ideoque alterum reprobatum, alterum iustificatum descendisse,...* | *Or.* 17.2 – *Nam et ille publicanus, qui non tantum prece, sed et vultu humiliatus atque deiectus orabat, iustificatio pharisaeo procacissimo discessit.*

Harnack rightly noted that Tertullian only alludes to the content of this parable; yet, he nevertheless offered a reconstruction of elements of vv. 10 and 14.<sup>331</sup> Tertullian refers to two men, a Pharisee and a tax collector, in the temple praying (v. 10). The Pharisee is presented “in arrogance” (vv. 11–12) and the publican “in humility” (v. 13), with the conclusion that one went down condemned and the other justified (v. 14). Thus, though Tertullian clearly does attest the presence of the key ideas of the parable, and the reference in *Or.* 17.2 also simply contains adjectives to describe the men, overall no definitive decisions can be made concerning the actual wording of Marcion's Gospel.<sup>332</sup>

### 3.1.78 Luke 18:22

4.36.4 – ... *Unum, inquit, tibi deest: omnia, quaecumque habes, vende et da pauperibus, et habebis thesaurum in caelo, et veni, sequere me.* | 4.36.7 – ... *Vende, inquit, quae habes ... Et da, inquit, egenis ... Et veni, inquit, sequere me.* | *Idol.* 12.2 – ... *atquin omnia vendenda sunt et egentibus dividenda.*<sup>333</sup>

<sup>330</sup> Harnack's reconstruction ... (ἐὰν) ἐπτάκις ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σε, ἀφήσεις ... once again could cause confusion by implying that the phrase appeared in this manner in Luke 17:4.

<sup>331</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 225\*.

<sup>332</sup> For example, Harnack reconstructed the opening of v. 10 as ἄνθρωποι δύο. However, D, every OL manuscript except e, and several of the versions attest the order δύο ἄνθρωποι. Tertullian's testimony cannot reveal which reading was in Marcion's text.

<sup>333</sup> An allusion to Luke 18:22 also occurs in 4.36.6.

Luke 18:22 is also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian attests the verse twice, once as a citation (4.36.4) and once as glosses on Mic 6:8 (4.36.7). In Harnack's reconstruction it is curious to note that he breaks off the reconstruction right at the point where Tertullian's testimony to this verse begins.<sup>334</sup> Once again, the opening words are not multiply attested in Tertullian, and it would be tenuous to assume the absence of ἔτι in Marcion's text based simply on Tertullian's omission of the adverb at the opening of his citation. The following two elements in the verse, however, are also attested in the allusion in *Idol*. 12.2. First, the omission of *omnia* in the gloss in 4.36.7 cannot be used to argue against the presence of πάντα in Marcion's text as the omission is either due to Tertullian simply shortening the reference or being influenced by Matt 19:21. Along the same lines, the alteration of the word order in the gloss (*vende quae habes*) is easily understood as a change due to Tertullian wishing to begin each of the glosses with a verb. Second, Marcion's text apparently read δός, as in Matt 19:21, as Tertullian writes *da* in both the citation and the allusion in *Adversus Marcionem* but uses the verb *dividere* in *Idol*. 12.2 due to an unusual influence of a Lukan reading (διαδίδωμι) rather than a Matthean one.<sup>335</sup> The closing elements of the verse are also not multiply attested, though it may preliminarily be noted that Tertullian attests ἐν οὐρανῶ, the reading of W, Θ, Ψ, 078, f<sup>1</sup>, f<sup>43</sup>, and the Majority Text, for Marcion.

### 3.1.79 Luke 18:38

4.36.9 – ... [the blind man] *exclamavit: Iesu, fili David, miserere mei!* ... [referring to the rebuke of the blind man to keep quiet] *Merito, quoniam quidem vociferabatur, non quia de David filio mentiebatur.* | 4.36.11 – ... *crediderit in voce: Iesu fili David.* | 4.37.1 – ... *vox illa caeci: Miserere mei,*<sup>336</sup> *Iesu, fili David ...* | 4.38.10 – *Nam qui olim a caeco illo filius David fuerat invocatus,...*

Luke 18:38 is also attested by Epiphanius and in *Adam*. Though the verse is not multiply cited outside of *Adversus Marcionem*, the citations in two different places provide insight into Tertullian's testimony to Marcion's text. In 4.36.9

---

<sup>334</sup> Harnack wrote ἐν σοι λείπει κτλ. From the apparatus it is apparent that Harnack primarily had the text of *Adam*. in view (*Marcion*, 226\*).

<sup>335</sup> The OL witnesses all read *da* (a may read *dando*) in Luke 18:22, apparently attesting the Matthean reading as they use either the verb *distribuere* or *dividere* in Luke 11:22, the only other place where διαδίδωμι appears in the Synoptic Gospels.

<sup>336</sup> *Mei*, possibly on account of a scribal error, is omitted in *M*.

Tertullian renders the generally attested text Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με. In 4.37.1, however, Tertullian renders a word order closer to Matt 20:30 ἐλέησόν με, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ Δαυίδ.<sup>337</sup> This observation increases the likelihood that the former citation is controlled by Marcion's reading. In addition, the presence of Ἰησοῦ, omitted by A, E, K, Π, and numerous other manuscripts, is confirmed by its multiple citation by Tertullian. Finally, Tertullian once again reveals how easily he can adjust the word order in his references to biblical texts as immediately following the citation in 4.36.9 he refers to *David filio*, whereas in all the other instances he writes *fili[us] David*.

### 3.1.80 Luke 18:42

4.36.10 – ... *Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit.* | 4.36.12 – ... *Fides tua te salvum fecit.* | *Bapt.* 12.8 – *Fides tua te, aiebat, salvum fecit ...* | *Praescr.* 14.3 – *Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit,...*<sup>338</sup>

The entirety of this verse is attested in *Adam.* and the final element is attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's testimony to Jesus' final words is unproblematic in rendering ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. Not only the near unanimity of the manuscript tradition is noteworthy, but also the fact that in all of Tertullian's citations he renders the phrase with the same Latin words and always places *te* before the verb.<sup>339</sup>

### 3.1.81 Luke 19:10

4.37.2 – *Cum vero dicit: Venit enim filius hominis salvum facere quod periit,...*<sup>340</sup> | *Pud.* 9.12 – *Venerat Dominus utique, ut quod perierat salvum faceret,...* | *Res.* 9.4 – ... *Ego, inquit, veni, ut quod periit salvum faciam;...* | *Res.* 34.1 – *In primis cum ad hoc venisse se dicit, ut quod periit salvum faciat,...*<sup>341</sup>

---

<sup>337</sup> In Matt 20:30 there are two blind men crying out and the text states ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς [κύριε,] υἱὸς Δαυίδ. According to IGNTP a *Catena* in *evangelia Lucae et Joannis*, Augustine, Origen, and Rufinus attest the reading Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με, υἱὸς Δαυίδ, in Luke 18:38.

<sup>338</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 18:42 occur in 4.36.14 and 4.38.10.

<sup>339</sup> For discussion of this phrase and how Tertullian's witness to Marcion's text and the OL manuscripts are interpreted by IGNTP see chapter 4, n. 104.

<sup>340</sup> Moreschini's text reads *perit*, and simply notes the reading *perit*, presumably created by a copy error, in *M*.

<sup>341</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 19:10 probably occurs in *Carn. Chr.* 14.1.

Tertullian’s citation of this verse attests ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός for Marcion’s text, which is also Harnack’s reconstruction.<sup>342</sup> The only problematic element involves the omission of ζητῆσαι καί before σῶσαι. Harnack, Tsutsui, and Braun are certain that this phrase was not present in Marcion’s text, with the possibility that the omission was due to Marcion himself.<sup>343</sup> Whether omitted by Marcion or not, it is possible that “seeking” was not in Marcion’s text and it is worth noting that in the manuscripts where this verse appears as Matt 18:11, ζητῆσαι is also missing.<sup>344</sup> At the same time, however, it is important to notice that Tertullian never mentions “seeking” in his other references to this verse as he always focuses on “saving.” Therefore, it is also possible that once again a simple omission has occurred on the part of Tertullian.

### **3.1.82 Luke 20:1, 4**

4.38.1 – *Sciebat Christus baptismum Iohannis unde esset. Et cur quasi nesciens interrogabat? Sciebat non responsuros sibi Phariseos.... Puta illos renuntiassent humanum Iohannis baptismum:...* | 4.38.2 – *Sed de caelis fuit baptismum Iohannis. | Bapt. 10.1 – Baptismus a Iohanne denuntiatus iam tunc habuit quaestionem ab ipso quidem domino propositam ad phariseos caelestisne is baptismus esset an vero terrenus,...*

For Luke 20:4 Harnack reconstructed τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου.<sup>345</sup> Though the second τό is attested in  $\aleph$ , D, and a handful of other manuscripts, Harnack provides no rationale for its inclusion here and Tertullian’s testimony cannot reveal its presence or absence. In addition, that Christ’s question included ἐξ οὐρανοῦ and ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, is confirmed by Tertullian’s references to *caelus* and *humanus* in 4.38.1, 2. That the terms arise from the text is supported by Tertullian’s paraphrase in *Bapt. 10.1* where the contrast is made between *caelus* and *terrenus*. It should also be noted that Tertullian’s use of *caelis* does not warrant the supposition that Marcion read an otherwise unattested ἐξ οὐρανῶν given the same use of the plural in *Bapt.*

<sup>342</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 227\*.

<sup>343</sup> Ibid.; Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 118–19; and Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 459n9.

<sup>344</sup> According to the NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus these manuscripts include D, L<sup>mg</sup>, W,  $\Theta^c$ , 078<sup>vid</sup>, the Majority Text, nearly all OL manuscripts, sy<sup>c</sup>, p<sup>h</sup>, and bo<sup>pl</sup>. In Luke 19:10 IGNTP lists 1187, 2757, and Ambrose as omitting the phrase.

<sup>345</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 228\*.



10.1.<sup>346</sup> Finally, *Bapt.* 10.1 reveals the same curious reference found in 4.38.1 that the Pharisees asked this question (v. 1).<sup>347</sup> Therefore, it is unlikely that Marcion's text read an otherwise unattested οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, as posited by Harnack,<sup>348</sup> and rather more likely that the reference to *Pharisaeos* is due to Tertullian.

### 3.1.83 Luke 20:25

4.38.3 – *Reddite quae Caesaris Caesari, et quae sunt dei deo.* | *Cor.* 12.4 – ...  
*reddite quae sunt Caesaris Caesari et quae dei deo,...* | *Fug.* 12.9 – ... *Reddite quae sunt Caesaris Caesari.* | *Idol.* 15.3 – *Reddenda sunt Caesari quae sunt Caesaris. Bene quod apposuit: et quae sunt dei deo.... reddite, ait, quae sunt Caesaris Caesari, et quae sunt dei deo,...* | *Scorp.* 14.2 – *Dehinc et exequitur, quomodo velit te subici potestatibus, reddite, iubens, cui tributum, tributum, cui vectigal, vectigal, id est quae sunt Caesaris Caesari, et quae dei deo;...*<sup>349</sup>

Harnack reconstructed this verse ἀπόδοτε τὰ Κάσαρος Κάισαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶ θεῶ.<sup>350</sup> Harnack rightly resisted representing *sunt* in the Greek text as Tertullian's other references evidence an inclination to insert the verb "to be" in various places in the verse. In addition, Tertullian never includes an introductory conjunction when referring to Luke 20:25, so it is not surprising that it is unattested in the citation of Marcion's text, though ultimately one cannot be sure of its presence or placement in the verse.<sup>351</sup>

---

<sup>346</sup> Though the parallels in Matt 21:25/Mark 11:30 also read the singular ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, it is worth noting that in Matt the plural occurs twice as often as the singular (55 vs. 27 times). In Luke the singular occurs 31 times and the plural only 4 times. It is quite possible that the frequency of the occurrence of the plural in Matthew has influenced the way Tertullian refers to "heaven(s)."

<sup>347</sup> Luke 20:1/Mark 11:27 indicate that it was "chief priests, scribes, and elders" and Matt 21:23 that it was "chief priests and elders."

<sup>348</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 228\*.

<sup>349</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 20:25/Matt 22:21/Mark 12:17 occurs in *Res.* 22.11.

<sup>350</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 228\*. D reads articles before the two forms of "Caesar," and a handful of other witnesses read only the second article. These articles are also attested in various witnesses in the Matthean and Markan parallels.

<sup>351</sup> In the Majority Text τοῖνυν follows ἀπόδοτε whereas in NA<sup>27</sup> it precedes the verb. Numerous other manuscripts read ὄν under the influence of Matt 22:21. D, most OL witnesses, and many church fathers omit the conjunction.

### 3.1.84 Luke 20:35–36

3.9.4 – *Et utique, si deus tuus veram quandoque substantiam angelorum hominibus pollicetur (erunt enim, inquit, sicut angeli<sup>352</sup>) cur non et deus meus veram substantiam hominum angelis accommodarit unde sumptam?* | 4.38.5 – ... *quos vero dignatus sit deus illius aevi possessione et resurrectione a mortuis neque nubere neque nubere, quia nec morituri iam sint, cum similes angelorum sint dei,<sup>353</sup> resurrectionis filii facti.<sup>354</sup> | 4.38.7 – *Nacti enim scripturae textum ita in legendo decucurrerunt: Quos autem dignatus est deus illius aevi, <ut illius aevi> deo adiungant,<sup>355</sup> quo alium deum faciant illius aevi, cum sic legi oportet: Quos autem dignatus est deus, ut facta hic distinctione post deum ad sequentia pertineat illius aevi, id est: Quos dignatus sit deus illius aevi possessione et resurrectione.* | 4.38.8 – *filii huius aevi nubunt et nubuntur ... quos deus illius aevi, alter scilicet, dignatus sit resurrectione,...* | 4.39.11 – ... *quia nec morientur in illo, nec nubent, sed erunt sicut angeli.* | 5.10.14 – ... *erimus enim sicut angeli.* | *Mon.* 10.5 – *Si autem in illo aevo neque nubent neque nubentur, sed erunt aequales angelis,...* | *Res.* 36.4–5 – *Neque enim, si nupturos tunc negavit, ideo nec resurrecturos demonstravit, atquin filios resurrectionis appellavit per eam quodammodo nasci habentes, post quam non nubent, sed resuscitati. Similes enim erunt angelis, qua non nupturi, quia nec morituri,...* | *Res.* 62.1 – *Sed huic disceptationi finem dominica pronuntiatio imponet: Erunt, inquit, tanquam angeli, si non nubendo, quia nec moriendo,...* | *Res.* 62.4 –*

---

<sup>352</sup> Moreschini rejects the addition of *dei* after *angeli* attested only in X.

<sup>353</sup> The main text and apparatus in the SC edition are problematic, and apparently erroneous, on two accounts. The text reads ... *quia nec morituri iam sint, cum similes angelorum sunt dei,...* and the apparatus provides data for the variant reading *fiant* for *sint*. The problem, however, is that the variant occurs not at *morituri iam sint* (the only occurrence of *sint* in the SC text), but at *sint dei*, which for some reason, and apparently without manuscript attestation, here reads *sunt dei*. For the correct text and variant see the apparatus in Moreschini's text found in his *Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem*, 307–8 and in Kroymann's edition in CCSL 1:649. Nevertheless, the SC apparatus, though placing the variant at the incorrect place in the manuscript, correctly records the witnesses noting that *sint* [actually before *dei*] is found in *M*,  $\gamma$ , Rigalti, and Kroymann and *fiant* [again before *dei*] in *R*, Gelenius, Pamelius, Oehler, and Evans.

<sup>354</sup> Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read *et resurrectionis filii* so that the passage is read "... since they are like the angels, being made the sons of God and of the resurrection" instead of "... seeing that they might be like the angels of God, being made sons of the resurrection."

<sup>355</sup> There are several text critical issues here. *illius aevi* is read twice in *R*<sub>3</sub> and all editors attest *illius aevi* twice, but it is attested only once in *M*,  $\gamma$ , *R*<sub>1</sub>, and *R*<sub>2</sub>. *adiungant* is the reading of *M* and Kroymann, whereas  $\gamma$ , *R*<sub>1</sub>, and *R*<sub>2</sub> attest *adiungat*. Rhenanus, followed by the other editors, amended the text to *adiungunt* in his third edition. Kroymann added *ut* in order to preserve the reading of *M* and Braun comments "Il nous paraît indispensable d'accueillir ici la correction de Kroymann qui supplée <ut> entre les deux *illius aevi* ... Le parallélisme *ita in legendo ... ut/sic legi ... ut* garantit que telle était la structure de la phrase à l'origine" (*Contre Marcion IV*, 470n3).

*Denique non dixit: Erunt angeli, ne homines negaret, sed tanquam angeli, ut homines conservaret:...*<sup>356</sup>

Tsutsui refers to v. 35a as “eine der unklarsten Stellen im Evangelium Marcions.”<sup>357</sup> The significant challenges lie not only in attempting to work back to the Greek from Tertullian’s Latin, but also in attempting to understand the interpretation that Tertullian attributes to Marcion in 4.38.7. Harnack reconstructed οὗς δὲ κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν (καὶ?) τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν.<sup>358</sup> Braun and Tsutsui both note the key difficulty surrounding how *possessio* is to be understood in the sentence.<sup>359</sup> I would suggest that Tsutsui is correct in noting the problem with τυχεῖν in Harnack’s text, though I am not persuaded that the answer to the difficulty of the verse is to affirm the wording of Tertullian’s citation while questioning the interpretation that Tertullian attributes to Marcion.<sup>360</sup> Rather, a different approach seems to be in order. First, although Tertullian does not elsewhere cite Luke 20:35a he repeats the citation of it several times in *Adversus Marcionem*. In 4.38.5 he uses *vero* in his citation, in 4.38.7 he twice uses *autem* and once no conjunction at all, and in 4.38.8 once again no conjunction. It is likely that Marcion read δέ in his text and that this alteration is due to Tertullian’s own tendency to omit and change introductory conjunctions. On the other hand, Tertullian consistently using *dignatus sit/est deus* would seem to indicate that Marcion did not read the substantive passive participle of Luke, and indeed the interpretation that Tertullian ascribes to Marcion requires ὁ θεός to be an external subject.<sup>361</sup> A construction of the sentence that may allow both Marcion’s and Tertullian’s interpretation is precisely the Latin reading that Tertullian gives in both

---

<sup>356</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 20:35–36/Matt 22:30/Mark 12:25 occur in 3.9.7; *An.* 56.7; and *Cult. fem.* 1.2.5.

<sup>357</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 120.

<sup>358</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*.

<sup>359</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 471n5 and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 120.

<sup>360</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 120. Though Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:487 rightly criticized the view of Ritschl, Hilgenfeld, and Volckmar, who viewed the text as simply containing the canonical reading with the addition ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, he also appeared simply to assume that *possessio* is rendering τυχεῖν. In addition, Zahn understood καὶ as “also,” rather than questioning its presence, as Harnack did. Though Zahn’s interpretation is not impossible, *possessio et resurrectione* do strongly give the appearance of being two things of which some are considered worthy (see also nn. 362 and 363).

<sup>361</sup> As in Luke 10:21 above, it seems unlikely that Tertullian created a reading, then created a Marcionite interpretation requiring that reading, only to refute the interpretation.

4.38.5 and 4.38.7: *quos dignatus sit deus illius aevi possessione et resurrectione*.<sup>362</sup> In Greek one could posit οὗς [δὲ] κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τῆς κληρονομίας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως,<sup>363</sup> in all likelihood followed by τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν as attested in 4.38.5. Thus, in 4.38.7–8 Tertullian, consonant with established citation habits, simply shortens the reference mentioning only being considered worthy of the resurrection by the God of that world.

Luke 20:35b is multiply cited. IGNTP lists several witnesses attesting future forms of γαμέω, and it is interesting that in every reference other than 4.38.8 Tertullian uses a future form of the verb.<sup>364</sup> This fact presents strong evidence that Marcion's text read the present tenses of Luke. Harnack reconstructed οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, though, it should be noted that the Latin does not allow for a definitive decision on the Greek lemma used for the final term of the verse.<sup>365</sup>

Harnack reconstructed Luke 20:36 as οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι μέλλουσιν, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν «καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν, vormarcionitischer Defekt» τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ (γεγονότες?).<sup>366</sup> Several points merit discussion. First, Harnack posited that Marcion's text read μέλλουσιν with D, W, Θ, and a handful of other witnesses, which certainly is possible.<sup>367</sup> In his other references, however, Tertullian never uses *posse* and always seems primarily to have the state of “not dying” in view instead of the absence of the ability to die (cf. 4.39.11; *Res.* 36.5 and 62.1). Therefore, it is possible that the *morituri sint* in 4.38.5 is due to Tertullian's own conception and not the reading of Marcion's text. Second, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν for

---

<sup>362</sup> Interpreting *dignari* with an accusative object (*quos*) and two ablatives of respect (*possessione* and *resurrectione*) along with an external subject (*deus*). The genitive phrase (*illius aevi*) is then taken either with *deus* or *possessione*.

<sup>363</sup> Tsutsui, with reference to Luke 18:18 and 1 Cor 15:50, also suggests that if *possessione* is understood in an absolute sense, as the interpretation attributed to Marcion requires, the Greek behind it cannot be τυχεῖν but rather κληρονομία/κληρονομησαί. At the same time he also notes that the sentence structure remains unusual (“Evangelium,” 120). τυχεῖν is not attested in numerous OL manuscripts, the Vulgate, sy<sup>s</sup>, and sy<sup>p</sup>, the Arabic Diatessaron, and several other witnesses; however, Tertullian's use of *possessione* seems to indicate that more than simply τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου preceded καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως in Marcion's text.

<sup>364</sup> In 4.39.11 and *Mon.* 10.5 he uses future indicatives, in *Res.* 36.4–5 a future indicative and a future participle, and in *Res.* 62.1 a future participle.

<sup>365</sup> ἔγαμίζω, ἐγαμίσκω, γαμίζω, and γαμίσκω are all attested in the Greek manuscript tradition.

<sup>366</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*.

<sup>367</sup> D. Plooiij also posited this reading for Marcion's text (“Eine enkratische Glosse im Diatessaron,” *ZNW* 22 [1923]: 15).

Marcion's text is confirmed by Tertullian's persistent use of the future tense elsewhere (cf. 3.9.4, 4.39.11, 5.10.14; *Mon.* 10.5; *Res.* 36.4–5, 62.1, 62.4). Third, Harnack believed that καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσὶν was not present in Marcion's text due to a pre-Marcion scribal error caused by homoteleuton.<sup>368</sup> Once again, this view is possible, though Tertullian nowhere else includes this element in his references to this Lukan element, possibly due to the influence of Matt 22:30/Mark 12:25. It may be a simple omission or an imprecise reference by Tertullian. In either case, the words are unattested for Marcion. Fourth, Tertullian's Latin cannot reveal whether the article preceded θεοῦ. Finally, Harnack wondered if Marcion's text read γεγονότες, apparently due to Tertullian's use of *facere*. According to IGntp, this reading is only attested elsewhere in the Arabic Diatessaron, which makes it rather more likely that Tertullian is offering a loose rendering of ὄντες.

### 3.1.85 Luke 21:7

4.39.13 – *Ipsum decursum scripturae evangelicae ab interrogatione discipulorum usque ad parabolam fici ...* | *Res.* 22.3 – *Interrogatus a discipulis, quando eventura essent ...*

Even though Tertullian's reference to Luke 21:7 in 4.39.13 reads as a passing allusion to the verse, Harnack reconstructed Luke 21:7a as ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί, explicitly stating that Marcion's text read the Matthean οἱ μαθηταί with D, d, and geo.<sup>369</sup> Though possible, it is not at all clear that this reading is required for Marcion's text. The context of the statement allows that Tertullian may simply be clarifying who the "they" of the verb are. This view becomes more likely when one notices that in *Res.* 22.3 Tertullian similarly refers to the disciples when discussing Luke 21.<sup>370</sup> In addition, Harnack omits δέ in his reconstruction; however, Tertullian's allusion cannot validate the view that the conjunction, omitted in only a few manuscripts, was absent in Marcion's text.

---

<sup>368</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*. The phrase is also not in D, several OL manuscripts, and sy<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>369</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 230\*.

<sup>370</sup> Of course, it cannot be ruled out entirely that Tertullian's own text of Luke had the reading found in D.

### 3.1.86 Luke 21:8

4.39.1 – ... *multos dicat venturos in nomine ipsius ... prohibeat eos recipi ...* | 4.39.2 – *Venient denique illi dicentes: Ego sum Christus ...* | 5.1.3 – *Praeter haec utique legisti multos venturos, qui dicant: Ego sum Christus.*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 21:8 πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί (μου), λέγοντες· ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός...<sup>371</sup> Several observations are in order. First, once again, given Tertullian's habitual omission of conjunctions, it is not clear that γάρ after πολλοί was absent in Marcion's text.<sup>372</sup> Second, IGNTP lists no witnesses omitting μου, making it rather likely that *ipsius* is reflecting an adaptation of the pronoun. Third, the omission of ὅτι after λέγοντες is possible as it is also omitted by **ℵ**, B, L, X, and numerous other manuscripts, though a simple omission on the part of Tertullian cannot be ruled out. Fourth, such a simple omission may become more probable when one considers the attested reading ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, which is the reading of the parallel Matt 24:5.<sup>373</sup> Harnack believed that Marcion's text had been influenced by the text of Matthew, which is indeed possible.<sup>374</sup> At the same time, however, in 5.1.3 Tertullian cites the pithy statement in its Matthean form. Therefore, it is possible that the phrasing is due to Tertullian himself as he is being influenced by the wording of Matthew. Finally, *prohibeat eos recipi* (4.39.1) appears to allude to the final element in v. 8, though the precise wording is unclear, as Harnack apparently also recognized.

### 3.1.87 Luke 21:9–11

4.39.3 – *Videamus et quae signa temporibus imponat: bella, opinor, et regnum super regnum, et gentem super gentem, et pestem, et fames terraeque motus, et formidines, et prodigia de caelo, quae omnia severo et atroci deo congruunt. Haec cum adicit etiam oportere fieri, quem se praestat?* | Res. 22.2 – *ad ... diem ultimum et occultum*

---

<sup>371</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 230\*.

<sup>372</sup> IGNTP lists only one manuscript of bo attesting the omission of γάρ. IGNTP goes on to state that Marcion's text attested ἐλεύσονται ψευδοπροφήται. It is a complete mystery to me on what basis this claim is made.

<sup>373</sup> ὅτι is also not present in Matt 24:5.

<sup>374</sup> Braun indicates his agreement with Harnack's interpretation (*Contre Marcion IV*, 475n5). IGNTP lists several manuscripts, including 157, most of the OL manuscripts, sy<sup>p</sup>, and a few other witnesses as attesting the Matthean reading in Luke 21:8.

*nec ulli praeter patri notum, et tamen signis atque portentis et concussionibus elementorum et conflictationibus nationum praenotatum.*<sup>375</sup>

Tertullian attests various elements in Luke 21:9–11 in this allusion. At the outset and closing of the section from 4.39.3 cited above, Tertullian attests two elements of v. 9 which Harnack reconstructed as πολέμους ... δεῖ ταῦτα γενέσθαι.<sup>376</sup> Even though there is some evidence in Latin manuscripts for the omission of γάρ after δεῖ, once again the omission cannot be demonstrated for Marcion's text based on Tertullian's testimony. For v. 10 Harnack posited the otherwise unattested order βασιλείαν [*sic*] ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος,<sup>377</sup> and for v. 11 λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ σεισμοί τε, φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ.<sup>378</sup> Harnack rightly noted that the order λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοί is attested by B, several OL manuscripts, and sy<sup>c</sup>; yet, he did not mention that σεισμοί following this pair is otherwise unattested. When one adds the observation that in *Res.* 22.2 Tertullian has the conflict between nations, one of the first elements in the list, at the end of his statement, it becomes questionable to posit that Marcion's text contained this highly unique order of elements rather than Tertullian simply having written an "unordered" list.<sup>379</sup> That Marcion's text contained the elements listed by Tertullian appears quite certain; however, the order in which they appeared cannot be determined with any precision.

### 3.1.88 Luke 21:25–26

4.39.9 – ... *signa iam ultimi finis enarrat, solis et lunae siderumque prodigia, et in terra*<sup>380</sup> *angustias nationum obstupescantium velut a sonitu maris fluctuantis pro expectatione imminentium orbi malorum. Quod et ipsae vires caelorum concuti habeant,...* | *Res.* 22.5–6 – ... *futura signa in sole et luna et [in] stellis, conclusionem*

---

<sup>375</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 21:9 occurs in 4.39.17.

<sup>376</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 230\*.

<sup>377</sup> Braun notes the use of *super* for *contra* based on the influence of ἐπί (Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 477n2). The OL manuscripts for Luke 21:10 offer *contra* (d, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, l, q, r<sup>1</sup>), *adversus* (f), and *super* (a, c, e). Even greater variation is found in the parallels in Matt 24:7 and Mark 13:8.

<sup>378</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 230\*.

<sup>379</sup> Note also that the necessity of the events occurring, appearing in v. 9, is not mentioned until the various signs, including those in vv. 10–11, have been enumerated.

<sup>380</sup> Moreschini's text follows the reading *in terra* of Gelenius and the other editors, rejecting *inter* in  $\theta$  and *interim* as inferred in R<sub>2</sub>.

*nationum, cum stupore sonitus maris et motus refrigerantium hominum prae metu et expectatione eorum, quae immineant orbi terrae. Virtutes enim, inquit, caelorum commovebuntur ...*

Even though Harnack recognized that Tertullian renders these verses rather freely, he still reconstructed a text that read just like Luke except for *ὡς ἤχους θαλάσσης κυμαίνουσης* (*ἤχους θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου* in Luke) at the end of v. 25 and *αὐτὰ γὰρ αἱ δυνάμεις* (*αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις* in Luke) in v. 26.<sup>381</sup> Despite knowing that the loose nature of the allusion meant that one cannot prove that Marcion made any changes, Harnack believed that the latter reading should be accepted.<sup>382</sup> Though the reference to these verses in *Res.* 22.5–6 is formulated differently at these two points, a similar free citation style is evident (e.g., the omission of *et in terra*, the use of *refrigerare*, and the addition of *eorum*). Therefore, the citation in *Res.* 22 would tend to confirm both that the order of the signs in Marcion's Gospel was the same as in Luke and, at the same time, that the precise wording of parts of the verses cannot be established from 4.39.9.

### **3.1.89 Luke 21:27–28**

4.39.10 – *Post haec quid dominus? Et tunc videbunt filium hominis venientem de caelis cum plurima virtute. Cum autem haec fient, erigetis vos, et levabitis capita, quoniam adpropinquabit*<sup>383</sup> *redemptio vestra. | 4.39.12 – ... erecturos scilicet se et capita levaturos in tempore regni redemptos. | Prax. 30.5 – Hic et venturus est rursus super nubes caeli talis, qualis et ascendit. | Res. 22.6–7 – Virtutes enim, inquit, caelorum commovebuntur, et tunc videbunt filium hominis venientem in nubibus caeli cum plurimo potentatu et gloria. Ubi autem coeperint ista fieri, emergetis et elevabitis capita vestra, quod redemptio vestra adpropinquaverit. Et tamen adpropinquare eam dixit, non adesse iam, et cum coeperint ista fieri, non cum facta fuerint, quia cum facta fuerint, tunc aderit redemptio nostra, quae eo usque adpropinquare dicetur, erigens interim et excitans animos ad proximum iam spei fructum.*

---

<sup>381</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*. Once again, Harnack reflected some of the reading attested by Tertullian, but also did not follow some changes in word order and the addition of *κακῶν* (attested in one lectionary witness, 1524), for example.

<sup>382</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>383</sup> Moreschini rejects the reading *adpropinquavit* of Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.



Tertullian attests Luke 21:27 as reconstructed by Harnack: καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς.<sup>384</sup> Two differences from Luke are immediately evident. First, instead of ἐν νεφέλῃ Tertullian renders ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν. Harnack sees this as a tendentious correction because “mit irdischem Nebel sollte Christus nichts zu tun haben.”<sup>385</sup> Tsutsui connects the wording to that of the first appearance of Marcion’s Jesus in Luke 4:31.<sup>386</sup> The citation in *Res.* 22.6 reads *in nubibus caeli* as in Matt 24:30 (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), which, along with *Prax.* 30.5 where the additional influence of Acts 1:11 is present, reveals that if Tertullian were being influenced by the synoptic parallel we would expect both “clouds” and “heaven” to be mentioned, and not simply “heaven.”<sup>387</sup> Therefore, it seems likely that Marcion’s text here did read ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν. Second, at the conclusion of the verse Luke reads μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. Once again, *Res.* 22.6 contains reference to both elements, increasing the likelihood that Marcion’s text only referred to δύναμις.<sup>388</sup> At the same time, however, a simple omission by Tertullian is possible.<sup>389</sup>

Several readings also merit attention in Luke 21:28. Harnack reconstructed τούτων δὲ γινομένων ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς, διότι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.<sup>390</sup> First, though Tertullian may simply be offering a loose translation of the Lukan opening ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι,<sup>391</sup> once again the citation in *Res.* 22.6 would tend to confirm that Tertullian would not be inclined to introduce the verse in this manner under his own initiative. Nevertheless, *Res.* 22.7

---

<sup>384</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*.

<sup>385</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>386</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 122.

<sup>387</sup> In addition, it is interesting that as Tertullian continues his argument he makes reference to the day of the Lord *venientis de caelis filii hominis* and then quotes Dan 7:13 where the Son of Man is described as coming *cum caeli nubibus* (4.39.11). Since Tertullian presumably knew he would employ Daniel in his argument, it would be strange for him purposely to omit reference to the “clouds.”

<sup>388</sup> According to IGNTP no other witness attests this omission.

<sup>389</sup> As mentioned in n. 387, Tertullian continues his argument with a reference to Dan 7:13. He concludes that citation with *data est illi* [the Son of Man] *regia potestas*, and here the omission of “glory” would create a closer parallel with the OT verse.

<sup>390</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*.

<sup>391</sup> Several OL manuscripts attest the reading τούτων δὲ γίνεσθαι ἀρχομένων, which reveals that Tertullian could have begun the verse as found in Marcion’s text and then offered a paraphrase of the concept of the verb.

reveals that Tertullian is paying particular attention to the tense in this discussion, which may have led to a more precise rendering. Second, the omission of the possessive ὑμῶν after κεφαλᾶς becomes slightly more likely for Marcion's text because Tertullian includes it in *Res.* 22.6.<sup>392</sup> Finally, though all the manuscripts of Tertullian's works attest *adpropinquabit*, numerous editors of Tertullian's works have posited *adpropinquavit*.<sup>393</sup> Harnack stated “*adpropinquabit* schwerlich richtig,” without any further explanation.<sup>394</sup> Even though ἤγγικεν is attested in some manuscripts, it may be that this is another case where Tertullian is rendering the Greek verb in the present tense (ἐγγίξει) with a Latin future,<sup>395</sup> and therefore there is no need to posit an error in the manuscript tradition of Tertullian's works.

### 3.1.90 Luke 21:31

4.39.10 – ... *in tempore scilicet regni, de quo subiecta erit ipsa parabola. Sic et vos, cum videritis omnia haec fieri, scitote adpropinquasse regnum dei.* | 4.39.16 – ... *sic et vos, cum videritis haec fieri, scitote in proximo esse regnum dei.* | *Res.* 22.8 – *Cuius etiam parabola subtexitur tenerescentium arborum in caulem, floris et dehinc frugis antecursorem. Ita et vos, cum videritis omnia ista fieri, scitote in proximo esse regnum dei.*

The first question concerning Luke 21:31 is whether the citation in 4.39.10 or 4.39.16 more closely represents Marcion's text. Harnack reconstructed vv. 29–31 from the latter, though Braun contends that in 4.39.16 Tertullian is reproducing the text rather freely and that, in v. 30 at least, Harnack “a tort d'y voir donné le texte même de Marcion.”<sup>396</sup> Since vv. 29–30 are not multiply cited they will not be discussed here. Concerning v. 31, however, it appears that the latter quotation may be accurate. First, the citation in 4.39.10 is only of v. 31, whereas three verses are cited in 4.39.16. Though not definitive in and of itself, in general there is a greater

---

<sup>392</sup> The possessive pronoun is also omitted in D, d, and in one manuscript of the Georgian Version.

<sup>393</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:488 did not distinguish between the text attested by the manuscripts and the readings posited by editors when he commented on Tertullian's “schwankende[r] Text.”

<sup>394</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*.

<sup>395</sup> Notice also that Tertullian begins the citation in 4.39.10 with the future *fient*, and renders the imperatives with Latin futures (*erigetis, levabitis*). Notice also the use of the future in *Res.* 22.6 (*emergetis et elevabitis*).

<sup>396</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 491n3.

likelihood that a longer citation will be made with reference to the text. Second, the quotation in 4.39.10 includes the Matthean *omnia* (Matt 24:33), which *Res.* 22.8 reveals may be the more familiar form for Tertullian. Of course, it is also possible that both Tertullian’s text of Luke and Marcion’s Gospel contained this harmonization;<sup>397</sup> yet, then one would have to explain why Tertullian omitted *omnia* in 4.39.16. Finally, and perhaps most tellingly, in 4.39.10 Tertullian uses *adpropinquare* instead of *in proximo esse* as in 4.39.16 and *Res.* 22.8. Apart from the fact that the latter is a more literal rendering of ἐγγύς ἐστίν and thus more likely to arise from a text, the former is never here attested in any OL witnesses.<sup>398</sup> Thus, it would seem that at least as far as v. 31 is concerned, 4.39.16 more closely follows Marcion’s text, which means that here Marcion’s text read the same as Luke 21:31.

### 3.1.91 Luke 21:33

4.39.18 – *Adhuc ingerit non transiturum caelum ac terram, nisi omnia peragantur.... Transeat age nunc caelum et terra*<sup>399</sup>—*sic enim dominus eorum destinavit—, dum verbum eius maneat in aevum—sic enim et Esaias pronuntiavit.* | *Herm.* 34.1 – ... *caelum et terra praeteribunt, inquit;...*

This verse is confusingly reconstructed by Harnack ἡ (δὴ?) γῆ καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς παρελεύσονται, ὁ δὲ λόγος μου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.<sup>400</sup> First, there is no good reason to suppose that *age* is anything other than Tertullian’s own exclamation as he advances his argument. Second, in his apparatus Harnack gave Kroymann’s text (*transeat age nunc caelum et terra*), though in his Greek reconstruction he changed the order without any rationale for apparently following a different reading.<sup>401</sup> Ultimately, though earlier in 4.39.18 and in *Herm.* 34.1 Tertullian uses the order “heaven and earth,” the variation in the manuscripts of

---

<sup>397</sup> IGNTP lists numerous manuscripts with this harmonization including the OL manuscripts e, gat, and r<sup>1</sup> along with Cyprian and other church fathers.

<sup>398</sup> See the data for this verse in the chart in Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess?,” (forthcoming).

<sup>399</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *caelum et terra* with *M* and Kroymann, rejecting *terra et caelum* read in  $\beta$  and the other editors.

<sup>400</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 232\*.

<sup>401</sup> It is quite possible that Harnack is here influenced by Zahn’s reconstruction as Zahn’s text of Tertullian read *terra et caelum* (*Geschichte*, 2:489). Tsutsui’s text for Tertullian is also confusing as it reads *terra et caelum transiet, verbum autem meum manet in aevum*, stated as coming from 4.39.18. In his bibliography Tsutsui lists both Kroymann’s and Evans’s editions of Tertullian; however, neither of those editions offers this reading.

Tertullian's works makes a definitive decision on Marcion's reading impossible. Third, despite Tertullian's singular verb (*transeat*), attested in numerous manuscripts, Harnack reconstructed *παρελεύσονται*. Harnack's reconstruction may be right, and no definitive decision can be made either way, but the plural is not what Tertullian attests. Fourth, though Harnack recognized *dum* and the subjunctive as created by Tertullian's argument, he did not realize that the singular *verbum* may very well have come from the wording of Isa 40:8, to which Tertullian makes reference at the end of his allusion.<sup>402</sup> This possible influence of Isaiah in the second half of the verse renders its precise wording unclear.

### **3.1.92 Luke 22:15**

4.40.1 – *Ideo et adfectum suum ostendit: Concupiscentia concupii pascha edere vobiscum, antequam patiar.*<sup>403</sup> | 4.40.3 – *Professus itaque se concupiscentia concupisse edere pascha ...* | *An. 16.4 – ... et concupiscentivum, quo pascha cum discipulis suis edere concupiscit.*

Luke 22:15 is also attested by Epiphanius and Eznik. Tertullian's three citations of the passage reveal the fluidity with which he can make reference to the verse. The citation in 4.40.1 attests ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν, which corresponds to Luke except for the absence of τοῦτο before τὸ πάσχα.<sup>404</sup> Neither of the other references in 4.40.3 or *An. 16.4* contain the demonstrative pronoun, so it may very well be an omission by Tertullian.

### **3.1.93 Luke 22:19**

4.40.3 – ... *acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum dicendo, ... Aut si propterea panem corpus sibi finxit, quia corporis carebat veritate, ergo panem debuit tradere pro nobis.* | 4.40.4 – ... *corpus suum*

---

<sup>402</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 493n3 rightly notes that Tertullian made the same type of reference to Isa 40:8 in 4.33.9.

<sup>403</sup> Braun notes that Tertullian has brought this verse forward in his discussion of chapter 22 for emphasis in the course of his argument (*Contre Marcion IV*, 496n1).

<sup>404</sup> This verse is also noted by Wolter as evidence for Lukan redaction being present in Marcion's Gospel (*Lukasevangelium*, 3).

*vocans panem. | Or. 6.2 – ... tunc quod et corpus eius in pane censetur: hoc est corpus meum.*<sup>405</sup>

Luke 22:19 is also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian's allusion to the opening of the verse includes a reference to the verbs λαμβάνω and δίδωμι. Tertullian clarifying to whom the bread is given does not require Marcion's text to have read τοῖς μαθηταῖς, as supposed by Harnack.<sup>406</sup> The omission of εὐχαριστέω and κλάω may be attributed to Tertullian, whose argument focuses on the bread as a substance requiring Jesus' body to be a true body (*veritatis corpus*). For this reason Tertullian's primary interest in the verse is in Jesus' statement τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, the direct citation of which is unproblematic (cf. *Or. 6.2*). Finally, as Tertullian continues his argument he alludes that Jesus' statement is followed by τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, stating that if Jesus did not have a true body then it is the bread itself that should have been delivered up for us.

### **3.1.94 Luke 22:69**

4.41.4 – ... *Abhinc, inquit, erit filius hominis sedens ad dexteram virtutis dei.* | 4.42.1 – ... *sine dubio dei filium, sessurum ad dei dexteram.* | *Carn. Chr. 16.1 – ... cum illam [the flesh of Christ] et ad dexteram patris in caelis praesidere ...*

The citation of Luke 22:69 in 4.41.4 is largely unproblematic as it renders ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ, which is also the reconstruction of Harnack.<sup>407</sup> Numerous manuscripts, including P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, A, B, D, and many OL manuscripts attest δέ after νῦν, and the conjunction could have been present in Marcion's text and simply omitted by Tertullian. That Tertullian largely is following the precise wording of Marcion's text may have slight confirmation by comparing the loose phrasing of the reference in *Carn. Chr. 16.1*. More significant is the confirmation that in the quotation Tertullian is following the word order of Marcion's text as he alters the order in the allusion in 4.42.1.

---

<sup>405</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 22:19/Matt 26:26/Mark 14:22 occur in 3.19.4 and *Adv. Jud.* 10.12.

<sup>406</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 233\*. IGNTP notes that Cyril in *Contra Nestorium* reads τοῖς μαθηταῖς and f reads τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

<sup>407</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 234\*. ἐξ δεξιῶν in Harnack's reconstruction is a typographical error.

### 3.1.95 Luke 23:44-45

4.42.5 – *Ecce autem et elementa concutiuntur:… Hic erit dies de quo et Amos: Et erit die illa dicit dominus, occidet sol meridie—habes et horae sextae significationem—, et contenebrabit super terram [Amos 8:9]. Scissum est et templi velum,...* | *Adv. Jud.* 13.14 – ... *et velum templi scissum est ...* | *Apol.* 21.19 – *Eodem momento dies, medium orbem signante sole, subducta est.*

These verses are also attested by Eznik, and v. 45 by Epiphanius. Tertullian's citation of Amos 8:9 indicates that a reference to the darkness/the sun's light failing was present in Marcion's Gospel, and the gloss in the citation connects the OT prophecy specifically to the ὥρα ἕκτη. 4.42.5 also attests ἐσχίσθε δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ for v. 45, though the precise conjunction and placement of it is not certain.<sup>408</sup> Some confirmation for the Lukan word order comes from *Adv. Jud.* 13.14 where, in the reference to Matt 27:51, Tertullian places the verb after the *velum templi*.<sup>409</sup> At the same time, it should be noted that the order *templi velum* in 4.42.5 is not found in any of the Synoptics.

### 3.1.96 Luke 23:46

4.42.6 – *Vociferatur ad patrem, ut et moriens ultima voce prophetas adimpleret. Hoc dicto expiravit.* | *Apol.* 21.19 – *Nam spiritum cum verbo sponte dimisit, praevento carnificis officio.* | *Prax.* 25.2 – ... *Pater, in tuis manibus depono spiritum meum,...* | *Prax.* 26.9 – ... *in Patris manibus spiritum ponens ...* | *Prax.* 30.4 – *Ceterum non reliquit Pater Filium in cuius manibus Filius spiritum suum posuit.*

Luke 23:46 is also attested by Epiphanius and in *Adam*. Tertullian's testimony makes reference to Jesus crying out to the Father; however, unlike the three references in *Adversus Praxean*, Tertullian here does not mention what Jesus said to the Father. Yet, that it is Luke's account which Tertullian has in mind is apparent not only because the cry is addressed to the Father, but also because

---

<sup>408</sup> Harnack reconstructed the opening of the verse as ἐσχίσθη [καί], though, as this reading is not attested in any manuscript and ἐσχίσθε δέ is found in P<sup>75</sup>, **8**, and several other manuscripts, it seems more likely to posit δέ as the conjunction. The Majority Text does read καί, but it has it before ἐσχίσθε.

<sup>409</sup> That Tertullian is citing Matt 27:51 in *Adv. Jud.* 13.14 is confirmed by the reference to the tombs being opened (v. 52) immediately following the reference to the veil being torn.

Tertullian does not speak of Jesus yielding up his spirit (cf. *Apol.* 21.19 referring to Matt 27:50); rather, *hoc dicto expiravit* is rendering τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν.<sup>410</sup>

### 3.1.97 Luke 24:37–39

4.43.6 – *cum haesitantibus eis ne phantasma esset, immo phantasma credentibus: Quid turbati estis?*<sup>411</sup> *et quid cogitationes subeunt in corda vestra? Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ipse ego*<sup>412</sup> *sum, quoniam spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me habentem videtis.* | 4.43.7 – ... *Spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me videtis habentem, quasi ad spiritum referatur sicut me videtis habentem, id est non habentem ossa sicut et spiritus.* | 4.43.8 – *Cur autem inspectui eorum manus et pedes suos offert,...*<sup>413</sup> *Cur adicit: Et scitote quia ego sum,...* | *Carn. Chr.* 5.9 – ... *fuit itaque phantasma etiam post resurrectionem, cum manus et pedes suos discipulis inspiciendos offert adspicite, dicens, quod ego sum, quia spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me habentem videtis? [Si] sine dubio manus et pedes et ossa, quae spiritus non habet, sed caro,...*

Vv. 38–39 are also attested by Epiphanius. For v. 37 Harnack reconstructed the reading of the verse along the lines of the reading in *Adam.* 198.18–19 (5.12); however, no explicit indication is made that Marcion's text is being quoted. Tertullian's testimony may reflect the reading φάντασμα in Marcion's text of Luke 24:37, which is also found in D and d. At the same time, however, some caution needs to be exercised since Tertullian also uses both *phantasma* and *spiritus* in *Carn. Chr.* 5.9. In v. 38 Tertullian attests Jesus' two-part question to the disciples as τί τετραγαμένοι ἐστέ καὶ [διὰ] τί διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. This reading, however, which has points of contact with other manuscripts and church fathers, cannot be compared with any other citation by Tertullian. V. 39 is again multiply cited and several points need to be made. First, Tertullian's *manus meas et pedes* in 4.43.6 should not be used to determine the placement or number of possessive pronouns in Marcion's text, since in *Carn. Chr.* 5.9 Tertullian writes

---

<sup>410</sup> This is also the reconstruction of Harnack, *Marcion*, 236\*.

<sup>411</sup> Moreschini does not add *inquit* after *estis* as do Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, Kroymann, and Evans.

<sup>412</sup> Moreschini's text reads *ipse ego* with M and Kroymann, and not the order *ego ipse* of β and the other editors.

<sup>413</sup> Braun references Luke 24:40 for this phrase (*Contre Marcion IV*, 526); however, the fact that Tertullian continues with *adicit* followed by v. 39b reveals that it is Luke 24:39 that is in view here.

*manus et pedes suos*. Second, Jesus' statement identifying himself is rendered in several different ways by Tertullian: *quia ipse ego sum* or the variant *quia ego ipse sum* (4.43.6); *scitote quia ego sum* (4.43.8); and *quod ego sum* (*Carn. Chr.* 5.9).<sup>414</sup> Greater insight into Marcion's wording at this point requires the incorporation of the evidence from Epiphanius. Third, though Tertullian does not attest ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε for Marcion's text, Tertullian also omits reference to this element in *Carn. Chr.* 5.9. Finally, in both 4.43.6 and 7, Tertullian only makes reference to a spirit having bones, without referring to σόρξ as well. Yet, once again, in the citation of v. 39 in *Carn. Chr.* 5.9 Tertullian also only mentions the bones, indicating that it may be a simple omission on Tertullian's part.

### 3.2 Conclusion

At this point a significant number of verses attested by Tertullian have been analyzed; however, a large number of verses that are not multiply cited must still be considered. Therefore, before providing a suggested reconstruction of elements of Marcion's Gospel, in the following chapter the remaining verses also must be examined.

---

<sup>414</sup> Tsutsui argues that *et scitote quia ego sum* (4.43.8) should be added to the end of v. 39, accusing Harnack of an oversight ("Evangelium," 130). However, apart from the dubious methodology employed by Tsutsui (he states concerning the reference "also ein direktes Zitat = sicher 'καὶ γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι'"), it is Tsutsui who has overlooked the context of the statement. Tertullian mentions that Jesus offered his hands and feet for an inspection, and it is to this offering that the statement is added. In other words, *et scitote quia ego sum* appears to be Tertullian's rephrasing of *quia ipse ego sum*, not an addition at the end of v. 39 (see also Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:494 who recognized that *et scitote* was added by Tertullian for clarity). Curiously, though Amphoux in his analysis of the textual tradition of Luke 24 elsewhere always follows Harnack's reconstruction when offering Marcion's text, here Amphoux contends that Marcion's text omitted ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτός along with ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ("Le chapitre 24 de *Luc* et l'origine de la tradition textuelle du *Codex de Bèze* (D.05 du NT)," *FN* 4 [1991]: 36). Though both elements are unattested by Epiphanius, Tertullian clearly references the first phrase. Since Amphoux provides no rationale for his view, it may simply be an oversight.



## Chapter 4

### 4.1 Tertullian as a Source: Single Citations

The texts examined in this chapter, though at times multiply attested in the sources, are not multiply cited by Tertullian outside of *Adversus Marcionem*. This reality removes the primary control for evaluating Tertullian's testimony concerning the text of Marcion's Gospel. Therefore, it is not surprising that much of the following discussion is negative in its conclusions in that no definitive decision can be made concerning specific readings in Marcion's text. Nevertheless, evidence from the textual tradition of Luke and tendencies in Tertullian's citation habits identified by Schmid and in the previous chapters do, at times, allow tentative conclusions regarding possible readings.

#### 4.1.1 Luke 3:1

1.15.1 – *At nunc quale est, ut dominus anno quinto decimo Tiberii Caesaris revelatus sit,...* | 1.15.6 – *His cum accedunt et sui Christi, alter qui apparuit sub Tiberio ...* | 1.19.2 – *Anno quinto decimo Tiberii Christus Iesus de caelo manare dignatus est,...* | 1.22.10 – *... si ab aevo Deus et non a Tiberio,...* | 4.6.3 – *Constituit Marcion alium esse Christum, qui Tiberianis temporibus a deo quondam ignoto revelatus sit in salutem omnium gentium,...* | 4.7.1 – *Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberii proponit eum descendisse in civitatem Galilaeae Capharnaum,...*

Elements of Luke 3:1, the opening of Marcion's Gospel, are attested by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Origen, (Pseudo-)Ephrem, and in *Adam*. Tertullian's testimony in his numerous allusions in *Adversus Marcionem* appears to attest that Marcion's text included a reference to ἔτει πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ and Τιβερίου, with Τιβερίου Κάισαρος attested in the allusion in 1.15.1.

#### 4.1.2 Luke 4:16, 23, 27, 29–30

4.8.2 – *Et tamen apud Nazareth quoque nihil novi notatur praedicasse, dum alio, merito unius proverbii,<sup>1</sup> eiectus refertur.... manus ei iniectas ... detentus et captus et*

---

<sup>1</sup> The words *unius proverbii* were omitted by Kroymann in his edition. On understanding the phrase here as if Tertullian had written *propter aliud, propter unum proverbium* see Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 107n4.

*ad praecipitium usque protractus ... | 4.8.3 – ... per medios evasit ... | 4.35.6 – Nunc etsi praefatus est multos tunc fuisse leprosos apud Israhelem in diebus Helisaei prophetae et neminem eorum purgatum nisi Neman Syrum,...*

Elements of this pericope are also attested by Epiphanius, Ephrem, and Jerome. According to the order in which Tertullian comments on Marcion's Gospel, a shortened form of Luke 4:16–30 followed Luke 4:31–35.<sup>2</sup> In addition, though Luke 4:27 is discussed here, both Epiphanius and Tertullian attest its presence in Marcion's Gospel in the pericope of the cleansing of the ten lepers (Luke 17:11–19). For Luke 4:27 Tertullian, in 4.35.6, attests πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν [ταῖς] ἡμέραις Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Ναϊμὰν ὁ Σύρος. The allusion to the entire pericope in 4.35.2–3, as recognized by Harnack, only references a few elements of the passage: Ναζαρέθ (v. 16, Harnack reproduced most of the reading in D in parentheses);<sup>3</sup> *unus proverbium* (probably the ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτὸν in v. 23);<sup>4</sup> ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν and ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἕως τῆς ὄφρους τοῦ ὄρους (v. 29); and διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο (v. 30).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See 4.7.1–4.8.3. Braun raises the possibility that the order of pericopes in Marcion's text was Luke 4:31–32; 4:16–30 [shortened]; 4:33–34 [sic]; 4:40; and 4:41 (*Contre Marcion IV*, 104–5n1). To support this view Braun offers the following comment on Tertullian's question *Quorsum hunc locum praemisimus* (4.7.13 in the discussion of Luke 4:33–35): "Par cette remarque, T. veut sans doute justifier le rédacteur évangélique d'avoir mis en premier un épisode permettant d'affirmer les attaches du Christ avec l'A.T. Mais on pourrait aussi penser que notre auteur a inversé l'ordre suivi par Marcion (Lc 4,16-30 en version abrégée aurait précédé Lc 4, 33-35)" (ibid., 103n4). A major difficulty, however, is that Tertullian introduces his discussion of Luke 4:33–35 with the words *exclamat ibidem spiritus daemonis* (4.7.9). Having just discussed Luke 4:31–32, this *ibidem* could only refer to the synagogue in Capernaum; yet, if these verses followed the account of the events at Nazareth it becomes very difficult to understand how Tertullian could have introduced vv. 33–35 in this way.

<sup>3</sup> D reads ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς Ναζαρέδ ὅπου ἦν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι. Harris, positing that οὐ ἦν τεθραμμένος and κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ were omitted by Marcion, argued that the reading in D had been influenced by Marcion's text (*Codex Bezae*, 232–33; see also Vogels, *Evangelium Palatinum*, 98–99). Alfred Plummer, with reference to Harris, more cautiously stated that the omissions were "perhaps due to Marcionite influence" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* [5<sup>th</sup> ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901], 119). Harnack contended "in D ist hier ein Teil des Textes M.s erhalten" (*Marcion*, 186\*).

<sup>4</sup> Lukas more forcefully states that these words are "certainly" those to which Tertullian refers (*Rhetorik*, 232).

<sup>5</sup> For Harnack's discussion see *Marcion*, 185\*–86\*.

### 4.1.3 Luke 4:31

4.7.1 – ... [Marcion] *proponit eum*<sup>6</sup> *descendisse in civitatem Galilaeae Capharnaum, utique de caelo creatoris,...* | 4.7.2 – *Nunc autem et reliquum ordinem descensionis exostulo, tenens descendisse illum. Viderit enim, sicubi ‘apparuisse’ positum est.... descendisse ...* | 4.7.4 – *Bene autem quod et deus Marcionis inluminator vindicatur nationum, quo magis debuerit vel de caelo descendere, et, si utique, in Pontum potius descendere quam in Galilaeam.* | 4.7.5 – *De caelo statim ad synagogam:...* | 4.7.6 – *Ecce venit in synagogam:... Ecce doctrinae suae panem prioribus offert Israhelitis:...* | 4.7.7 – *Et tamen quomodo in synagogem potuit admitti ... Sed etsi passim synagoga adiretur, non tamen ad docendum ...*

Elements of Luke 4:31 are also attested by Irenaeus, Origen, Hippolytus, and possibly an anonymous Syriac manuscript.<sup>7</sup> Tertullian’s testimony in 4.7.1 attests κατηλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν.<sup>8</sup> κατηλθεν is attested numerous times, though interestingly Tertullian indicates that *apparuisse* (ἐφάνη) was elsewhere used to describe Jesus’ appearance. Harnack is probably correct when he posits that this term was used in the *Antitheses*.<sup>9</sup> Less clear is whether *de caelo*, also repeated numerous times, is attested by Tertullian for Marcion’s Gospel. Tsutsui apparently thought it was, and Harnack, in his reconstruction, wrote (ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ?).<sup>10</sup> Braun rightly notes, however, “la place de *utique* [in 4.7.1] amène à admettre que c’est tout le groupe de mots qui appartient au commentaire de T.”<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the *de caelo*

---

<sup>6</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *eum* with all manuscripts and most editors, though Gelenius and Pamelius read *deum*.

<sup>7</sup> For a brief discussion of this fragment and the various views concerning its authenticity see Riemer Roukema, “The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity,” *VC* 58 (2004): 57–58.

<sup>8</sup> Assuming the reading in Moreschini (*eum descendisse*) is correct one would expect an explicit external subject; however, it remains unclear if it was ὁ Ἰησοῦς or ὁ Χριστός (cf. 1.15.6; 1.19.2).

<sup>9</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 185\*. See also the comment of Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 93n5 and Theodor Zahn, “Ein verkanntes Fragment von Marcions Antithesen,” *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 21 (1910): 372–74. For additional arguments for the authenticity of this fragment see Werner Monselewski, *Der barmherzige Samariter: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10,25-37* (BGBE 5; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1967), 19–21.

<sup>10</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 77 and Harnack, *Marcion*, 183\*.

<sup>11</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 93n1(cont.). Immediately prior to this comment Braun observes that Harnack “serait porté à penser que ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ figurait dans la texte de Marcion, *utique* portent uniquement sur *Creatoris*.” Harnack stated that these words were “wahrscheinlich” present in Marcion’s text (*Marcion*, 185\*). Further down in the same note, however, Harnack states that it “muß offen bleiben, ob ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ im Eingang des Ev.s gestanden hat,” which would explain the question mark in the reconstructed text.

throughout should be seen as Tertullian’s own, and polemically employed, description for the “coming down” of Jesus.<sup>12</sup> Finally, in 4.7.5, 6, 7 Tertullian seems to reflect a text closer to that of Mark 1:21 (εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν) than Luke 4:31 (ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασι); however, even though the testimony of other witnesses still needs to be considered it is worth noting that there is no evidence for the Markan reading in Luke 4:31 in the extant manuscript tradition.

#### 4.1.4 Luke 4:35

4.7.13 – *Atquin, [Marcion] inquis, increpuit illum [the demon] Iesus.*<sup>13</sup>

Tertullian presents the opening words of 4:35 as Marcion’s response to Tertullian’s contention that 4:34 reveals the demon’s knowledge of Jesus as the Son of the Creator. According to IGNTP, the extant witnesses to the text are nearly uniform, and there is no difficulty in positing that Marcion’s text read ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

#### 4.1.5 Luke 4:40–41

4.8.4 – *Ad summam, et ipse mox tetigit alios, quibus manus imponens, ... beneficia medicinarum conferebat, ... quodcumque curaverit Iesus, meus est.* | 4.8.5 – *Ceterum et a daemoniis liberare curatio est validitudinis. Itaque spiritus nequam ... cum testimonio excedebant vociferantes: Tu es filius dei. Cuius dei, ... Sed proinde increpabantur et iuebantur tacere. Proinde enim Christus ab hominibus, non ab spiritibus inmundis, volebat se filium dei agnosci, ...*

Curiously, though Harnack cites the allusion in 4.8.4 he offers no reconstruction of any elements of Luke 4:40, and Tsutsui erroneously indicates that the verse is unattested.<sup>14</sup> Yet, Tertullian makes reference to τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.<sup>15</sup> That Tertullian drew his allusion from Marcion’s text may

<sup>12</sup> See Tertullian’s argument in 3.23.7, referenced in 4.7.1.

<sup>13</sup> Several additional references to the rebuke by Jesus occur in 4.7.14–15.

<sup>14</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 78. Technically Tsutsui uses the symbol indicating “unbezeugt, aber nicht ganz getilgt: der Kontext fordert ein Erzählstück an der betreffenden Stelle.”

<sup>15</sup> Numerous manuscripts read ἐπιθείς and ἐθεράπευεν, making the precise reading in Marcion unclear.

receive confirmation by the fact that the laying on of hands is not mentioned in the parallel passages in Matt 8:16/Mark 1:34. If correct, then some confidence in Tertullian's attestation to the following verse is also warranted.

Harnack offered ἐξήρχετο δαιμόνια κράζοντα· Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν as a reconstruction for 4:41.<sup>16</sup> His contention that ὅτι before σύ was absent with “zahlreichen Lateinern” cannot be accepted with certainty as the entire phrase καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι is unattested by Tertullian.<sup>17</sup> The final phrase of 4:41 is simply unattested, and therefore Zahn's view that it was absent is questionable.<sup>18</sup> In addition, the unattested conjunctions, though absent in a few witnesses, may well have been present in Marcion's text.

#### 4.1.6 Luke 4:42–43

4.8.9 – *In solitudinem procedit.* | 4.8.10 – *Detentus a turbis: Oportet me, inquit, et aliis civitatibus adnuntiare regnum dei.*

Without any real transition from his previous discussion, Tertullian begins 4.8.9 with a reference to Jesus going into a wilderness (Luke 4:42). Harnack offered ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον; yet, it cannot be ascertained whether Marcion's text read ἐπορεύθη or ἐπορεύετο.<sup>19</sup> In 4.8.10 there is a reference to οἱ ὄχλοι ... κατεῖχον αὐτόν,<sup>20</sup> which is largely unproblematic. Tertullian's citation of Luke 4:43 in 4.8.10 presents a few challenges. Harnack reconstructed Δεῖ με καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις (ἐτέραις?) πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>21</sup> First, Harnack wrongly stated that δεῖ με is never clause initial,<sup>22</sup> as this is precisely the position in

---

<sup>16</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\*. It is worth noting that Harnack reconstructed the plural *excedebant* with a singular. Several manuscripts attest the plural (including **Σ**, C, Θ, *f*<sup>1</sup>, and 33), and Marcion's reading cannot be reconstructed with certainty. Similarly Tertullian's Latin cannot reveal whether the reading was κράζοντα or κραυγάζοντα. With all OL manuscripts (except f and q), P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, B, D, and numerous other witnesses, Marcion's text does not attest ὁ Χριστός before ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. An allusion to this verse in 4.8.7, with its reference to *dei filium*, once again reveals Tertullian's freedom with word order.

<sup>17</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\*. According to IGNTP, καὶ λέγοντα is almost uniformly attested in the manuscript tradition, and is present in all OL witnesses.

<sup>18</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:458. Concerning Zahn's view Harnack stated “ich sehe keinen Grund hierfür” (*Marcion*, 187\*).

<sup>19</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\*. IGNTP states that the latter reading is attested by several witnesses including most OL manuscripts.

<sup>20</sup> Harnack offered only the latter, apparently overlooking the reference to the crowd (*turbis*).

<sup>21</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\*.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

D, d, and e. It is possible that Tertullian is here reflecting Marcion's word order, even if Tertullian himself changing the order cannot be ruled out.<sup>23</sup> Second, though the reference to εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ is straightforward,<sup>24</sup> deciphering *et aliis civitatibus* is a bit more difficult. καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν is read almost uniformly in the manuscript tradition and is rendered *et aliis civitatibus* in every OL manuscript reflecting this Greek text. D reads καὶ εἰς τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις, which corresponds to the reading *et in alias civitates* in d and e. Thus, Harnack's suggested reading is rather unlikely, and Tertullian is either reflecting the reading καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις, or he is loosely rendering the reading of D, d, and e. If δεῖ με was indeed clause initial then the latter may be more likely, though a definite conclusion is not possible.

#### 4.1.7 Luke 5:2, 9–10

4.9.1 – *De tot generibus operum quid utique ad piscaturam respexit, ut ab illa in apostolos sumeret Simonem et filios Zebedaei ... dicens [Jesus] Petro trepidanti de copiosa indagine piscium: Ne time, abhinc enim homines eris capiens.*

Concerning chapter 5, Harnack rightly noted that according to our sources Marcion's Gospel "bot alle Erzählungen dieses Kapitels; aber im einzelnen ist nur wenig bekannt."<sup>25</sup> In the first pericope (Luke 5:1–11), Tertullian makes reference to fishermen, the astonishment at the abundant catch of fish, and Simon and the sons of Zebedee (vv. 2, 9, 10).<sup>26</sup> For Jesus' words in v. 10 Tertullian attests, as Harnack reconstructed, μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γὰρ ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωογρῶν.<sup>27</sup> The general accuracy of the citation is confirmed by the lack of influence from the rather differently worded Synoptic parallels (Matt 4:19/Mark 1:17) and the literal rendering of the Greek. Only the γὰρ is problematic; yet, given Tertullian's propensity

<sup>23</sup> According to IGNTP δεῖ με is attested by the remaining OL witnesses and numerous versions and church fathers before εὐαγγελίσασθαι, and is attested after the verb in B, W, and 892.

<sup>24</sup> The significance of this reading for the question of the relationship between Marcion's Gospel and Luke was noted in the discussion in chapter 3, n. 326.

<sup>25</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\*.

<sup>26</sup> Harnack did not reconstruct οἱ ἀλιεῖς in v. 2 and viewed Σίμων as attested for v. 3; however, since Simon is mentioned with the Sons of Zebedee, it is more likely that the reference is to v. 10. In addition, εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα is also not reconstructed by Harnack, though Amphoux is probably correct to see *dicens Petro* as a reference to this phrase ("Les premières éditions de Luc I. Le texte de Luc 5." *ETL* 67 [1991]: 322).

<sup>27</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 188\*.

alternately to exclude, include, or add conjunctions, it may not have been present in Marcion's text.<sup>28</sup>

#### 4.1.8 Luke 5:12–14

4.9.3 – ... *in leprosi purgationem ... in exemplo leprosi non contingendi*,... | 4.9.4 – ... *tetigit leprosum*,... | 4.9.7 – ... [as compared to Elisha in 2 Kgs 5] *Christum verbo vero solo, et hoc semel functo, curationem statim repraesentasse*. | 4.9.9 – ... *vetuit eum* [the healed leper] *divulgare ... iussit ordinem impleri: Vade, ostende te sacerdoti, et offer munus quod praecepit Moyses*. | 4.9.10 – *Itaque adiecit: Ut sit vobis in testimonium*,...

For Luke 5:12–14, v. 14 is also attested by Epiphanius. Harnack, based on 4.9.3, thought that Marcion's text read ἀνὴρ λεπρός with D (*vir leprosus* in d) in v. 12.<sup>29</sup> Since Tertullian only refers to the cleansing *leprosi*, however, the Greek could just as easily have been ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας. In fact, since the parallels in Matt 8:2/Mark 1:40 only speak of a λέπρος, it is not surprising that Tertullian, in a passing reference, would not employ either of the longer descriptions attested for Luke.<sup>30</sup> The exact reading of Marcion's text remains unknown. For v. 13, 4.9.4 attests ἥψατο, and 4.9.7 alludes to the word of Christ and the healing, revealing that the entire verse was present even if its wording is unrecoverable.

Tertullian's citations in 4.9.9, 10 attest ἄπελθε (though *vade* could also be rendering the imperatival sense of ἀπελθών) δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκον τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, ἵνα ἡ ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον.<sup>31</sup> The Matthean reading (καὶ ... Μωϋσῆς in Matt 8:4), ἵνα ἡ, and ὑμῖν are all worth noting.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Tsutsui simply notes that Tertullian attests γάρ ("Evangelium," 78), but Harnack stated that Marcion's text here reads with D and e (*Marcion*, 188\*). Harnack's claim is rather problematic because those manuscripts, along with d, offer a completely different reading of Jesus' statement (see IGNTP or NA<sup>27</sup>) that does indeed include γάρ, though in a significantly different context. The attempt by Amphoux to use the γάρ as key in positing the text of D being Marcion's model is speculative ("Luc 5," 323–24).

<sup>29</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 188\*.

<sup>30</sup> Note also the simple reference to a *leprosus* in 4.9.4 and to a *paralyticus* in 4.10.1 in the next pericope (see n. 34).

<sup>31</sup> It is not clear why IGNTP states that Marcion *apud* Tertullian attests ἵνα ἡ εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν.

<sup>32</sup> According to IGNTP these last elements, though in different orders, are attested in D, numerous OL manuscripts, and Ambrose. sy<sup>s</sup> attests ἵνα ἡ with αὐτοῖς.

#### 4.1.9 Luke 5:17–18, 24, 26

4.10.1 – *Curatur et paralyticus, et quidem in coetu, spectante populo.... Exurge, et tolle grabattum tuum,...* | 4.10.2 – ... *et dimissorem delictorum Christum recognosce ...* | 4.10.8 – *Qua igitur ratione admittas filium hominis,*<sup>33</sup> *Marcion, circumspicere non possum.* | 4.10.13 – ... *cur non secundum intentionem eorum [the Jews] de homine eis respondit habere eum potestatem dimittendi delicta, quando et filium hominis nominans hominem nominaret,...* | 4.10.14 – [Son of Man] *consecutum iudicandi potestatem, ac per eam utique et dimittendi delicta—qui enim iudicat, et absoluit—, ut scandalo isto discusso per scripturae recordationem facilius eum agnoscerent ipsum esse filium hominis ex ipsa peccatorum remissione. Denique nusquam adhuc professus est se filium hominis quam in isto loco primum in quo primum peccata dimisit, id est in quo primum iudicavit, dum absolvit.*

In Luke 5:17–26, vv. 20–21 are multiply cited. 4.10.1 contains an allusion to vv. 17, 18, and possibly 26 with the mention of a paralytic, an assembly, and the people looking on.<sup>34</sup> For v. 24, which is also attested by Epiphanius, Tertullian’s statements do allow for insight into Marcion’s Gospel. From the extended discussion in 4.10.6–16 it is obvious that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was present.<sup>35</sup> 4.10.13 attests ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἀμαρτίας,<sup>36</sup> and 4.10.1 ἐγείρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου.<sup>37</sup>

#### 4.1.10 Luke 5:27, 30

4.11.1 – *Publicanum adlectum a domino ...* | 4.11.2 – [Following a reference to Luke 5:31] *Si enim male valentes voluit intellegi ethnicos et publicanos, quos adlegebant,...*

In the discussion of Luke 5:27–32, apart from the multiply cited v. 31, 4.11.1 has a reference to the τελώνης and that he is called by “the Lord” (v. 27). 4.11.2 alludes to Jesus sitting μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν (v. 30). The reference to *ethnici* in

---

<sup>33</sup> Evans here adds in brackets “into the text of your gospel” (*Adversus Marcionem*, 2:299).

<sup>34</sup> Tertullian’s simple reference to a *paralyticus* (cf. also 4.12.15) instead of to an ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος (Luke 5:18) confirms the point made above concerning *leprosus*.

<sup>35</sup> Tertullian explicitly states that this is the first occurrence of “Son of Man” in the Gospel (4.10.14).

<sup>36</sup> IGNTP indicates that Athanasius also reads ἔχει ἐξουσίαν.

<sup>37</sup> This is the reading of D, d, and r<sup>1</sup>. **ℵ** and numerous other manuscripts attest ἄρον, and several other manuscripts read τὸν κράβαττον.



4.11.2 does not arise directly out of Marcion's text, though it could be a loose rendering of ἀμαρτωλοί.<sup>38</sup> Its use may be due to Tertullian's sarcastic statement that Marcion *nusquam legerat lumen et spem et <ex>spectationem nationum praedicari Christum* (4.11.1).

#### 4.1.11 Luke 5:33–35

4.11.4 – *Unde autem et Iohannes venit in medium? Subito Christus, subito et Iohannes.* | 4.11.5 – ... *si non etiam ipsum inter ceteros tinxisset, nemo discipulos Christi manducantes et bibentes ad formam discipulorum Iohannis adsidue ieiunantium et orantium provocasset,...* | 4.11.6 – *At nunc humiliter reddens rationem quod non possent ieiunare filii sponsi quamdiu cum eis esset sponsus, postea vero ieiunatuos promittens cum ablatus ab eis sponsus esset,...*

Allusions to Luke 5:33–34 are also found in Ephrem and v. 34 is attested by (Pseudo-)Ephrem. Tertullian's comments in 4.11.4 indicate that this is the first mention of John the Baptist in Marcion's Gospel.<sup>39</sup> In 4.11.5, v. 33 is attested, which Harnack reconstructed οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου πυκνὰ νηστεύουσιν καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται. (Christi Jünger) ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.<sup>40</sup> That Tertullian is following Marcion's Gospel may be supported by the presence of Lukan elements not found in the parallel Matt 9:14/Mark 2:18. In addition, this reconstruction is largely unproblematic as the manuscript tradition is quite uniform; however, the otherwise unattested order πυκνὰ νηστεύουσιν is probably due to Tertullian.

4.11.6 attests vv. 34–35, which Harnack reconstructed μὴ δύνανται νηστεύειν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὁ νύμφιος. ὅταν ἀπαρθῆ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νύμφιος ... νηστεύσουσιν.<sup>41</sup> The Lukan text has been influenced by Matthew in several manuscripts, and it is possible to view Marcion's text, as Harnack did, as also containing harmonization with Matthew.<sup>42</sup> Harnack, however, apparently did not consider the possibility that Tertullian created the closer

---

<sup>38</sup> καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν is omitted in C\*, D, 265, and d.

<sup>39</sup> See also Harnack, *Marcion*, 187\*.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 189\*.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> See IGNTP for complete data on the readings and Harnack's apparatus for his evidence for Marcion's Lukan text containing Matthean readings (*Marcion*, 189\*).

affinity with Matt 9:15.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, it may be that Tertullian is not following Marcion's text, but rather providing the sense of the verses, which is all his argument required, closer to their Matthean form. Thus, the actual wording of Marcion's text here, apart from where Luke and Matthew are identical, remains elusive.

#### 4.1.12 Luke 6:1–4

4.12.1 – *De sabbato ... Nec enim disceptaretur cur destrueret sabbatum, si destruere deberet.* | 4.12.5 – *Esurierant discipuli ea die; spicas decerptas manibus efflixerant, cibum operati ferias ruperant.... accusant Pharisei, ... de exemplo David introgressi sabbatis templum et operati cibum audenter fractis panibus propositionis.* | 4.12.14 – *Ita nec Christus omnino sabbatum rescindit, cuius legem tenuit et supra, in causa discipulorum pro anima operatus—esurientibus enim solacium cibi indulgit—, et nunc manum aridam curans,...*

In the two pericopes concerning the Sabbath (Luke 6:1–11), 6:5 is multiply cited, and vv. 3–4 are also attested by Epiphanius.<sup>44</sup> For v. 1, Tertullian alludes to ἐν σαββάτῳ (4.12.1) and then to the actions of the disciples (4.12.5). Harnack reconstructed v. 1b ἐπείνασαν οἱ μαθηταί, ἔτιλλον τοὺς στάχους ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσὶν (εἰργάσαντο βρώσιν?).<sup>45</sup> This reconstruction is problematic for several reasons.<sup>46</sup> First, ἐπείνασαν appears only in the parallel Matt 12:1, a fact which Harnack also recognized but which did not keep him from including the term in Marcion's text. Yet, several factors argue against Harnack's conclusion: though present in Matthew, the term appears in no witness to Luke 6:1; it is also used in a general reference to this account in 4.12.14; and it creates a closer parallel to David's hunger in Luke 6:3. Thus, the term is almost certainly due to Tertullian's tendency and argument.<sup>47</sup> Second, since ἐπείνασαν was not in Marcion's text the word order proposed by Harnack becomes unnecessary. The uniquely Lukan reference to ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσὶν may indicate that Tertullian is paying some attention to

---

<sup>43</sup> Though Matthew reads πενθεῖν in the question, D, W, 1424, and many of the versions read νηστεύειν.

<sup>44</sup> For discussion concerning its position in these verses see chapter 3, n. 30.

<sup>45</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 190\*.

<sup>46</sup> See also the disagreement with Harnack's reconstruction by Tsutsui ("Evangelium," 80–81).

<sup>47</sup> This conclusion is significantly more likely than Zahn's contention that Marcion himself intermingled Matt 12:1 and Luke 6:1 (*Geschichte*, 2:459).

Marcion's text, but the allusion simply does not reveal the precise wording of the verse.<sup>48</sup> Finally, Harnack, in his apparatus, stated that εἰργάσαντο βρώσιν appeared to have been present in Marcion's Gospel due to Tertullian's *operati cibum*, even though he placed a question mark in the main text.<sup>49</sup> This phrase, however, simply seems to be Tertullian's description of the actions undertaken by the disciple, and the activity to which objection was raised.<sup>50</sup> For v. 2, it is evident that the Pharisees were mentioned, and that they objected to what they had witnessed (4.12.1, 5), but nothing further is revealed about the wording of Marcion's text.

For vv. 3–4, Tertullian, in 4.12.5, attests the reference to David in v. 3, and alludes to εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ and τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως in v. 4.<sup>51</sup> Harnack viewed Tertullian's use of *sabbatis* as an easily understandable oversight, though Tsutsui viewed it as a tendentious statement to more closely link David with the activities of Jesus' disciples.<sup>52</sup> In either case, it was not in Marcion's text. In addition, the renewed use of *operati cibum* is a link created by Tertullian and does not reflect a reading in Marcion's Gospel.

#### **4.1.13 Luke 6:6–7, 9**

4.12.9 – *Exinde observant Pharisaei si medicinas sabbatis ageret, ut accusarent eum:...* | 4.12.11 – *... per manus arefactae restitutionem ... interrogat: Licetne sabbatis benefacere, an non? animam liberare an perdere?* | 4.12.14 – *... manum aridam curans,...*

In the pericope concerning the man with the withered hand (Luke 6:6–11), Tertullian attests elements of vv. 6, 7, and 9. In v. 6 he alludes to χεῖρ ξηρά (4.12.11, 14) and for v. 7 the general content of the verse is attested in 4.12.9, even if the precise wording is not recoverable.<sup>53</sup> Tertullian's reference, however, both omits

---

<sup>48</sup> Note also the simple omission of καὶ ἡσθιον by Tertullian.

<sup>49</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 190\*.

<sup>50</sup> The idea of “food” again appears in the general reference in 4.12.14.

<sup>51</sup> Harnack rather questionably reads ὁ Χριστός for Marcion's text in v. 3, apparently due to Tertullian's statement in 4.12.5 (*excusat illos Christus*). In his first edition Harnack stated that Χριστός instead of Ἰησοῦς was unattested elsewhere (*Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 171\*); however, in the second edition he apparently erroneously, according to IGNTF, wrote “mit Codd. Afric.” (*Marcion*, 190\*).

<sup>52</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 190\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 81.

<sup>53</sup> Harnack, who normally tended to reconstruct as many words as possible, here was content to write “παρετηροῦντο ... Φαρισαῖοι (das Folgende wesentlich identisch)” (*Marcion*, 190\*).

elements in and compresses the content of the verse.<sup>54</sup> This observation is particularly relevant when considering Tertullian’s citation of v. 9 in 4.12.11, from which Harnack reconstructed (ἐπερωτῶ) εἰ ἔξοστιν τοῖς σάββασιν (τῷ σαββάτῳ?) ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ μή; ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;<sup>55</sup> Given the observation just made about v. 7, it would appear that Harnack’s question, concerning the reading μή instead of κακοποιῆσαι, “ob Tert. nicht willkürlich verkürzt hat?” should be answered in the affirmative.<sup>56</sup> In addition, it is unclear whether Marcion read εἰ, though Harnack rightly notes that it is also unclear whether Marcion had “Sabbath” in the singular or plural (cf. Matt 12:12).<sup>57</sup>

#### 4.1.14 Luke 6:12–14, 16

4.13.1 – ... *certe ascendit in montem et illic pernoctat in oratione et utique auditur a patre.* | 4.13.4 – *Cur autem duodecim apostolos elegit,...* | 4.13.6 – *Mutat et Petro nomen de Simone,...*

Several elements in Luke 6:12–16 are attested by Tertullian, though once again specific details remain elusive. V. 16 is also attested by Epiphanius. In v. 12 Harnack reconstructed εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι ... διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ πατρός (τοῦ θεοῦ?).<sup>58</sup> Yet, in 4.13.1 προσεύξασθαι is not attested, and τοῦ πατρός certainly was not in Marcion’s text. Harnack recognized that τοῦ θεοῦ is universally attested, and therefore considered that reading as possible since “Tert. mag hier nur referieren.”<sup>59</sup> That Tertullian is imprecisely alluding to the verse, despite reference to obviously Lukan elements, is clear by his stating *ascendit in montem*, reflecting the more common ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος (cf. Matt 5:1; 14:23; 15:29) rather than ἐξελεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος.<sup>60</sup> That τοῦ πατρός is wording created by Tertullian is revealed by the fact that he does not mention simply “the

---

<sup>54</sup> For example, there is no mention of οἱ γραμματεῖς, and Tertullian expresses the idea of ἵνα εὐρώσιν κατηγορεῖν with *ut accusarent*.

<sup>55</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 190\*.

<sup>56</sup> Given the loose nature of the allusion it is unnecessary to posit, with IGNTF, an otherwise unattested λῦσαι (from Tertullian’s *liberare*) for Marcion’s text.

<sup>57</sup> The same uncertainty concerning the latter point was expressed by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:460.

<sup>58</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 191\*.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> IGNTF lists no evidence for ἀνέβη occurring in Luke 6:12.

Father” but writes *auditur a patre*, which he uses to create a direct connection to an altered reading of Ps 22:2 (4.13.2) and the prophets generally (4.13.3).<sup>61</sup>

Tertullian attests the words ἐκλεξάμενος, δώδεκα, and ἀποστόλους from v. 13; yet, greater precision, beyond the basic recognition that the words come from the Lukan account (cf. Matt 10:2/Mark 3:14), cannot be gained from the question in 4.13.4.<sup>62</sup> In v. 14, Tertullian refers to Jesus changing Simon’s name (4.13.6), which once again points to the Lukan Σίμωνα ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον.<sup>63</sup> Although Tertullian does not refer to v. 16 (attested by Eriphanius) in *Marc.* 4, he does refer to *Iudam traditorem* in 2.28.2.<sup>64</sup> There the reference is used in a series of “anti-antitheses” created by Tertullian to counter accusations leveled by Marcion against the creator, where Tertullian contends that the charge against “our God” (the Creator) is also true of “your God” (the God revealed by Jesus). Thus, Tertullian may also attest the presence of the reference to Judas as the betrayer in Marcion’s Gospel.

#### **4.1.15 Luke 6:17**

4.13.7 – *Conveniunt a Tyro et ex aliis regionibus multitudo, etiam transmarina.*

This verse is also attested by Eriphanius. The textual evidence for Luke 6:17b, alluded to by Tertullian in 4.13.7, is quite complicated and Harnack’s reconstruction, πλῆθος (πολὺ) ἀπὸ τῆς (παραλίου?) Τύρου καὶ ἄλλων τε χωρῶν (πόλεων?) καὶ τῆς περαίας ἐληλυθότων, is unconvincing.<sup>65</sup> The allusion does contain a reference to πλῆθος and to ἀπὸ Τύρου, though this is probably the only place name mentioned in order to strengthen the connection to Ps 86:4–5 quoted

---

<sup>61</sup> See also the comments in Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 167n3 and 168n3. For further discussion on the altered Ps 22:2 see Braun, “Le témoignage des Psaumes dans la polémique antimarcionite de Tertullien,” *Aug* 22 (1982): 152–53.

<sup>62</sup> Harnack’s reconstruction ἐκλεξάμενος δώδεκα . . . ἀποστόλους is a bit misleading in that it cannot be determined whether Marcion’s text read ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δώδεκα with most witnesses or ἐκλεξάμενος δώδεκα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν with numerous OL, and a handful of other, witnesses (*Marcion*, 191\*).

<sup>63</sup> Mark 3:16 also refers to the agency of Jesus (ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον), though according to IGNTP this reading does not appear in the Lukan manuscript tradition. Matt 10:2 simply states Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος.

<sup>64</sup> On the reading in 2.28.2 see Braun, *Contre Marcion II*, 210. Tertullian also refers to *Iudam ... traditorem* in *An.* 11.5 and to Judas as *traditor Christi* in *Praescr.* 3.11.

<sup>65</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 191\*. Tsutsui also notes “Die Textüberlieferung des Satzes ist sehr kompliziert, und Tertullians Anspielung zu knapp. Deshalb ist es unmöglich, den genauen Wortlaut festzustellen” (“Evangelium,” 81–82).

immediately subsequently.<sup>66</sup> Thus, *ex aliis regionibus* could be referring to the other locales mentioned in the verse. Harnack, along with Braun, also saw the reference to *etiam transmarine* reflecting the textual variant καὶ τῆς περαΐας (*et trans fretum*) found after Ἱερουσαλήμ in **N\***, **W**, and several OL manuscripts.<sup>67</sup> Though this view is possible, it is also possible that Tertullian uses the term to create a link with those who are described *veniunt ab aquiline et mari* in the citation of Isa 49:12 (4.13.7).

#### 4.1.16 Luke 6:24

4.15.3 – *Ecce enim demutat in maledictionem, ... Vae enim dicit. | 4.15.9 – Sed accidentia vitia divitiis illa in evangelio quoque ‘vae’ divitibus adscribunt: Quoniam, inquit, recepistis advocacionem vestram, ...*<sup>68</sup>

Luke 6:24 is also attested by Eznik. Tertullian’s citation of the verse in 4.15.9 attests οὐαὶ τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.<sup>69</sup> It is worth noting concerning the two “omissions” that Harnack cautioned “Ob plñ und ὑμῖν gefehlt haben bleibt ungewiß.”<sup>70</sup> As is often the case, the conjunction may well have been omitted by Tertullian.<sup>71</sup> Also, since ὑμῖν is not included in the allusion to Luke 6:25 and is elsewhere only omitted by Eutropius the Presbyter it is, in all likelihood, a simple omission by Tertullian.

#### 4.1.17 Luke 6:26

4.15.14 – *Vae, cum vobis benedixerint homines! Secundum haec faciebant et pseudoprophetae patres illorum.*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 6:26 οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα ἐποίουν καὶ τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.<sup>72</sup> Several elements, however, should be questioned. First, the omission of

<sup>66</sup> The citation begins *et ecce allophyli et Tyrus et populus Aethiopum* (4.13.7).

<sup>67</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 191\* and Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 172n3. Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 248n1201 follows Braun.

<sup>68</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 6:24 occur in 4.15.6–8, 10–11.

<sup>69</sup> This is also the reconstruction of Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*. The manuscript tradition for this verse is relatively uniform.

<sup>70</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*. Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:461.

<sup>71</sup> According to IGNTP πλñν is only omitted in **Λ**, 716, 1187\*, and the Persian Diatessaron.

<sup>72</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 192\*.

ὕμῖν in 6:24, 25 reveals that it could have been present after οὐαί here as it is in D, W\*, sy<sup>s</sup>, sy<sup>p</sup>, co, and several other witnesses.<sup>73</sup> Second, though ὑμῶς is set before καλῶς in P<sup>75</sup>, B, e, g<sup>1</sup>, and q, Tertullian’s propensity to move pronouns does not necessarily mean this was the reading of Marcion’s text.<sup>74</sup> Third, πάντες before οἱ ἄνθρωποι, with D and numerous others witnesses, may have been missing, though a simple omission by Tertullian cannot be ruled out. Fourth and finally, the omission of γάρ before and the addition of καί after ἐποίουν are not certain.<sup>75</sup>

#### 4.1.18 Luke 6:34

4.17.1 – ... *Et si feneraveritis a quibus speratis vos recepturos, quae gratia est vobis?*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 6:34a καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ’ ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν, ποία χάρις ἐστὶν ὑμῖν.<sup>76</sup> That Marcion’s text read ἀπολαβεῖν may be confirmed not only by the fact that it is read in many manuscripts,<sup>77</sup> but also because one would expect Tertullian to have used *accipere* in rendering λαμβάνω, as he does in 13:19 (4.30.1) and 22:15 (4.40.3).<sup>78</sup> Also, given the various readings in the manuscripts, it is possible, though not certain, that Tertullian’s future perfect attests δανίσητε in Marcion’s text. In addition, though ὑμῖν is attested at the end of the phrase in D and numerous OL manuscripts,<sup>79</sup> Tertullian’s inclination to move pronouns renders its position in Marcion’s text uncertain. Finally, it is curious that Harnack included no mention of Tertullian’s attesting ὑμεῖς after ἐλπίζετε. The

<sup>73</sup> Manuscripts omitting ὑμῖν include P<sup>75</sup>, ℵ, A, B, and numerous others.

<sup>74</sup> See NA<sup>27</sup> for the various orders in which ὑμῶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν is found in the manuscript tradition.

<sup>75</sup> The omission of γάρ is also found in D, 1319, several lectionaries, most OL manuscripts, and the Persian Diatessaron. The addition of καί is found in b, f, q, and in Irenaeus.

<sup>76</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 194\*.

<sup>77</sup> NA<sup>27</sup> reads λαβεῖν on the strength of the testimony from P<sup>75vid</sup>, ℵ, B, L, W, and a few other witnesses.

<sup>78</sup> Tsutsui questionably states “Das Futur ‘recepturos’ entspricht wohl der Lesart von EvThom 95” (“Evangelium,” 84). Apart from saying 95 of *Gospel of Thomas* being only loosely parallel to Luke 6:34, even if the parallel were closer, Tertullian’s use of the future to render the sense of a verb in another tense has already been seen to be part of Tertullian’s citation habit. The use of a different mood by Tertullian here, especially when the manuscript tradition attests no other mood than the infinitive, seems more likely.

<sup>79</sup> Though D and d also omit ἐστὶν making their reading different in respects other than simply word order.

pronoun is read in b, q, and r<sup>1</sup>, though it may very well have been added here by Tertullian.

#### 4.1.19 Luke 6:35

4.17.5 – *Et eritis filii dei.* | 4.17.6 – *Quia ipse, inquit, suavis est adversus ingrates et malos.... Sed quis iste suavis,...?*

Without any transition from the previous discussion, in 4.17.5 Tertullian cites part of Luke 6:35b. He attests καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ θεοῦ, and Harnack rightly noted that no other witness attests θεοῦ instead of ὑψίστου.<sup>80</sup> Yet, Harnack did not mention that e reads *fili Altissimi Dei*. It is not probable, however, that either υἱοὶ ὑψίστου θεοῦ or υἱοὶ θεοῦ was the reading of Marcion's text.<sup>81</sup> The reading may be due to Tertullian himself as υἱοὶ ὑψίστου occurs only here in the NT, whereas υἱοὶ θεοῦ occurs in Matt 5:9, Rom 8:14, Rom 9:26, and Gal 3:26.<sup>82</sup> Also relevant is that in the following discussion Tertullian focuses exclusively on the absurdity of being made "sons" by Marcion's god who forbade marriage. Forms of *filius* occur throughout 4.17.5, but no element of the discussion would be affected by the question of whether the sons were called "sons of God" or "sons of the most high."<sup>83</sup> Therefore, with his thoughts on the "sons" element Tertullian may have unconsciously written the more common *filii dei*.<sup>84</sup> Tertullian continues the citation in 4.17.6 attesting the nearly uniform reading ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.

#### 4.1.20 Luke 6:36

4.17.8 – *Estote, inquit, misericordes, sicut pater vester*<sup>85</sup> *misertus est vestri.... Aut si alius nunc misericordiam praecepit, quia et ipse misericors sit,...*

---

<sup>80</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 194\*.

<sup>81</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:462 overstated the case when he called Tertullian's citation "genau."

<sup>82</sup> It is worth noting that Marcion's text read υἱοὶ ἐστε (τῆς) πίστεως in Gal 3:26, but was not an alteration by Marcion himself (see Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 114–16, 346). Also, Tertullian makes reference to *filios Dei* from Matt 5:9 in *Pat.* 11.8 and *Pud.* 2.2.

<sup>83</sup> See Wright, *Alterations*, 128 for a similar view.

<sup>84</sup> Thus, contra Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:452, there may indeed be an "erdenklichen Grund" for the possibility that Tertullian has provided an inexact citation.

<sup>85</sup> *Vester* is omitted by β and Gelenius, but attested by *M* and retained by all the other editors.



Harnack reconstructed this verse γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ᾧ κτεῖρεν ὑμᾶς (οἰκτίρμων ἔστιν?).<sup>86</sup> The most obvious question relates to the conclusion of the verse as Harnack noted, “Hier ist die Entscheidung schwierig; die erste Fassung ist sonst unbezeugt; die zweite ist die Lukanische.”<sup>87</sup> The context gives no further clues and with the absence of multiple citation or multiple attestation no firm conclusion can be reached as to whether the citation or the allusion renders Marcion’s text. The absence of οὖν after γίνεσθε and καί after καθὼς in Tertullian’s citation is not definitive, though the strong textual evidence for their omission may make their absence in Marcion’s text slightly more likely.<sup>88</sup> Finally, though there is some question in the textual tradition of Tertullian’s works concerning *vester*, it most likely was present here and in Marcion’s text.<sup>89</sup>

#### 4.1.21 Luke 6:38

4.17.9 – ... *date et dabitur vobis. Mensuram bonam, pressam ac fluentem dabunt in sinum vestrum. Eadem, qua mensi eritis, mensura remetietur vobis.*

The final element of this verse is also attested in *Adam*. In 4.17.9 Tertullian quotes Luke 6:37 and 38 together, though only 6:37 is multiply cited. For v. 38 he attests δίδοτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλόν, πεπιεσμένον καὶ ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ μετρεῖτε<sup>90</sup> ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.<sup>91</sup> Apart from πεπιεσμένον καὶ ὑπερεκχυννόμενον, most of 6:38a, b is unproblematic. IGNTP lists numerous variants for the problematic phrase. Though the reading attested by Tertullian (πεπιεσμένον καὶ ὑπερεκχυννόμενον) is found in a few manuscripts,<sup>92</sup> the omission

---

<sup>86</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 194\*.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>88</sup> See IGNTP for the data.

<sup>89</sup> IGNTP lists Marcion as the only witness omitting ὑμῶν. However, even if one concludes that *vester* was not present in Tertullian’s work, his inconsistent rendering of pronouns makes a definitive verdict concerning the absence of the pronoun in Marcion’s text questionable.

<sup>90</sup> IGNTP interprets the *mensi eritis* here and *mensi eritis, mensi fueritis, metieritis*, and *mensuraveritis* in the OL manuscripts as attesting a Greek future (μετρήσετε). Though possible, in the absence of any Greek attestation for this reading the future perfect plus perfect construction may simply reflect a Latin stylistic choice.

<sup>91</sup> This is also Harnack’s reconstruction (*Marcion*, 194\*).

<sup>92</sup> IGNTP lists 71\*, 828\*, 148, gat, and a few witnesses to geo.

of σεσαλευμένον could be due to Tertullian's omitting an element from a multiple-element phrase.

Discussion of v. 38c must also take the testimony of *Adam.* into account, though it may here be noted that the omission of the conjunction γάρ, though also attested in other manuscripts, may be due to Tertullian. In addition, Tertullian's word order (τῶ αὐτῶ ᾧ μετρεῖτε μέτρῳ), is elsewhere unattested for either Luke 6:38 or the parallel in Matt 7:2. This possible, though unlikely, order is therefore also probably due to his own hand.

#### **4.1.22 Luke 6:41-42**

4.17.12 – *Eximat et de oculo suo trabem haereticus, tunc in oculo Christiani si quam putat stipulam revincat.*

In the allusion to Luke 6:41–42 in 4.17.12, Tertullian clearly attests the presence and general teaching of the verses even if no insight can be gained into the reading of Marcion's text.<sup>93</sup>

#### **4.1.23 Luke 6:45**

4.17.12 – ... *sic nec Marcion aliquid boni de thesauro Cerdonis malo protulit, nec Appelles de Marcionis.*

Luke 6:45 is also attested by Origen. Tertullian, following the reference to the multiply-cited Luke 6:43, merely alludes to Luke 6:45 and the issue of good and evil proceeding from good or evil treasure. No insight into the wording of the verse in Marcion's Gospel can be gained.<sup>94</sup>

#### **4.1.24 Luke 6:46**

4.17.13 – *Si ita est, quis videbitur dixisse: Quid voca<ti>s,<sup>95</sup> domine, domine? |*

4.17.14 – *Quis item adiecisse potuisset: Et non facitis quae dico?*

---

<sup>93</sup> Harnack simply noted "Anspielung" and offered no reconstruction (*Marcion*, 194\*).

<sup>94</sup> Once again, Harnack simply noted "Anspielung" and offered no reconstruction (*ibid.*, 195\*).

<sup>95</sup> *Vocatis* is read by Pamelius, Rigalti, and Kroymann whereas θ and the other editors read *vocas*.

Harnack reconstructed Luke 6:46 τί με (unsicher) καλεῖτε (καλεῖς?) κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε (ποιεῖς?) ἃ λέγω.<sup>96</sup> It is curious that in the second edition Harnack indicated his uncertainty about several readings when his comment in the apparatus remained essentially the same: “Daß Tert. „me“ gelesen hat, zeigt die folgende Ausführung; daß „vocatis“ zu lesen ist, folgt mit einer gewissen Wahrscheinlichkeit aus „facitis“.”<sup>97</sup> The omission of the pronoun με could well be due to Tertullian, and though several manuscripts also omit δέ after τί, Tertullian may also be responsible for the absence of the conjunction. Finally, the attestation of *vocas* and *facitis* in the manuscript tradition is confusing, and the reading *vocatis* is warranted even if not completely secure.<sup>98</sup>

#### 4.1.25 Luke 7:12, 14–16

4.18.2 – *Resuscitavit et mortuum filium viduae... ut omnes illic creatori gloriam retulerint, dicentes: Magnus propheta prodiit in nobis, et respexit deus populum suum.*<sup>99</sup>

In 4.18.2 Tertullian makes a general reference to the pericope in Luke 7:11–17, though once again only elements from one verse can be reconstructed. After stating that Jesus raised a widow’s dead son (vv. 12, 14–15), Tertullian cites v. 16. Harnack reconstructed this verse ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν ... μέγας προφήτης προῆλθεν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.<sup>100</sup> According to IGNTP the order μέγας προφήτης is only attested by Chrysostem and Origen, and it cannot be ruled out that it is here due to Tertullian. In addition, Harnack believed that Tertullian’s *prodiit* revealed Marcion having changed his text to read προῆλθεν instead of ἠγέρθη, thus avoiding a passive form.<sup>101</sup> The OL manuscripts, however,

<sup>96</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 195\*.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid. “Mit einer gewissen Wahrscheinlichkeit” did not appear in the note of the first edition, and the text was reconstructed without any of the elements in parentheses (Harnack, *Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 177\*).

<sup>98</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:463, however, makes reference to Junius’s conjecture *facis* provided in his annotations on Pamelius’s text. According to IGNTP no other witness attests καλεῖς, and only Clementina reads ποιεῖς.

<sup>99</sup> Further allusions to Luke 7:16 occur in 4.18.3 and 4.19.9.

<sup>100</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 196\*.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid. Harnack provided only ἠγέρθη as the Lukan reading and did not mention ἐγήγερται, the reading of most manuscripts, including D. He rightly stated that προῆλθεν is otherwise unattested.

all also read an active form here (*surrexit*). Furthermore, though the use of the verb *prodire* to render ἐγείρω would be somewhat unusual, Harnack did not find it problematic to posit the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι behind the perhaps only slightly less unusual *respicere*.<sup>102</sup> Thus, Harnack’s argument appears less than persuasive, though it still remains unclear whether Marcion’s text read ἠγέρθη or ἐγήγερται. Finally, the omission of ὅτι after καί may very well be a simple omission by Tertullian as he did not include it at the beginning of the clause either.

#### 4.1.26 Luke 7:24

4.18.7 – ... *si et testimonium Iohanni perhibet ...* | 4.18.8 – ... *Quid existis videre in solitudinem?...*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 7:24 (ἦρξατο λέγειν) περὶ Ἰωάννου· τί ἐξεληλύθατε θεάσασθαι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον,<sup>103</sup> Concerning this reconstruction, first, the majority reading is ἐξεληλύθατε, but P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, B, D, L, W and numerous other manuscripts read ἐξήλθατε. The Latin perfect, *existis*, could render either form so it is not entirely clear that Harnack’s reading is correct. In addition, IGNTP gives no other witness for εἰς τὴν ἔρημον following instead of preceding the infinitive. That Tertullian is responsible for the word order cannot be excluded.

#### 4.1.27 Luke 7:37–38, 47–48, 50

4.18.9 – *Diximus de remissa peccatorum. Illius autem peccatricis feminae argumentum eo pertinebit, ut cum pedes domini osculis figeret, lacrimis inundaret, crinibus detergeret, unguento perduceret,... et ut peccatricis paenitentia ... mererit veniam,...* [the woman] *per paenitentiam ex fide iustificatam ab eo* [Jesus] *audivit: Fides tua te salvam fecit,...*

Tertullian’s statement “we have already spoken of the forgiveness of sins” (4.18.9) prefaces, and provides the reason for, a cursory reference to the pericope in Luke 7:36–50. In this passage vv. 36–38, and 44–45 are attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian makes reference to the γυνή described as ἀμαρτωλός (v. 37), what she

---

<sup>102</sup> In the Gospels, ἐπισκέπτομαι is used five times (Matt 25:36, 43; Luke 1:68, 78; Luke 7:16). For the occurrences, nearly the entire OL manuscript tradition uniformly renders the verb with *visitare*, the only exceptions being the use of *venire* in ff<sup>1</sup>, ff<sup>2</sup>, and q in Matt 25:43 and *prospicere* in e in Luke 1:68.

<sup>103</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 197\*.

did (v. 38), her repentance and pardon (vv. 47–48), and then quotes Jesus’ words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε (v. 50).<sup>104</sup> The listing of the woman’s actions (v. 38) has clearly been adapted by Tertullian as seen by his placing the verb at the end of each element. Thus, no significance should be attributed to the word order of each element, and perhaps no significance should be read into the order of the elements themselves, though it is worth noting that Tertullian lists the actions of the woman in the order τοὺς πόδας κατεφίλει, τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξε, ταῖς θριξίν ἐξέμασσεν, and τῷ μύρῳ ἤλειφεν.

#### 4.1.28 Luke 8:2-3

4.19.1 – *Quod divites Christo mulieres adhaerebant, quae et de facultatibus suis ministrabant ei, inter quas et uxor regis procuratoris, de prophetia est.*

In 4.19.1 Tertullian alludes to certain elements in Luke 8:2–3 that he argues are in accordance with prophecy. For these verses Harnack reconstructed γυναῖκες ... γυνὴ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου, αἴτινες καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν.<sup>105</sup> Though Harnack rightly recognized that “auf seine [Tertullian’s] Wortstellung ist hier kein Gewicht zu legen,” he nevertheless questionably placed considerable weight on individual elements found in Tertullian’s adaptation of this verse.<sup>106</sup>

First, though καί is attested in several manuscripts, including D and numerous OL manuscripts, and may have been in Marcion’s text, its presence is far from certain. Apart from the usual difficulty of evaluating Tertullian’s testimony involving conjunctions, here Tertullian lifts three elements from v. 3 that are “from prophecy” and joins them with *et*. Thus, the flow of Tertullian’s thought can easily account for the conjunction.

---

<sup>104</sup> IGNTP lists Marcion *apud* Tertullian as attesting the reading σε σέσωκεν, along with the OL manuscripts and several Latin church fathers. However, Tertullian in every instance cites this phrase as *fides tua te salvam fecit* (cf. Luke 8:48; 17:19; and the multiply cited 18:42) and the OL manuscripts almost uniformly place *te* before the verb in every occurrence of the phrase in the Gospels (Matt 9:22; Mark 5:34, 10:52; Luke 7:50, 8:48, 17:19, 18:42). The only exceptions are d in Luke 17:19 and d, e in Luke 18:42. Thus, it is not clear that these OL witnesses, and certainly not Tertullian, can be used as evidence for a variant word order in the Greek. In addition, IGNTP is curiously inconsistent in that it attributes the variant reading σε σέσωκεν to Marcion and the OL witnesses in Luke 7:50, 8:48, and 17:19, but lists no variants in Luke 18:42.

<sup>105</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 197\*.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

Second, the reading αὐτῶ is attested by numerous manuscripts, including **Σ**, A, and L, making its presence here possible. Since it is also the reading of Matt 27:55/Mark 15:41, however, it is conceivable that Tertullian has been influenced by the wording in the other Synoptics. In addition, Tertullian follows the reference to Luke 8:2–3 with a citation of Isa 32:9–10, which he applies to Christ. Thus αὐτῶ instead of αὐτοῖς fits naturally into Tertullian’s argument.

Third, *suis* should probably be read as rendering αὐταῖς and not αὐτῶν. Though the latter is read in a handful of manuscripts, including **Σ\*** and D, every OL manuscript, except d, renders the verse *de facultatibus suis*.<sup>107</sup> It is worth noting that IGNTP does not consider the OL manuscripts to be attesting αὐτῶν.

Finally, Harnack was probably right in seeing *regis* as a reference to Ἡρώδου, though it would be more accurate to place ellipses before and after γυνή, as the impression should not be given that the unattested names Joanna and Chuza were absent in Marcion’s Gospel.

#### **4.1.29 Luke 8:4, 8**

4.19.2 – *Aeque de parabolis ... dedit Christo frequenter inculcare: Qui habet aures, audiat.... Qui habet aures, audiat.*

In 4.19.2 Tertullian appears to allude to παραβολή in v. 4, and then twice quotes the conclusion of the parable in v. 8 in the form ὁ ἔχων ὠτα ἀκούετω. Harnack, who also reconstructed the text in this manner, rightly noted that this is not the Lukan, but rather the Matthean reading.<sup>108</sup> Yet, the fact that Tertullian introduces the citation with the idea that Christ frequently spoke these words, that this is the form always found in Matthew and only in Matthew (cf. Matt 11:5, 13:9, and 13:43), and that it is essentially unattested for Luke makes it quite likely that this form is due to Tertullian and not the reading of Marcion’s Gospel.

#### **4.1.30 Luke 8:16**

4.19.5 – ... *lucernam negat abscondi solere...*

---

<sup>107</sup> d reads *de substantia sua*. Also, it is not entirely clear whether *de* is rendering ἀπό or ἐκ, though the former is more likely.

<sup>108</sup> Harnack stated it was a “bei Luk. völlig unbezeugte Fassung” (*Marcion*, 198\*). IGNTP states that 2643 also omits ἀκούειν.

Tertullian makes a passing allusion to Luke 8:16 in 4.19.5 where the general content of the verse of no one hiding (καλύπτει) a lamp (λύχνον) is evident; yet, no further insight into the reading of the text can be gained.

#### 4.1.31 Luke 8:22–25

4.20.1 – *Quis autem iste est qui ventis<sup>109</sup> et mari imperat?... sed agnorant substantiae auctorem suum, quae famulis quoque eius obaudire consueverant.* |

4.20.2 – ... *praedicatio marinae istius expeditionis* ... | 4.20.3 – *Nam cum transfretat ... Cum undas freti discutit, ... Cum ad minas eius eliditur mare, ... utique cum ventis, quibus inquietabatur.*

Vv. 23–24 in this pericope are also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian begins his testimony to the passage with a reference to v. 25b, which Harnack reconstructed τίς (ἄρα) οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅς τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ;<sup>110</sup> It is interesting to note that here Harnack observed “Tert. „*autem*“, aber das ist unerheblich (ebenso die Wortstellung gleich darauf),” and one can only speculate as to why Harnack was not able to recognize these points more often.<sup>111</sup> In addition, though ὅς and the omission of καί after it does have some attestation in the manuscript tradition, Tertullian may simply be providing a loose phrasing focusing on the identity and activity of the “who” in the question, namely, Christ. The reading τῇ θαλάσῃ found in the Synoptic parallels (cf. Matt 8:27/Mark 4:41) is also noteworthy.<sup>112</sup> It is found in numerous OL manuscripts and several versions in Luke, but the possibility of Tertullian being influenced by the parallel accounts must be taken into account.<sup>113</sup>

In 4.20.3, the verb *transfretare* seems to refer to διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν of v. 22, where numerous OL manuscripts also use this verb to render the phrase.<sup>114</sup> The

---

<sup>109</sup> Moreschini rejects the reading *et ventis* found in R<sub>3</sub>, Gelenius, Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.

<sup>110</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 199\*.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 198\*.

<sup>112</sup> Concerning word order, it is also worth noting that Matt and Mark speak of οἱ ἄνεμοι (Mark: ὁ ἄνεμος) καὶ ἡ θάλασσα obeying Jesus.

<sup>113</sup> Harnack incorrectly stated that this reading is unattested in Luke (*Marcion*, 198\*).

<sup>114</sup> It is not clear why Harnack inserted an ellipsis after διέλθωμεν (*ibid.*). Also, Braun notes that *transfretare* is used in the Vulgate, though there is an apparent misprint in placing LXX before the citation of the Greek of Luke 8:22 (*Contre Marcion IV*, 251n7).

“windstorm” in v. 23 (λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου) may lie behind the comment about the wind having disquieted (*inquietabatur*) the sea in 4.20.3. In the same section, Tertullian’s testimony to v. 24 attests the rebuke of the sea, again the reading of the parallels in Matt 8:26/Mark 4:39, and of the wind.

#### 4.1.32 Luke 8:27–28, 30–32

4.20.4 – ... *cum invenis in uno homine multitudinem daemonum, legionem se professam, ... atque ita ipsum esse qui cum legione quoque daemonum erat dimicaturus,...* | 4.20.5 – *Cuius autem dei filium Iesum legio testatus est? Sine dubio cuius tormenta et abyssum noverant et timebant.* | 4.20.6 – *Non enim depetunt [the demons] ab alio quod meminissent petendum sibi a creatore, veniam scilicet abyssi creatoris.* | 4.20.7 – *Denique impetraverunt.... deum abyssi ...*

In the pericope of the demoniac and the swine (Luke 8:26–39), v. 30 is also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian’s testimony renders numerous elements in multiple verses, though not all in order. In 4.20.4 Tertullian refers to the ἀνὴρ and him having δαιμόνια (v. 27),<sup>115</sup> followed by a reference to the demon calling himself λεγεώων (v. 30). V. 28 is attested in 4.20.5, and Harnack reconstructed Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ (wahrscheinlich fehlte τοῦ ὑψίστου) μή με βασιάνησ.<sup>116</sup> Harnack argued “τοῦ ὑψίστου fehlte wahrscheinlich, weil Tert. sonst nicht so fragen konnte [in 4.20.5].”<sup>117</sup> This contention, however, is speculative because Tertullian’s answer reveals the rhetorical purpose for the question. The focus on the God of the “known and feared torment and abyss” is an emphasis that would not necessarily be brought out by the term τοῦ ὑψίστου, and Tertullian may simply have omitted it.<sup>118</sup> In 4.20.6 reference is made to παρεκάλουν and the request not to send the demons εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον (v. 31).<sup>119</sup>

<sup>115</sup> That Tertullian draws these elements from Luke 8:27 is likely due to his emphasis on one man. Matt 8:28 speaks of δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι.

<sup>116</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 199\*.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid. The same point was made by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:452.

<sup>118</sup> Tsutsui states that the words may have been omitted, but remains uncommitted to Marcionite redactional activity (“Evangeliem,” 89).

<sup>119</sup> On the extremely rare verb *depetere* see Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 255n8, who also recognizes that it is an echo of παρακαλέω.



Greater uncertainty surrounds vv. 32–37, and Harnack contended that the verses were omitted by Marcion and that his text only had “Sie erlangten es.”<sup>120</sup> Braun rightly notes the problem with this view, responding “Ce n’est pas sûr et *impetrauerunt* [4.20.7] peut fort bien renvoyer à ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς (*permissit illis*) du v. 32. L’adverbe *denique* indique clairement que le récit est abrégé.”<sup>121</sup>

#### 4.1.33 Luke 8:43–46, 48

4.20.8 – ... *tangitur a femina, quae sanguine fluitabat, et nescivit a qua. Quis me, inquit, tetigit? Etiam excusantibus discipulis perseverat in ignorantiae voce: Tetigit me aliquis, idque de argumento adfirmat: Sensi enim uirtutem ex me profectam.*<sup>122</sup> | 4.20.9 – ... *dixit: Fides tua te salvam fecit.* | 4.20.13 – *Nec illud omittam, quod, dum tangitur vestimentum eius,...*<sup>123</sup>

In this account, vv. 44–46 are also attested by Epiphanius.<sup>124</sup> Tertullian’s testimony begins with a general reference to the pericope (4.20.8), as he notes that a woman with an issue of blood touched Jesus (vv. 43–44). This general reference is followed by citations of several verses. For v. 45 Tertullian attests the Markan form of the question τίς μου ἥψατο (Mark 5:31)<sup>125</sup> followed by a reference to the Markan οἱ μαθηταί, implying their comment that Jesus is surrounded by a crowd.<sup>126</sup> In reply, Tertullian attests Jesus’ words ἥψατό μου τις and ... γὰρ ἔγνω δύνάμιν

<sup>120</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 199\*.

<sup>121</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 256n1. Lukas notes Harnack’s view and comments “zu beweisen ist das nicht” (*Rhetorik*, 267n1266). Tsutsui sees an allusion to vv. 32–39 in the words *denique impetrauerunt* (“Evangelium,” 89), but this seems to include too much in Tertullian’s brief reference.

<sup>122</sup> The broader context of the discussion here is Marcion’s accusation that the Creator is ignorant as evidenced by his question “Adam, where are you?” (Gen 3:9). Tertullian argues that Marcion’s Christ is also ignorant, and the statement *etiam excusantibus discipulis* is a reference to the reason offered by the disciples (i.e., he is surrounded by a crowd pressing in on him) for Jesus not knowing who touched him. However, Tertullian points out that even with this “excuse” Jesus persists in his expression of ignorance.

<sup>123</sup> Tertullian also refers to the woman touching Jesus in 4.20.10, 11.

<sup>124</sup> Tertullian may also be referring to this account in 3.8.4. Harnack was certain that Epiphanius read this pericope in a shortened form, though Harnack provided no argument for this conviction (*Marcion*, 199\*). It apparently is this fact that led Harnack to provide a very curious reconstruction. He reconstructed just over three lines of Greek text for “42b–48,” then wrote “dazu” and offered additional words for vv. 43, 44, 45, and 48.

<sup>125</sup> This is the form when the disciples restate Jesus’s question. In Mark 5:30 Jesus says τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων.

<sup>126</sup> See n. 122.

ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ (v. 46).<sup>127</sup> In 4.20.9 Jesus’ words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε (v. 48) are attested.<sup>128</sup> At the conclusion of the discussion Tertullian, in order to demonstrate that Jesus had a body, makes a further reference to v. 44 (ἤψατο ... τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ).

Though the evidence from Epiphanius must also be taken into account, it is worth noting that the Markan form of the question in v. 45 is also attested by D and several OL manuscripts. Also, Harnack believed the, for Luke, otherwise unattested οἱ μαθηταί to be the reading of Marcion’s text;<sup>129</sup> yet, many manuscripts read Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σύν αὐτῶ (μετ’ αὐτοῦ in a few witnesses), and if this was the reading in Marcion’s text Tertullian could be simplifying the expression. Finally, in v. 44 τοῦ κρασπέδου is omitted by D and several OL manuscripts, raising the possibility that it was also missing in Marcion’s text.

#### 4.1.34 Luke 9:2–3, 5

4.21.1 – *Dimittit discipulos ad praedicandum dei regnum.... Prohibet eos victui aut vestitui quid in viam ferre.... At cum iubet pulverem excutere de pedibus in eos a quibus excepti non fuissent, et hoc in testimonium mandat fieri.*

Luke 9:2–3 is also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian alludes to the disciples (in v. 1 there is a reference to Jesus calling together τοὺς δώδεκα) whom Jesus ἀπέστειλεν ... κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>130</sup> There is a clear allusion to v. 3 and the prohibition to take bread and two tunics, amongst other items, though based on Tertullian’s testimony no reconstruction of the text is possible. Tertullian’s adaptation of v. 5 seems to attest μὴ δέχωνται [ὑμᾶς] and τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν [ὑμῶν] ἀποτινάξατε εἰς μαρτύριον.<sup>131</sup> Though the precise readings of

<sup>127</sup> Once again Harnack rightly noted “die Wortstellung bei Tert. hier und in v. 48 ist ohne Bedeutung” (*Marcion*, 200\*).

<sup>128</sup> For the word order see n. 104.

<sup>129</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 199\*.

<sup>130</sup> IGNTP states τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν βασιλείαν for Maricon *apud* Tertullian with no other witnesses. To conclude that this was the reading in Marcion would read too much into Tertullian’s word order.

<sup>131</sup> There is also strong manuscript evidence for the readings δέχωνται and ἀποτινάσσατε. Marcion’s text almost certainly read either aorist or present subjunctives and imperatives, and the infinitives suggested by Harnack (δέχεσθαι and ὑποτινάσσειν [*sic*, Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 89 already drew attention to the likely misprint]), are nowhere else attested and unlikely.

Marcion's text are not clearly evident, the strongly Lukan tenor of the references is obvious.<sup>132</sup>

#### **4.1.35 Luke 9:7–8**

4.21.2 – *Nullum deum novum a Christo probatum illa etiam opinio omnium declaravit, quia Christum Iesum alii Iohannem, alii Heliam, alii unum aliquem ex veteribus prophetis Herodi adseverabant. Ex quibus quicumque fuisset, non utique hoc est suscitatus ut alium deum post resurrectionem praedicaret.*

In Tertullian's adaptation of Luke 9:7–8, there are references to Ἡρώδης and ὑπό τινων [ὅτι] Ἰωάννης [ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν] (v. 7), as well as to ὑπό τινων ... Ἡλίας and ἄλλων προφήτης εἷς τῶν ἀρχαίων [ἀνέστη] (v. 8). That some reference to John, Elijah, or one of the prophets rising from the dead was in the verses is clear; yet, given the various readings in the manuscript tradition the exact wording is not. In v. 7 Harnack commented “„omnium“ ist auffallend (Luk. τινων)”,<sup>133</sup> however, he appears to have misunderstood Tertullian's statement. Tertullian does attest the τινων (*alii*) in v. 7, and *opinion omnium* is a reference to the sum of what the different groups were saying. In v. 8 Harnack reconstructed εἷς τις τῶν ἀρχαίων προφητῶν (oder προφήτης τῶν ἀρχαίων).<sup>134</sup> Given that Tertullian is making a general reference to the content of the verses, the former, otherwise unattested, reading is unlikely and unnecessary to posit. Finally, *unum* probably attests εἷς, though, with numerous manuscripts, τις is not impossible.

#### **4.1.36 Luke 9:12–14, 17**

4.21.3 – *Pascit populum in solitudine, ... panis et piscis ... quinque circiter ... milia hominum ...* | 4.21.4 – *... pabuli exiguitatem non tantum sufficere, verum etiam exuberare ...*

In the pericope of the feeding of the five thousand (Luke 9:10–17), Tertullian alludes to ἐν ἐρήμῳ (v. 12), ἄρτοι ... καὶ ἰχθύες (v. 13), πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες

---

<sup>132</sup> For comments on the reference to Matt 10:10 in 4.21.1 see Roth, “Matthean Readings,” 595–96.

<sup>133</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 200\*.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

(v. 14), and that there was an overabundance of food (τὸ περισσεύσαν in v. 17).<sup>135</sup> None of these references provides any particular insight into Marcion's text other than attesting the presence of the pericope in Marcion's Gospel.

#### 4.1.37 Luke 9:20–21

4.21.6 – ... *interroganti domino quisnam illis videretur, cum pro omnibus* [Peter] *responderet: Tu es Christus,*<sup>136</sup> ... *silentium indicens.... ille autem praecepit ne cui hoc dicerent,*...<sup>137</sup>

In Luke 9:20–21, v. 20 is also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian's testimony to this verse begins with a reference to Jesus' question to the disciples concerning his identity followed by a citation of Peter's response in the form of the parallel Mark 8:29, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός.<sup>138</sup> Tertullian's adaptation of v. 21 offers the final element, which Harnack reconstructed παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο. As λέγειν is the reading of numerous manuscripts, including P<sup>75</sup>, **N**, A, B, and D, it is likely for Marcion's text, though the Latin cannot rule out the reading εἰπεῖν in the TR.

#### 4.1.38 Luke 9:33–34

4.22.4 – ... *eius* [Peter] *suggerit consilium: Bonum est hic nos*<sup>139</sup> *esse—bonum plane, ubi Moyses scilicet et Helias—, et: Faciamus hic tria tabernacula, unum tibi, et Moysi unum, et Heliae unum. Sed nesciens quid diceret.*<sup>140</sup> | 4.22.7 – ... *sub eodem etiam ambitu nubis* [as in Exod 19:16–20],... | 4.22.13 – ... *utique nubilo illo ...* | 4.22.16 – ... *discessit a Christo ...*

Most of the account of the transfiguration is multiply cited (Luke 9:28, 29, 30–32, and 35). For v. 33 Harnack reconstructed ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι ... ὁ

<sup>135</sup> Harnack overlooked the “bread and fish” in Tertullian's testimony to v. 13 but did see φαγεῖν as attested for this verse, apparently extrapolated from the comment that Jesus “fed” the people in the wilderness (ibid.).

<sup>136</sup> The reply *Tu es Christus* is repeated in 4.22.6 and 4.34.15.

<sup>137</sup> Additional references to the silence enjoined occur in 4.21.7–8.

<sup>138</sup> The citation in Matt 16:16 also begins with these words. The idea that Peter spoke *pro omnibus* (4.21.6) is an addition by Tertullian (cf. Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 268n2 and Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 270n1277).

<sup>139</sup> Moreschini's text reads *hic nos* with *M* and Kroymann, though  $\beta$  and the other editors read *nos hic*.

<sup>140</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 9:33 occurs in 4.22.12.

Πέτρος· ... καλόν ἔστιν ὧδε ἡμᾶς εἶναι καὶ ποιήσωμεν ὧδε σκηνὰς τρεῖς, μίαν σοί καὶ Μωσῆ [sic] μίαν καὶ Ἡλίᾳ [sic] μίαν, μή εἰδῶς ὃ λέγει.<sup>141</sup> First, Harnack stated that the order ὧδε ἡμᾶς is “sonst fast unbezeugt,” though IGNTP lists no other witnesses.<sup>142</sup> Even if the manuscripts of *Adversus Marcionem* reading *hic nos* reflect what Tertullian wrote, the order could be due to Tertullian. Second, Harnack wrote that the second ὧδε is otherwise unattested, when in fact it is attested by D\*, d, l, r<sup>1</sup>, and numerous versions. Third, Harnack apparently made an error in his reconstruction, because in the apparatus he stated that Marcion read τρεῖς σκηνάς with D, most OL manuscripts, and many other witnesses, which may well be correct. Finally, the placement of μίαν in each reference is variably attested in the manuscript tradition. According to IGNTP, only 700, l1056, and ff<sup>2</sup> attest this particular combination of μίαν before σοί and then following Moses and Elijah. It is possible that Marcion’s text read this way, though Tertullian’s influence is also possible.<sup>143</sup>

In 4.22.7, 13 Tertullian alludes to the cloud that overshadowed the group on the mountain (v. 34), though no further insight can be gained into the reading of Marcion’s text.

#### 4.1.39 Luke 9:41

4.23.1 – *Stet Christus Marcionis et exclamet: O genitura incredula, quousque ero apud vos? Quousque sustinebo vos?*<sup>144</sup> | 4.23.2 – *Suscipio adhuc et personam discipulorum, in quos insilitt: O natio incredula, quamdiu ero vobiscum, quamdiu vos sustinebo?*

Luke 9:41 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian twice cites the verse, though not in the same Latin form.<sup>145</sup> Nevertheless, the citations could render

---

<sup>141</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 202\*.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 203\*.

<sup>143</sup> It is interesting that Tertullian’s testimony twice has the numeral before the noun (*tria tabernacula, unum tibi*) and then twice after the noun (*Moysi unum, Heliae unum*).

<sup>144</sup> The second question is omitted by γ, R<sub>1</sub>, and R<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>145</sup> This verse is one of the passages upon which Harnack leans heavily in his contention that Tertullian was using a Latin translation of Marcion’s text (see Harnack, *Marcion*, 180\*, 203\*). On this point see Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess?,” (forthcoming). Braun observes “... contrairement à ce qu’affirme HARNACK, p.203\*, la seconde formulation n’est pas en «meilleur latin» que la première” (*Contre Marcion IV*, 295n2[cont.]; also Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 275).

essentially the same Greek text, with only the placement of *vos* being different. Since Tertullian has been shown to often change the position of pronouns, both quotations could attest a reading ὧ γενεὰ ἄπιστος ... ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν. The unattested καὶ διεστραμμένη may be a simple omission by Tertullian.<sup>146</sup> Also, the repeated *quousque/quamdiu* appears to attest ἕως πότε appearing twice, as in numerous other manuscripts.<sup>147</sup>

#### 4.1.40 Luke 9:46–48

4.23.4 – *Sed ecce Christus diligit parvulos, tales docens esse debere qui semper maiores velint esse,...*

In an antithesis in 4.23.4, Tertullian alludes to Luke 9:46–48. Though the words μείζων and παιδίον appear to be attested, this brief reference provides no basis upon which to reconstruct any longer readings in Marcion’s text.

#### 4.1.41 Luke 9:54–55

4.23.7 – *Repraesentat creator ignium plagam Helia postulante in illo pseudopropheta. Agnosco iudicis severitatem, e contrario Christi <lenitatem, increpantis> eandem animadversionem destinantes discipulos super illum viculum Samaritarum.*<sup>148</sup>

Harnack stated that here Tertullian is interacting with another of Marcion’s antitheses.<sup>149</sup> Braun, however, responds that the comparison could have arisen out of the statement ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν found at the end of v. 54 in numerous manuscripts, which Harnack also believed was present in Marcion’s text. Regardless of whether or not an antithesis was involved, the confident assertion by both Harnack and Braun that these words were present in Marcion’s text is overstated.<sup>150</sup> Even

<sup>146</sup> Mark 9:19 has only one adjective describing the generation (ὧ γενεὰ ἄπιστος).

<sup>147</sup> The long list of manuscripts attesting this reading in IGNTP reveals that Harnack’s comment “ἕως πότε secundum mit wenigen Zeugen” is a significant understatement (*Marcion*, 203\*).

<sup>148</sup> An additional reference to Luke 9:54–55 occurs in 4.29.12.

<sup>149</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 204\*.

<sup>150</sup> Harnack writes they were “gewiß” present (*ibid.*) and Braun “sans doute” present (*Contre Marcion IV*, 299n6). See also Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:468. Zahn, however, viewed the longer readings as original and therefore did not view Marcion as their creator (see especially *Evangelium des Lucas*, 399–402, 764–67). On the other hand, Harris, at the end of the nineteenth century, wrote concerning the additions in vv. 54–55: “Dr. Hort says that both these passages are Western; we add that if so they

more problematic are Harnack's assertions that the additions in vv. 55–56, though unattested by Tertullian, were not only in Marcion's Gospel but also from Marcion's hand.<sup>151</sup> Tsutsui is rightly much more cautious stating that the additions “können, mindestens zum Teil, marcionitisch sein. Aber m.E. darf man nicht aus dem Tertullians Bericht folgern, daß sie auch im von ihm benutzten Marcion-Text gestanden haben.”<sup>152</sup>

#### 4.1.42 Luke 10:1, 4, 7–11

4.24.1 – *Adlegit et alios septuaginta apostolos super duodecim.* | 4.24.2 – ... *Christus autem nec virgam discipulis in viam ferre praescrpsit.... hi autem in civitates mittebantur.* | 4.24.3 – *Etiam calciamenta portare vetuit illos.... Neminem, inquit, in via*<sup>153</sup> *salutaveritis.* | 4.24.5 – *Dignus*<sup>154</sup> *autem operarius mercede sua,...* | 4.24.6 – *Regnum dei ... [Christ] iubet adnuntiari adpropinquasse.* | 4.24.7 – *Etiam adicit ut eis qui illos non recepissent dicerent: Scitote tamen adpropinquasse regnum dei.... in salutem scilicet eorum qui adnuntiationem eius recepissent?... Sic et pulverem iubet excuti in illos, in testificationem ...*<sup>155</sup>

In this pericope, v. 5 is multiply cited. Tertullian attests two elements of v. 1: ἀνέδειξεν [or ἀπέδειξεν] ... ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα (4.24.1) and ἀπέστειλεν ... εἰς ... πόλιν (4.24.2).<sup>156</sup> As is well known, the manuscript tradition is divided between

---

are probably Marcionite” (*Codex Bezae*, 233). Against the Marcionite origin of the sayings is J. M. Ross, “The Rejected Words in Luke 9:54-56,” *ExpTimes* 84 (1972): 85–88. An excellent refutation of the view that these readings were found in Marcion's text is found in Delobel, “Extra-Canonical Sayings,” 115–16.

<sup>151</sup> Concerning v. 56 Harnack stated, “leider fehlt uns hier der Marcion-Text; aber angesichts der überwältigenden Zahl von Zeugen gegen den Vers, kann er nicht ursprünglich sein. Wer aber sollte ihn hinzugefügt haben, wenn nicht M.?” (*Marcion*, 248\*). Such an argument is tenuous at best.

<sup>152</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 94.

<sup>153</sup> Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read *per viam*. According to IGNTP the Greek text uniformly attests κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. The OL attests *per viam*, *circa viam*, and *in viam*.

<sup>154</sup> Moreschini rejects the reading *dignus est* in Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.

<sup>155</sup> The following phrase reads *eieratae etiam terrae eorum, nedum communicationis reliquae* in Moreschini's text, which is also the reading of Kroymann. However, the first element is attested in numerous forms in the manuscripts and edited editions of Tertullian. *M* reads *ei*; *haeret etiam*; *R*<sub>3</sub>, *B*, and Golenius read *et adhaerentiam*; Pamelius, based on the conjecture of *R*<sub>3</sub>, reads *ad horrentiam*; Rigalti reads *et haerentiam*; and Oehler and Evans read *et haerentia*. Though some of these readings render the idea of wiping off the dust κολληθέντα to them, the great uncertainty here does not allow this idea to be posited for Marcion's text.

<sup>156</sup> Harnack thought that *adlegit* was rendering ἀπέδειξεν. This reading is possible, and is found in D. IGNTP also states that e and a (both *elegit*), c (*probavit*), d (*ostendit*), and b and l (*designavit*) attest this reading. Given that ἀναδείκνυμι occurs only here and in Acts 1:24, it is

the reading “seventy” and “seventy-two.” Tertullian here attests the former as Marcion’s reading.

Harnack reconstructed Luke 10:4 μήτε ῥάβδον (?), μὴ ὑποδήματα ... μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσησθε.<sup>157</sup> The question mark is due to Harnack not being sure if the reference to a *virga* was due to Marcion’s text or due to Tertullian importing an element from the mission of the 12 (Luke 9:3).<sup>158</sup> Since IGNTP indicates that no manuscript and only Didymus the Blind and Epiphanius attest ῥάβδον in this verse, and since *virga* creates a point of contact with *bacillus* mentioned in the citation of 2 Kgs 4:29 (4.24.3), the latter is more likely the case.

In 4.24.5 Tertullian attests the phrase ἄξιος ... ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ from Luke 10:7. The use of *autem* here can be understood as due to the flow of Tertullian’s argument, and should not be construed to attest either the reading δέ, or the absence of γάρ in Marcion’s text.<sup>159</sup> In 4.24.6, Tertullian adapts the phrase concerning the nearness of the kingdom of God (Luke 10:9), and in 4.24.7 there is an allusion to δέχωνται (v. 8).<sup>160</sup> Finally, in 4.24.7 Tertullian offers a reference to v. 10 (μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς) followed by a citation and adaptation of elements in v. 11. Tertullian quotes πλὴν ... γινώσκετε [ὅτι] ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and concludes with a reference to τὸν κονιορτὸν [ἀπομασσόμεθα].<sup>161</sup> The reference to *excuti* and *in testificationem* are again taken by Tertullian from the mission of the 12 (Luke 9:5).<sup>162</sup>

---

difficult to evaluate the OL readings. However, Tischendorf and Von Soden list no variants for Acts 1:24, and here *gig*, which has an OL text in Acts, reads *ostende* as does the Vulgate. It is hardly inconceivable that some of the OL evidence for Luke 10:1 reveals the challenge of rendering ἀνέδειξεν, and is not attesting ἀπέδειξεν. Tsutsui’s contention that ἀποστόλους in Marcion’s text is “ganz sicher” and that ἐπὶ τοῖς δώδεκα probably appeared is questionable. Indeed, his view seems to be influenced by his belief that the antithesis discussed by Tertullian is between the 70 and the 12. This view is strongly and rightly criticized by Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 304n1, 305n3.

<sup>157</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 205\*.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.; cf. Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 305n3.

<sup>159</sup> Once again, the lack of an ellipsis in Harnack, *Marcion*, 205\* could be misleading.

<sup>160</sup> Harnack thought that Marcion’s text, along with a handful of manuscripts, omitted ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς in v. 9 (ibid.). Its absence, however, could also be a simple omission by Tertullian.

<sup>161</sup> It is unclear why Harnack reconstructed the otherwise unattested γινώσκεσθε (ibid.).

<sup>162</sup> For εἰς μαρτύριον see Harnack’s comments in the apparatus (ibid.). See also Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 309n3.



#### 4.1.43 Luke 10:16

4.24.8 – ... *Qui vos spernet, me spernet.*<sup>163</sup>

It is interesting that although Harnack quotes the reading *spernet* he was content to reconstruct Luke 10:16 with the Greek present tense: ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ.<sup>164</sup> Also noteworthy is that Harnack did not here feel compelled to place ὑμᾶς before the verb. The use of the future and the change of position of *vos*, though the reading ὑμᾶς ἀθετῶν is attested by P<sup>45</sup> and numerous OL manuscripts, can be explained by Tertullian's citation habit. Thus, Harnack's reconstruction is probable, even if not certain.

#### 4.1.44 Luke 10:23–24

4.25.12 – *Si et sequentia inspicias: Beati oculi qui vident quae videtis: dico enim vobis quia prophetae non viderunt quae vos videtis.*

Harnack reconstructed these verses μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι προφηταὶ οὐκ ἴδαν [*sic*], ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε.<sup>165</sup> The final element in v. 23 and the opening to v. 24 are unproblematic and exhibit little variation in the manuscript tradition. The remainder of v. 24, however, renders an otherwise unattested text. The omission of πολλοί is elsewhere attested only in 1241, though καὶ βασιλεῖς is also omitted in D and several OL manuscripts.<sup>166</sup> The placement of ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε in Tertullian's citation is elsewhere unattested. One cannot be certain if Tertullian or Marcion is responsible for the phrasing, or to what extent elements of the reading were present in Marcion's source text.<sup>167</sup>

#### 4.1.45 Luke 11:7–8

4.26.8 – ... *cubantem iam cum infantibus,...* | 4.26.9 – *Exsurgit et dat, et si iam non quasi amico, non tamen quasi extraneo homini. Sed quasi molesto, inquit.*

---

<sup>163</sup> Moreschini's text reads *spernet (bis)* with *M* and Kroymann, whereas β and the other editors read *spernit (bis)*.

<sup>164</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 205\*.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, 206\*.

<sup>166</sup> The parallel Matt 13:17 reads δίκαιοι instead of βασιλεῖς, attested for Luke 10:24 in b, q, r<sup>1</sup>, and Ambrose.

<sup>167</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 206\*; Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 97; and Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 325n3 all see redaction by Marcion in the verse.

In Luke 11:5–8, v. 5 is multiply cited. The allusion in 4.26.8 reveals the presence of the statement of the man being in bed with his children (v. 7), though the precise wording of Marcion’s text remains elusive.<sup>168</sup> In v. 8, the allusion similarly reveals the main ideas of the verse even if the precise wording of the Greek cannot be reconstructed.<sup>169</sup>

#### 4.1.46 Luke 11:14, 18–20

4.26.11 – *Cum surdum daemonium expulisset ... Si ego, inquit, in Belzebule*<sup>170</sup> *eicio daemona, filii vestri in quo eiciunt?... Si ego in Belzebule, filii vestri in quo?... non posse satanan dividi adversus semetipsum.... subiungit: Quodsi ego in digito dei expello daemona, ergone adpropinquavit*<sup>171</sup> *in vos regnum dei?*

For Luke 11:14–20, v. 15 is multiply cited. In 4.26.11, Tertullian makes a general reference to Jesus having cast out a “deaf devil” (v. 14).<sup>172</sup> An allusion to Jesus’ question involving a reference to Satan being divided against himself (v. 18) follows a citation of v. 19, which Harnack reconstructed εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβαλλουσιν;<sup>173</sup> The omission of δέ after εἰ posited by Harnack and attested by b and a handful of versions, may be a simple omission by Tertullian.

Harnack reconstructed v. 20 εἰ δ’ ἐγὼ ἐν δακτυλῷ [*sic*] θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν εἰς ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, and only noted the otherwise unattested reading εἰς ὑμᾶς.<sup>174</sup> It is not certain, however, that *in vos* is not

---

<sup>168</sup> Harnack stated that, with several manuscripts, Marcion read τὰ παιδία and not τὰ παιδία μου; however, Tertullian’s discussion would not allow the use of a first-person pronoun, and Tertullian may well have simply omitted the pronoun.

<sup>169</sup> Harnack attempted to reconstruct the verse, and his reconstruction is plausible, though based largely on inference (*Marcion*, 208\*).

<sup>170</sup> On the spelling of Beelzebul here in both the Latin and Greek see chapter 3, nn. 239 and 240.

<sup>171</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *adpropinquavit* with R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub>, rejecting *adpropinquabit* read by M, γ, and R<sub>1</sub>. The difference may simply be orthographic; however, given Tertullian’s propensity to use the future, the reading of M et al. could be attesting a future. IGNTP lists no variants for the reading ἔφθασεν.

<sup>172</sup> Braun rightly notes that Tertullian renders κωφός with *surdus* instead of *mutus* to create a closer correspondence in his reference to Isa 29:18 (*Contre Marcion IV*, 339n5). In addition, the allusion cannot reveal whether καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν was present in Marcion’s text or not (set in brackets in NA<sup>27</sup>).

<sup>173</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 209\*.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*

rendering the nearly uniformly attested ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.<sup>175</sup> Tsutsui disagreed with Harnack's reconstructing ἐφθασεν, contending that *adpropinquavit* rendered ἤγγικεν.<sup>176</sup> Tsutsui rightly notes that only d, which also reads *adpropinquavit*, might support this reading. In addition, though not mentioned by Tsutsui, Tertullian elsewhere in *Adversus Marcionem* uses *adpropinquare* to render the verb ἐγγιζω or the phrase ἐγγυς ἐστίν.<sup>177</sup> At the same time, however, the OL manuscripts do reveal some variation in their renderings of v. 20,<sup>178</sup> and Tertullian may have been influenced by the readings of the recently cited Luke 10:9 (4.24.6) or Luke 21:31 where the reference is to the kingdom of God drawing near. Therefore, it is possible that Tertullian more loosely rendered the end of the citation rather than having found either of these readings in Marcion's text, but one cannot be sure.<sup>179</sup> Finally, ἐγώ in v. 20 is also worth noting, as it may have been in Marcion's text since it is attested by D and numerous other manuscripts, several versions, and multiple church fathers.<sup>180</sup> At the same time, an unconscious influence on Tertullian by Matt 12:27 cannot be ruled out.

#### 4.1.47 Luke 11:37–43

4.27.1 – ... *et 'vae' ingerit Pharisaeis et doctoribus legis.* | 4.27.2 – *Ideo et tunc Pharisaeus qui illum vocarat ad prandium retractabat penes se cur non prius tinctus esset quam recubisset, ... Iesus autem etiam interpretatus est ei legem, dicens illos [the Pharisees] calicis et catini exteriora emundare, interiora autem ipsorum plena esse rapina et iniquitate, ... exteriora, inquit, calicis lavatis, id est carnem, interiora autem vestra non emundastis,<sup>181</sup> id est animam; adiciens: Nonne qui exteriora fecit— id est carnem—, et interiora fecit, id est animam?* | 4.27.3 – *Subiungit enim: Date quae habetis elemosinam, et omnia munda erunt vobis.* | 4.27.4 – *Sic et holuscula*

<sup>175</sup> Every OL manuscript except c, reads *in vos*, which IGNTP does not interpret as evidence for the reading εἰς ὑμᾶς.

<sup>176</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 100.

<sup>177</sup> See 4.24.6 (Luke 10:9), 4.39.10 (Luke 21:28), 4.39.16 (Luke 21:30), and 4.39.10 (Luke 21:31). Tertullian, however, writes *in proximo esse* for Luke 21:31 in 4.39.10.

<sup>178</sup> The OL manuscripts attest the verbs *praevenire* (b, f, q, r<sup>1</sup>), *provenire* (ff<sup>2</sup>, i), *pervenire* (aur, c, l), *anticipare* (a<sup>2</sup>), and *adpropinquare* (d).

<sup>179</sup> A similar possibility was suggested for Luke 11:33 in chapter 3.

<sup>180</sup> P<sup>75</sup>, N<sup>1</sup>, B, D, f<sup>13</sup>, and several other witnesses have ἐγώ before ἐκβάλλω.

<sup>181</sup> Moreschini's text reads *emundastis* with M<sup>2</sup>, F, and Kroymann, rejecting the reading *emundatis* in M, R, and the other editors as well as *mundatis* in X.

*decimantes, vocationem autem et dilectionem dei praetereuntes obiurgat. Cuius dei vocationem et dilectionem, nisi cuius et rutam et mentam ex forma legis ex decimis offerebant? | 4.27.5 – Primatum quoque captantes locorum et honorem salutationum cum incusat,... | 4.27.6 – ... qui cum maxime potiora legis praetereuntes incusabat, elemosinam et vocationem et dilectionem dei, ne haec quidem gravia, nedum decimas rutarum et munditias catinorum?*

For Luke 11:37–43, v. 42 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian’s testimony in 4.27.1 begins with a general reference to the οὐαί spoken against the Pharisees (vv. 42–43) and the doctors of the law (vv. 46–47, 52 discussed below). In 4.27.2 Tertullian adapts v. 37, making reference to the invitation extended to Jesus by the Pharisee to dine with him and Jesus’ reclining at the table.<sup>182</sup> Notably, Tertullian’s reference to v. 38 attests Marcion’s text as having read similarly to D and d concerning the Pharisee: ἦρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη.<sup>183</sup> The precise wording and word order, however, are not entirely certain as most other OL manuscripts attest ἦρξατο ἐν ἑαυτῷ διακρινόμενος.<sup>184</sup> Tertullian concludes the thought with a reference back to the “reclining” of v. 37.<sup>185</sup>

Tertullian continues in 4.27.2 with an adaptation and then a citation of Jesus’ reply to the Pharisee (v. 39).<sup>186</sup> Tertullian’s testimony is curious here in that in the space of a few lines he offers divergent wordings for the verse.<sup>187</sup> In the adaptation Tertullian appears to attest the reading [οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος τὸ ἔξωθεν καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ

---

<sup>182</sup> Tertullian’s use of the pluperfect (*vocarat*) cannot reveal whether a historical present was in Marcion’s text or not.

<sup>183</sup> The phrase ἦρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ is also attested in 343, 716, 1229, and a.

<sup>184</sup> Harnack noted the point of contact with the reading in D, but did not note the variant word order (*Marcion*, 210\*). Curiously, IGNTP lists Marcion as reading the latter word order. sy<sup>c</sup> attests a similar reading.

<sup>185</sup> Harnack inquired “Las M. πρὸ τοῦ ἀναπεσεῖν für πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου [in v. 38]?” (*Marcion*, 210\*). Though the question legitimately arises out of Tertullian’s phrasing, the free form of the reference does not offer grounds to seriously entertain this otherwise unattested reading.

<sup>186</sup> This is another rare occasion in Harnack’s otherwise maximalist reconstructed text in that he provides no reconstruction for Luke 11:39–40 (see *ibid.*).

<sup>187</sup> Tsutsui overlooks this fact and only notes the phrasing of the citation of v. 39. In the notes he states “Im Vergleich mit dem Lk-Text ist der Satz nach dem direkten Zitat von Tertullian ziemlich vereinfacht” (“Evangelium,” 101). As seen in the discussion above, this evaluation should be rejected when all the data is considered.

πονηρίας.<sup>188</sup> A few lines later, however, Tertullian quotes a rather more truncated text τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καθαρίζετε (or νίπτετε) τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν οὐ καθαρίζετε. The key to understanding Tertullian's testimony is found in the manner in which Tertullian links vv. 39 and 40, most clearly evidenced by the glosses *id est animam* and *id est carnem* made to both verses. Immediately after citing v. 39, Tertullian quotes v. 40, attesting the relatively unproblematic οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν.<sup>189</sup> It would appear that Tertullian abbreviated the elements in the citation of v. 39 to create closer parallels with v. 40, and that therefore his earlier adaptation of the text more closely reflects Marcion's reading.<sup>190</sup>

In 4.27.3 Tertullian quotes v. 41 in a slightly curious form. Only one manuscript attests anything similar to *quae habetis*,<sup>191</sup> and it is possible that Tertullian is unconsciously being influenced by the similarly themed Luke 18:22 (ὅσα ἔχεις) or Matt 19:21 (τὰ ὑπάρχοντα).<sup>192</sup> In any case, Tertullian does attest the words δότε and ἐλεημοσύνην in v. 41a, as well as πάντα καθαρὰ ἔσται ὑμῖν in v. 41b.<sup>193</sup> The latter could have been the reading in Marcion's text as it is also found in D;<sup>194</sup> yet, Tertullian's own propensity to use the future and alter the position of pronouns means that one cannot be certain.

Tertullian adapts v. 42 in 4.27.4, where he attests part of the verse, though with an altered text. Tertullian references tithing herbs but passing over τὴν κλῆσιν

---

<sup>188</sup> The textual tradition here is fairly uniform. Even though a few words appear in a slightly different place in Tertullian's Latin (e.g., the position of *exteriora*), and Tertullian has obviously changed the verbs to infinitives due to his introducing the adaptation with *dicens*, the adaptation closely follows the Greek text in Luke (cf. the slight differences in Matt 23:25).

<sup>189</sup> Once again *exteriora* is in a different place in Tertullian's Latin (see n. 188). Several texts, including P<sup>45</sup> and D invert the order of ἔξωθεν and ἔσωθεν. Though the opening word of v. 30 is unattested, Harnack noted "Fehlte ἄφρονες bei M? Schwerlich" (*Marcion*, 210\*).

<sup>190</sup> Another slightly different reference to v. 39 occurs in 4.27.6 where Tertullian simply refers back to *munditias catinorum*.

<sup>191</sup> The OL manuscript f reads *ex his que habetis*.

<sup>192</sup> J. Ramsey Michaels simply assumes that *quae habetis* is Tertullian's translation and interpretation of τὰ ἐνόντα ("Almsgiving and the Kingdom Within: Tertullian on Luke 17:21," *CBQ* 60 [1998]: 481).

<sup>193</sup> Harnack only provided a reconstruction of the latter element (*Marcion*, 210\*).

<sup>194</sup> The reading ἔσται ὑμῖν is attested by numerous OL manuscripts and church fathers, and ὑμῖν ἔσται is attested in many manuscripts, including P<sup>45</sup>.

καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>195</sup> τὴν κλήσιν is otherwise unattested;<sup>196</sup> however, the likelihood of it being the reading of Marcion’s text is further increased by Tertullian again referencing the *vocationem et dilectionem dei* in 4.27.6 when he refers back to this passage. The final phrase of this verse is not attested; however, both Harnack and Tsutsui contend that Marcion deleted it.<sup>197</sup> Yet, even if it was missing in Marcion’s text, it is also absent in D and d, revealing that its omission may not have been due to an alteration by Marcion.

Finally, in 4.27.5 Tertullian alludes to v. 43. That a reference to πρωτοκαθεδρία and ἀσπασμός occurred in the verse is clear; yet, no further insight can be gained into the reading of Marcion’s text.

#### **4.1.48 Luke 11:46–48**

4.27.6 – *Invehitur et in doctores ipsos legis, quod onerarent alios importabilibus oneribus, quae ipsi ne digito quidem adgredi auderent,...* | 4.27.8 – *Cur autem ‘vae’ audiunt etiam quod aedificarent prophetis monimenta interemptis a patribus eorum, laude potius digni, qui ex isto opere pietatis testabantur se non consentire factis patrum,...*

In the series of “woes” spoken against the lawyers, v. 47 is attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian adapts v. 46 in 4.27.6, beginning with the observation that Jesus also pronounces οὐαί against the νομικοί. The adaptation attests the loading with φορτία δυσβάστακτα,<sup>198</sup> and it is clear that Marcion’s text also mentioned the lawyers not using a finger to help with those burdens, even if much of the precise wording cannot be recovered.<sup>199</sup> Tertullian has adapted v. 47, though his testimony seems to point to οὐαὶ ... ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν.<sup>200</sup> The

<sup>195</sup> IGNTTP wrongly states that Marcion omitted καὶ ... θεοῦ.

<sup>196</sup> IGNTTP lists only Marcion for this reading. Both Harnack, *Marcion*, 210\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 101 view it as a tendentious alteration.

<sup>197</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 210\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 101. The same view is held by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:473–74.

<sup>198</sup> Braun notes that *importabilis* occurs only in ecclesiastical Latin and strengthens the translation of δυσβάστακτος (*Contre Marcion IV*, 351n1).

<sup>199</sup> Harnack only reconstructed οὐδὲ τῷ δακτύλῳ (*Marcion*, 211\*). Though it is true that there is some manuscript evidence for the dative here, Tertullian may also have been influenced by Matt 23:4 or simply have written *digito* because of the structure of the sentence in which he embeds the verse.

<sup>200</sup> Though the reading τὰ μνήματα attested by Epiphanius must be taken into account, this reading, according to IGNTTP, is elsewhere only attested in I1056 and Chrysostom. No manuscript

participial phrase *interemptis a patribus eorum* attests a statement similar to πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς, even if the precise wording is not clear from Tertullian's adaptation. The allusion to v. 48 is noteworthy in that it appears to render a reading similar to D and d, μαρτυρεῖτε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν.<sup>201</sup>

#### 4.1.49 Luke 12:1

4.28.1 – *Cavete, inquit discipulis, a fermento Pharisaeorum, quod est hypocrisis,...*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 12:1 ... (ἤρξατο λέγειν) πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς· [πρῶτον?] προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις.<sup>202</sup> In the apparatus Harnack indicated that he was inclined to see πρῶτον as missing, and he highlights the omission of ἑαυτοῖς after προσέχετε. Though a handful of manuscripts, including several OL manuscripts, omit one or both of these elements, a simple omission by Tertullian is possible. Harnack made no mention of the omission of αὐτοῦ after μαθητάς, or the placement of τῶν Φαρισαίων after ζύμης instead of at the end of the sentence. The former omission is attested by D, several OL manuscripts, and bo. The latter word order is that of numerous manuscripts, including P<sup>45</sup>, ℵ, A, C, D, and W. Once again, though these readings are possible for Marcion, another simple omission by Tertullian and the influence of the loosely parallel Matt 16:6/Mark 8:15 (ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων) remains possible.

#### 4.1.50 Luke 12:11–12

4.28.8 – *Perductos ad potestates prohibet ad interrogationem cogitare de responsione. Sanctus enim, inquit, spiritus docebit vos ipsa hora quid eloqui debeatis.*

---

evidence exists for “prophets” in the dative, and the phrase *aedificarent prophetis monimenta* should be attributed to Tertullian.

<sup>201</sup> Harnack reconstructed v. 48 (ἄρα) μάρτυρές ἐστε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν (*Marcion*, 211\*). It is not clear why he chose to render *testabantur* with μάρτυρές ἐστε (this is the reading of NA<sup>27</sup> following ℵ, B, and a few other manuscripts), nor is it evident why he neglected to render *factis partum*. The readings of a, b, q (*non consentientes*) and e (*non placere vobis*) express a similar sentiment to the reading found in D, d.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid.

In 4.28.8 Tertullian alludes to Luke 12:11 and then cites v. 12. Harnack reconstructed the words προσφέρωσιν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς in v. 11, and then noted that Tertullian merely alludes to the remainder of the verse. That *perductos* renders the TR reading προσφέρωσιν is possible. On the other hand, the conclusion that either ὑμᾶς, τὰς συναγωγὰς, or τὰς ἐξουσίας was omitted would be unwarranted.

Based on the citation of v.12 Harnack reconstructed τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τί δεῖ εἰπεῖν ὑμᾶς.<sup>203</sup> Tertullian's word order *sanctus enim spiritus* is different from nearly the entire extant OL tradition and the Vulgate, which read *spiritus enim sanctus*.<sup>204</sup> According to IGTP the entire Greek manuscript tradition attests ἅγιον πνεῦμα, and it is likely that Tertullian's word order is following the word order of Marcion's text.<sup>205</sup> The remainder of the verse, up until the final element, is unproblematic as the manuscripts are nearly uniform. Two points, however, need to be made concerning τί δεῖ εἰπεῖν ὑμᾶς. First, ff<sup>2</sup>, gat, and Heracleon attest τί instead of ἅ, though it is not clear that Tertullian's use of *quid* necessitates this reading in Marcion's text. Second, though he gave no indication in his reconstructed text, Harnack in his apparatus admitted that the second ὑμᾶς is "nicht sicher" and "sonst unbezeugt."<sup>206</sup> There is no compelling reason to posit the presence of this pronoun for Marcion's text.

#### 4.1.51 Luke 12:13–14

4.28.9 – *Christus vero postulatus a quodam ut inter illum et fratrem ipsius <de> dividenda hereditate componeret, operam suam, et quidem tam probae causae, denegavit.* | 4.28.10 – *Quis me, inquit, iudicem constituit super vos?*

In 4.28.9 Tertullian alludes to Luke 12:13–14, and then provides a citation from v. 14 in 4.28.10. For v. 13 Tertullian alludes to τις ... εἰπὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν κληρονομίαν.<sup>207</sup> Though the precise wording is not

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., 213\*.

<sup>204</sup> Only a reads *sanctus enim spiritus*.

<sup>205</sup> Tertullian also generally writes *spiritus* followed by *sanctus* as can be seen in his references to Luke 7:27 (4.18.4); 11:2 (4.26.4); 11:13 (4.26.10); and 12:10 (4.28.6). In fact, of all the references to the Holy Spirit in *Adversus Marcionem*, as far as I know, 2.24.2 is the only other occurrence where *sanctus* precedes *spiritus*.

<sup>206</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 213\*.

<sup>207</sup> Harnack reconstructed very similarly though excluding εἰπέ and μου (ibid.).



clear, the minimal manuscript variation makes this reading rather likely.<sup>208</sup>

Tertullian's allusion continues with the statement that Christ refused to assist (4.28.9) and then cites his response. Harnack reconstructed τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.<sup>209</sup> Interestingly, Harnack once again did not change the Greek word order to match the order of Tertullian's Latin. That the word order is due to Tertullian is highly likely as there is no manuscript evidence for κριτὴν ever preceding κατέστησεν. κριτὴν is the reading of several manuscripts, including P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, B, D, and L, though it is possible that *iudicem* is rendering the reading δικαστήν.<sup>210</sup> Finally, it is also possible that with D, 28, a, b, d, and the Persian Diatessaron, ἡ μεριστήν was omitted in Marcion's text.<sup>211</sup> As has often been the case, however, a simple omission by Tertullian cannot be ruled out completely.<sup>212</sup>

#### 4.1.52 Luke 12:22–23

4.29.1 – *Quis nollet curam nos agere animae de victu et corpori de vestitu ... qui et substantiam ipsius animae accommodavit potiolem esca, et materiam ipsius corporis figuravit potiolem tunica,...*

Harnack places his reconstruction of these verses in parentheses and reconstructed the text verbatim to the reading in NA<sup>27</sup> (starting with μὴ μεριμνᾶτε in v. 22), except for the omission of γάρ in v. 23.<sup>213</sup> It is not entirely clear what Harnack wanted to denote with the use of parentheses, and he did not preface the offered text with “Anspielung” as he often did elsewhere when discussing allusions. For v. 22, τῇ ψυχῇ and τῷ σώματι are clearly attested, and some mention of not worrying about them in regards to food or clothing must have been present. No further insight into the precise wording of the verse can be gained, however, particularly as the wording of v. 23, with its mention of life being more than τροφή

---

<sup>208</sup> Several minuscules and lectionaries read τὴν κληρονομίαν μετ' ἐμοῦ.

<sup>209</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 213\*.

<sup>210</sup> The NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus recognizes this point noting “κριτην v1 δικαστην Mcion<sup>T</sup>.”

<sup>211</sup> Harnack believed that Marcion's text did omit the phrase (*Marcion*, 213\*).

<sup>212</sup> Thus, the certainty of the omission cannot be assumed and Baarda's positing a “doctrinal and deliberate correction of the original text” should be stated more cautiously (“Luke 12, 13-14 Text and Transmission: From Marcion to Augustine,” in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* [ed. Jacob Neusner; 4 vols.; SJLA 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975], 1:118).

<sup>213</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 213\*. γάρ is present in many manuscripts, including P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, B, and D, but absent in numerous others, including P<sup>45</sup>, A, K, Q, and W.

and the body being more than ἔνδυμα, seems to have influenced Tertullian's phrasing.<sup>214</sup> Similarly, the allusion to v. 23 implies the presence of the ψυχή/τροφή and σῶμα/ἔνδυμα comments, without revealing further insight into the phrasing of the verse.

#### 4.1.53 Luke 12:30

4.29.3 – *Nam et cum subicit: Haec enim nationes mundi quaerunt,... Porro cum et adicit: Scit autem pater opus esse haec vobis,...*

Luke 12:30 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's citation of v. 30a attests ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν (or ἐπιζητεῖ/ζητεῖ).<sup>215</sup> Though according to IGNTP πάντα after γὰρ is omitted in b, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, l q, r<sup>1</sup> and by Pseudo-Firmicus, it may be a simple omission by Tertullian. For v. 30b Tertullian attests οἶδεν δὲ (or γὰρ) ὁ πατήρ, which has points of contact with the reading of D and several OL manuscripts. It is worth noting, though, that in these witnesses ὑμῶν after πατήρ is nowhere else omitted.<sup>216</sup> The Latin *opus esse haec vobis* does not reveal the exact reading of the Greek for the latter phrase, though it may have been ὅτι χρῆζετε τούτων. It is possible, therefore, that Tertullian is reflecting Marcion's text for v. 30b, though with his own simple omission of the possessive pronoun.

#### 4.1.54 Luke 12:35–37

4.29.6 – ... *id sumus, servi: dominum enim habemus deum; succingere debemus lumbos, ... item lucernas ardentis habere, ... atque ita expectare dominum, ... Unde redeuntem? si a nuptiis, ...*

Tertullian weaves allusions to Luke 12:35–37 into his discussion of the parables as they relate to the Creator and his promises or his Christ. Tertullian begins with a reference to the δούλοι and the κύριος mentioned in v. 37. He then alludes to the phrases αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι and οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι (v. 35) followed by

<sup>214</sup> Thus, for v. 22 it is not clear whether ὑμῶν was present with either ψυχή or σῶματι, or both. In addition, no insight into the form of the verbs ἐσθίω and ἐνδύω, assuming they were present, can be gained.

<sup>215</sup> Harnack reconstructed v. 30a with ἐπιζητεῖ (*Marcion*, 214\*). All three forms of the verb are attested in the manuscript tradition, though the only Greek manuscript reading ζητεῖ is D. The Latin *quaerunt* does not definitively reveal the underlying Greek.

<sup>216</sup> D, e, a, c, d, and l attest οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν. b, f, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, q, and r<sup>1</sup> attest οἶδεν δὲ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν.

an allusion to προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ... ἀναλύση ἐκ τῶν γάμων (v. 36).<sup>217</sup>  
The precise wording, however, cannot be recovered for any of these verses.

#### 4.1.55 Luke 12:39–48

4.29.7 – *In sequenti quoque parabola satis errat qui furem illum, cuius horam si pater familiae sciret, non sineret suffodi domum suam, in personam disponit creatoris.... cuius horam etiam in primordio si homo scisset, numquam ab eo suffossus esset, propterea iubet ut parati simus, quia qua non putamus hora filius hominis adveniet,...* | 4.29.9 – *Itaque interroganti Petro in illos an et in omnes parabolam dixisset,... proponit actorum similitudinem, quorum qui bene tractaverit consertos absentia domini reverso eo omnibus bonis praeponetur, qui vero secus egerit, reverso domino qua die non putaverit, hora qua non scierit,... segregabitur et pars eius cum infidelibus ponetur.*<sup>218</sup> | 4.29.11 – *Quem alium intellegam caedentem*<sup>219</sup> *servos paucis aut multis plagis, et prout commisit illis ita et exigentem ab eis,...*

In this set of parables, Luke 12:46 is also attested by Epiphanius, and vv. 47–48a possibly in *Adam*. As Tertullian interacts with Marcion’s interpretation of the text he alludes to numerous elements in the account. Harnack recognized that these verses are largely attested through “Anspielungen.”<sup>220</sup> Nevertheless, for the parable in vv. 39–40, Harnack reconstructed v. 39 ... εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης, ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης (ἔρχεται), οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.<sup>221</sup> No manuscript attests ποία ὥρα as clause initial, and Harnack here rightly does not follow Tertullian’s word order. Unmentioned by Harnack is the omission of the phrase ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ after ἔρχεται, found in most manuscripts, but not in P<sup>75</sup>, S\*, D, and several versions. As this reading appears to have arisen through the influence of the parallel Matt 24:43,<sup>222</sup> and since Tertullian often inclines to Matthean wording, the fact that Tertullian does not allude to it here may indicate that it was not present in Marcion’s text. For v. 40 Harnack only reconstructed ὁ υἱὸς

---

<sup>217</sup> Harnack’s reconstructed elements are nearly identical to the above, though his lack of ellipses within the reconstruction again problematically could imply that unattested elements are absent (*Marcion*, 215\*).

<sup>218</sup> Additional allusions to these verses occur in 4.29.10–11.

<sup>219</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *caedentem* with *M*, *R*<sub>2</sub>, and *R*<sub>3</sub>, rejecting *cedentem* in *γ* and *R*<sub>1</sub>.

<sup>220</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 215\*.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>222</sup> See the comments in Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 136.

τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, apparently due to an oversight of the reference to the verse in 4.29.7, which is not included in Harnack’s apparatus. Tertullian clearly also attests γίνεσθε ἔτοιμαί, ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται. Once again one should not attempt to follow Tertullian’s word order slavishly or his use of the future (*adveniet*), and the reconstruction should be viewed as only generally representative of Marcion’s text.

Tertullian then renders Peter’s response in v. 41 to Jesus’ words (4.29.9), reconstructed by Harnack ὁ Πέτρος· πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας τὴν παραβολὴν λέγεις.<sup>223</sup> Harnack commented in his apparatus “Wortstellung belongos,” though it is not clear whether Harnack thereby intended to indicate that he did not consider his reconstruction necessarily to be reflecting Marcion’s text.<sup>224</sup> In any case, given that Tertullian has constantly, and even in the previous two verses, shown great freedom with his word order, the here otherwise unattested order should not be followed. In addition, the omission of ταύτην may be a simple omission by Tertullian.

For the parable in vv. 42–48, Tertullian’s general reference to the characters (*actorum* and *conservos*) does not reveal the Greek terms used in vv. 42–43. It is clear that a master leaves and returns (ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος),<sup>225</sup> and that the steward who treats his fellow slaves well will be rewarded, which Harnack reconstructed ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν καταστήσει αὐτόν (v. 44). Despite Tertullian’s paraphrase (*omnibus bonis praeponetur*), due to the near uniformity of the manuscript tradition, this reconstruction is probable; however, one would also expect a pronoun to have been present after ὑπάρχουσιν.<sup>226</sup> Also, Harnack rightly considered the passive *praeponetur* to be rendering the active καταστήσει, thus viewing the voice as due to Tertullian and not reflecting Marcion’s text. This observation becomes particularly relevant when considering vv. 45–46.

---

<sup>223</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 215\*.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>225</sup> It appears that it is Tertullian himself who selects the verb *revertere* to speak of the master’s coming as he uses it here in v. 43 and also for v. 46.

<sup>226</sup> No extant text omits the pronoun entirely, with αὐτοῦ strongly attested and αὐτῷ attested by P<sup>45</sup>, the OL manuscripts e and c, and several other manuscripts. Whether Marcion’s text read the genitive or dative cannot be determined with certainty, though the former is more likely. Its omission here appears to be a simple omission by Tertullian.

Tertullian alludes to v. 45 with a reference to the steward who has acted “otherwise” (i.e., having not treated his fellow servants well), and then delineates the consequence. Though Epiphanius’s testimony must also be taken into account for v. 46, Tertullian attests the return of the master ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἧ οὐ προσδοκᾷ καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ἧ οὐ γινώσκει; yet, the compact nature of Tertullian’s testimony does not allow the exact wording to be reconstructed.<sup>227</sup> More significantly, Harnack reconstructed the final element of the verse ἀποχωρίσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων τεθήσεται, appealing to Marcion’s theological views as the basis for positing the otherwise unattested readings ἀποχωρίσει and τεθήσεται.<sup>228</sup> Though the use of *segrego* is curious and Tertullian’s argument in 4.29.10 might suggest a term other than διχοτομέω it is certainly unpersuasive that Harnack suddenly sees Tertullian’s passive *ponetur* rendering a passive verb in Marcion’s text when Tertullian has been utilizing the passive throughout.<sup>229</sup>

For vv. 47–48 Tertullian once again only provides general allusions that must be compared with the data from *Adam*. There is a reference to the idea of the servant who will receive many or few beatings (δαρήσεται πολλάς [v. 47], δαρήσεται ὀλίγας [v. 48]), and to the principle of requiring in proportion to what has been given in v. 48b. Tertullian, however, provides no clear insight into the wording of these two verses.

#### **4.1.56 Luke 12:49, 51, 53**

4.29.12 – *Proclamat Christus tuus: Ignem veni mittere in terram...*<sup>230</sup> | 4.29.14 – *Ipsa melius interpretabitur ignis istius qualitatem, adiciens: Putatis venisse me pacem mittere in terram? non, dico vobis, sed separationem. ‘Machaeram’ quidem scriptum est sed Marcion emendat: quasi non et separatio opus sit machaerae.... Denique, dividetur, inquit, pater in filium et filius in patrem, et mater in filiam et filia in matrem, et nurus in socrum et socrus in nurum.*

---

<sup>227</sup> The alternate word order given by IGNTP for Marcion ap Adam is problematic in that the referenced passage in *Adam* gives no indication that Marcion’s text is in view.

<sup>228</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 215\*.

<sup>229</sup> Tsutsui is also unconvinced on these two points stating that Harnack’s view “bedarf m.E. noch hinreichender Begründung, um völlig glaubwürdig zu sein” (“Evangelium,” 106).

<sup>230</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 12:49 occurs in 4.29.13.

Tertullian cites the first half of Luke 12:49, rendering πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν.<sup>231</sup> A clear indication of Tertullian working from Marcion’s text is found in 4.29.14 where Tertullian confuses the reading of Matt 10:34 (μάχαιραν) with the reading in Luke 12:51 (διαμερισμόν) and accuses Marcion of having altered the former to the latter.<sup>232</sup> Harnack reconstructed v. 51 δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἦλθον εἰρήνην βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ διαμερισμόν (ἀποχώρισιν?).<sup>233</sup> The reading is possible, but at many points uncertain. First, Tertullian does not render ὅτι, but Harnack is likely correct in considering it present in Marcion’s text.<sup>234</sup> Second, εἰρήνην between the verbs is nowhere attested in the extant manuscript tradition, and Matt 10:34, which Harnack believed had influenced the reading in Marcion’s text, reads ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην. Therefore, the order here may be due to Tertullian. Third, it is not clear that *venisse me* is rendering ἦλθον and not παρεγενόμεν.<sup>235</sup> Fourth, according to IGNTP βαλεῖν instead of δοῦναι is attested in several OL manuscripts, sy<sup>s</sup>, sy<sup>p</sup>, the Arabic Diatessaron, bo, sa, and Petrus Chrysologus. Thus, it could have been the reading in Marcion’s text, though Tertullian could also have been unconsciously influenced by the Matthean phrasing or by having written *mittere in terram* shortly before (4.29.12). This fact also means that it is not certain that the preposition ἐπί plus the accusative was in Marcion’s text. Fifth, Marcion’s text could have read ἀλλά instead of ἀλλ’ ἢ with P<sup>45</sup>, D, and several other manuscripts, but again, all OL manuscripts read *sed*, which IGNTP does not take as evidence for the reading ἀλλά. Finally, though raising the questions “Hat aber M. διαμερισμόν gelesen? Las er nicht ἀποχώρισιν oder ähnlich?,”

---

<sup>231</sup> Harnack offered the preposition ἐπί instead of εἰς. This reading is possible, though the latter preposition appearing in P<sup>45</sup>, D, and probably underlying the uniform *in terram* in the OL manuscripts, may make εἰς more likely. Harnack also considered *Adam.* 68.1–2 (2.5) to contain references to Luke 12:49, 51. However, there is no indication that Marcion’s text is in view here as Adamantius simply references τοῦ σωτῆρος ἢ φωνῆ.

<sup>232</sup> Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:476–77 and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 106–7 argue that the statement *Ipse melius interpretabitur ignis istius qualitatem, adiciens* reveals that 12:49b–50 were omitted by Marcion. Harnack rightly noted “allein ausreichend ist dieses Argument nicht” and then added “und man sieht auch nicht ein, warum M. diese Worte getilgt haben soll” (*Marcion*, 216\*). That Tertullian simply did not refer to the intervening material is entirely possible.

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>234</sup> According to IGNTP ὅτι is only omitted in 1210.

<sup>235</sup> The entire extant OL manuscript tradition employs *veni* here (*venim* in e is corrected to *veni*), and IGNTP lists only Cyril and one other witness as reading ἦλθον.

Harnack provided no rationale for Marcion's text reading anything other than διαμερισμόν.<sup>236</sup>

Tertullian's testimony to v. 53 is largely unproblematic and Harnack reconstructed διαμερισθήσεται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῶ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί, καὶ μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρί καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρί, καὶ πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.<sup>237</sup> A few observations include, first, that Tertullian attests the TR reading διαμερισθήσεται, even though many witnesses, including P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, **S**, B, D, and the OL manuscripts read διαμερισθήσονται. Second, Harnack stated that the second and fourth καί are otherwise unattested,<sup>238</sup> though IGNTP indicates that there is some evidence for their presence.<sup>239</sup> Nevertheless, it is not certain whether they were present in Marcion's text or due to Tertullian. Finally, though Tertullian attests no pronouns after *socrum* and *nurum*, a simple omission in one or both cases by Tertullian cannot be ruled out.<sup>240</sup>

#### 4.1.57 Luke 12:56

4.29.15 – *Et ideo hypocritas pronuntiabat, caeli quidem et terrae faciem probantes, tempus vero illud non dinoscentes,...*

On the basis of Tertullian's adaptation in 4.29.15, Harnack reconstructed Luke 12:56 ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς δοκιμάζετε, τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον οὐκ οἶδατε δοκιμάζειν.<sup>241</sup> Harnack rightly placed τὸ πρόσωπον after ὑποκριταί, its universally attested position, and not later in the phrase based on Tertullian's placement of *faciem*. In addition, Harnack did not render *quidem* in his

---

<sup>236</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 216\*. No Greek manuscript, apart from 1242\* which reads μάχαϊραν, reads anything other than διαμερισμόν. In addition, with Tertullian the OL manuscripts a, b, f, i, l and q render διαμερισμόν with *separationem*.

<sup>237</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 216\*. The Latin, of course, cannot reveal whether the Greek read ἐπὶ υἱῶ or ἐφ' υἱῶ. In addition, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whether ἐπί plus dative or accusative is being attested by Tertullian's *in* plus accusative. Both the Greek and OL manuscript tradition exhibit considerable variation, though it appears that no Greek manuscript utilizes the dative or accusative throughout.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid.

<sup>239</sup> The Perisan Diatessaron and the Adiṣ manuscript of geo attest καί in both instances, and c and e attest the latter instance. A few additional witnesses for the presence of one or the other καί are also listed in IGNTP.

<sup>240</sup> Only a very few manuscripts omit the first αὐτῆς; however, the second is omitted by P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, **S**\*, B, D, and several other manuscripts.

<sup>241</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 216\*.

reconstruction, though it is worth noting that D, a, d, q, and a few other witnesses read τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον (cf. Matt 16:3). Whether *quidem* is representing a particle in Marcion's text or is Tertullian's own addition is not certain. Third, it is quite likely that Marcion's Gospel read "heaven" followed by "earth," as this is the order attested by P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>,  $\aleph^c$ , D, numerous other manuscripts, and many versions. Finally, since D, along with several OL, sy<sup>c</sup>, and, according to IGNTP, three Coptic manuscripts omit πῶς after τοῦτον, it is possible that the interrogative adverb was not in Marcion's text; however, a simple omission by Tertullian is also possible. On the other hand it is not certain that Marcion's text read τὸν δὲ καιρόν (P<sup>75</sup>, B, and 892 read τὸν καιρὸν δέ), and Harnack's reconstruction of the verbs is speculative. It could be that *probantes* is rendering an otherwise unattested δοκιμάζετε, and *dinoscentes* reflecting οἶδατε δοκιμάζειν,<sup>242</sup> though it also could be that Tertullian's parallel construction reflects a parallel construction of οἶδατε δοκιμάζειν in Marcion's text.<sup>243</sup>

#### 4.1.58 Luke 13:14–15

4.30.1 – *Quaestionem rursus de curatione sabbati<s>*<sup>244</sup> *facta quomodo discussit? Unusquisque vestrum sabbatis non solvit*<sup>245</sup> *asinum aut bovem suum a praesepe et ducit ad potum?*

Harnack viewed the opening question in 4.30.1 as attesting ἐν τοῖς σάββασι in Luke 13:10; however, that a "question" or "objection" concerning a healing on the Sabbath is mentioned, along with v. 15 immediately following, makes it more likely that v. 14 is in view. Though the idea of healing on Sabbath days is present, no insight can be gained into the actual wording of the verse. The citation of

---

<sup>242</sup> For the former reading IGNTP lists only Marcion as a witness, and concerning the latter rendering Harnack simply stated "so ist „*dinoscentes*“ zu verstehen" (*Marcion*, 217\*).

<sup>243</sup> As already noted οἶδατε δοκιμάζειν is universally attested in the first phrase, and it is the reading of P<sup>75</sup>, A, B, and several other manuscripts and versions in the second phrase (the other witnesses attest δοκιμάζετε). The fact that Tertullian uses different Latin verbs is not problematic as he is notorious for his vocabulary variation (see Roth, "Did Tertullian Possess?," [forthcoming]). Alternatively, Tertullian could be highlighting different elements of the phrase.

<sup>244</sup> Moreschini follows the emendation of Kroymann (*sabbati<s>*) as M, γ, R<sub>1</sub>, and R<sub>2</sub> read *sabbati*, and R<sub>3</sub>, along with the other editors, reads *sabbato*. Braun calls the correction by Kroymann "pleinement justifiée" (*Contra Marcion IV*, 381n6).

<sup>245</sup> Moreschini reads *solvit* with R<sub>3</sub>, apparently viewing *solvet* in M, γ, R<sub>1</sub>, and R<sub>2</sub> as erroneous. However, given Tertullian's inclination at times to use the future in his citations, he may well have written *solvet*.



v. 15 has several interesting elements and Harnack reconstructed ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τοῖς σάββασι [*sic*] (τ. σαββάτω?) οὐ λύει τὸν ὄνον αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν βουὸν ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει;<sup>246</sup> The otherwise unattested plural *sabbatis* probably should be attributed to Tertullian.<sup>247</sup> Given Tertullian's word order, it is not clear why Harnack placed αὐτοῦ after “donkey” and not after “ox.” IGNTP lists Marcion as being the only witness for the reading τὸν ὄνον ἢ τὸν βουὸν αὐτοῦ; whereas, 69 reads as Harnack reconstructed.<sup>248</sup> 69 is also the only witness to attest “donkey” before “ox” in this verse and it ultimately cannot be determined if this order was found in Marcion's text or if the elements were inverted in Tertullian's citation.<sup>249</sup> Finally, ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει may very well be correct as ἀπάγει τῷ ὕδατι (rendering *ducit ad potum*) is not attested in any Greek manuscript, and, according to IGNTP, is only witnessed in l, r<sup>1</sup>, geo, and Ambrose.

#### 4.1.59 Luke 13:19

4.30.1 – *Simile est regnum dei, inquit, grano sinapis, quod accepit homo et seminavit in horto suo.*<sup>250</sup>

Tertullian cites Luke 13:19a in 4.30.1 and Harnack reconstructed ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ (ἐν τ. ἑαυτοῦ κήπῳ?).<sup>251</sup> Though IGNTP views *regnum dei* as part of Marcion's text,<sup>252</sup> given that Tertullian makes no mention of the questions in 13:18 it is probably Tertullian's addition in order to clarify what v. 19 was about. Up until the final element in the verse, the manuscript tradition is fairly uniform and Tertullian's

<sup>246</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 217\*.

<sup>247</sup> According to IGNTP Irenaeus attests τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, but that reading also could be due to Irenaeus himself and not a reading actually found in a manuscript. It is worth remembering that in 4.12.10 in the citation of Luke 6:9 Tertullian also wrote *sabbatis*, though in that case there is manuscript evidence for the plural. Tertullian's ability to alternate between the singular and plural is particularly clear in a few examples from 2.21 (singular in 2.21.1 and plural in 2.21.2) and 4.12 (singular in 4.12.1, 3, 6, 7, 14 and plural in 4.12.5, 9, 13, 15).

<sup>248</sup> Harnack, however, was unaware of the testimony of this manuscript as he believed that the order attested by Tertullian was unattested elsewhere (*Marcion*, 217\*).

<sup>249</sup> The only other occurrence of *asinus* and *bos* together in *Adversus Marcionem* is in 3.6.7 in the citation of Isa 1:3 where the order is *agnovit bos possessroem suum et asinus praesepe domini sui*. The terms do not occur together anywhere else in the NT.

<sup>250</sup> Allusions to elements in Luke 13:19 also occur in 4.30.2.

<sup>251</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 199\*. The reconstruction in *Marcion*, 217\* is identical except that the final element simply reads εἰς κῆπον, where it appears that ἑαυτοῦ was erroneously omitted.

<sup>252</sup> The same position is taken by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:477.

testimony unproblematic. The same cannot be said for *seminavit in horto suo*. Harnack noted “ἔσπειρεν allein [IGNTP indicates that it is also the reading of aeth], aber nach Matt. 13, 31” and his reconstruction reveals his uncertainty concerning the prepositional phrase. It is possible that Matt 13:31 can shed light on more than simply the verb. The entire phrase in Matthew reads ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ. If Tertullian has greater familiarity with the Matthean text, he may have begun harmonizing elements from Marcion’s Gospel and the Matthean reading at the end of the citation. This suggestion would explain the Matthean verb and prepositional phrase as well as the Lukan *horto*. If this supposition is correct, it is also possible that the addition of *regnum dei* is partially due to the influence of Matt 13:31. Ultimately, however, in the absence of multiple citation or multiple attestation Marcion’s reading remains obscure.

#### **4.1.60 Luke 13:20–21**

4.30.3 – *De sequenti plane similitudine vereor ne forte alterius dei regno portendat. Fermento enim comparavit illud,...*

Tertullian’s testimony reveals that the parable in Luke 13:20–21 was present in Marcion’s text, though very little insight into the exact wording can be gained. Nothing beyond the nearly universally attested τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 20) and ὁμοία ἐστὶν ζύμη (v. 21) can be reconstructed.<sup>253</sup>

#### **4.1.61 Luke 13:25–27**

4.30.4 – *Cum surrexerit, inquit, pater familiae;... Et cluserit ostium:... quibus pulsantibus respondebit: Nescio unde sitis, et rursus enumerantibus quod coram illo ederint et biberint et in plateis eorum docuerit, adiciet: Recedite a me omnes operarii iniquitatis:...*

Tertullian cites several elements from Luke 13:25, which Harnack reconstructed ἐὰν ἐγερθῆ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν ... κρούειν .. ἀποκριθεὶς (ἐρεῖ)· οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἔστε [*sic*].<sup>254</sup> Most of this reconstruction is unproblematic, though two elements should be noted. First, Harnack viewed the opening ἐὰν as attested by the Vulgate and “Itala” (reading *cum*); however, IGNTP

<sup>253</sup> Harnack also offered no further reconstructed elements (*Marcion*, 217\*).

<sup>254</sup> *Ibid.*, 217\*–18\*.

does not interpret the evidence from these Latin witnesses as rendering a Greek text different from the almost uniformly attested ἀφ' οὗ ἄν.<sup>255</sup> Insisting that *cum* renders ἐάν over-reads the Latin. Second, Harnack viewed ὑμᾶς after οἶδα as absent from Marcion's text.<sup>256</sup> The omission of the pronoun, though, may very well be due to Tertullian. It is worth noting that Tertullian not mentioning "the door" again after *pulsantibus* did not lead Harnack to conclude that it was absent in Marcion's text,<sup>257</sup> but merely that the word was unattested (note Harnack's two dots after κρούειν).

The adaptation of v. 26 attests the largely unproblematic phrase ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας. No witness attests ἐνώπιον before ἐφάγομεν, revealing that Tertullian's word order is almost certainly not arising from Marcion's text. Elsewhere only a few witnesses exhibit minor variation.

The citation of v. 27 attests the reply of the master of the house to the man knocking: ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ἀνομίας/ἀδικίας.<sup>258</sup> Concerning the final word, Harnack reconstructed Marcion's text with the former. He rightly noted that ἀνομίας (cf. Matt 7:23 and Ps 6:9) is attested by a few witnesses, including D.<sup>259</sup> Braun, however, states, "Le text de Luc, conservé par Marcion, se sert de l'expression «ouvriers d'iniquité» (ἐργάται ἀδικίας)."<sup>260</sup> Part of the problem is that *iniquitas* could render either term.<sup>261</sup> Even if Harnack is right, and the general pattern of Tertullian's Latin leans in that direction,<sup>262</sup> it still may not have

---

<sup>255</sup> Ibid., 218\*. ἀφ' οὗ ἄν occurs only here in the NT. According to IGNTP the first two words (ἀφ' οὗ) are almost universally attested, though several manuscripts then read ἐάν. instead of ἄν.

<sup>256</sup> Harnack stated the omission was otherwise unattested (*Marcion*, 218\*); however, c and possibly r<sup>1</sup> also omit it.

<sup>257</sup> It is absent in D, several OL manuscripts, and a few other witnesses.

<sup>258</sup> *Operarii* could be either vocative or nominative and therefore cannot distinguish between οἱ ἐργάται and ἐργάται. The latter, which is the reading of many manuscripts including P<sup>75</sup>, ℵ, B, and D is more likely.

<sup>259</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 218\*.

<sup>260</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 386n1.

<sup>261</sup> The OL witnesses and the Vulgate employ *iniquitas* in both Matt 7:23 and Luke 13:27.

<sup>262</sup> Tertullian cites 6 of the 24 NT verses with ἀδικία, and only in 5.16.5 (2 Thess 2:12) does he use *iniquitas*. In every other instance he employs *iniustitia* (4.33.1 [Luke 16:9], 5.13.2 [Rom 1:18], *Pud.* 19.14 [1 John 1:9], *Pud.* 19.28 [1 John 5:17], *Res.* 25.19 [2 Thess 2:10]). He cites only 2 of the 13 verses with ἀνομία, using *iniquitas* in *Pud.* 15.11 (2 Cor 6:14) and *delictum* in 5.16.4 (2 Thess 2:3).

been the reading of Marcion's text as Tertullian could have been influenced by the Matthean wording or the Psalm.

#### **4.1.62 Luke 14:12**

4.31.1 – *Ad prandium vel ad cenam quales vocari iubet?*

Very little insight into the wording of Luke 14:12 in Marcion's text can be gained from the brief allusion in Tertullian's question, though it is clear that it contained a reference to ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον and the verb φώνει.

#### **4.1.63 Luke 14:16–24**

4.31.2 – ... *Homo quidam fecit cenam et vocavit multos.* | 4.31.3 – *Dehinc si is mittit ad convivas qui cenam paravit,...* | 4.31.4 – *Excusant se invitati.... Agrum emi, et boves mercatus sum, et uxorem duxi.* | 4.31.5 – *Hoc ut patri familiae renuntiatum est, motus tunc—bene quod et motus, negat enim Marcion moveri deum suum: ita et hoc meus est—mandat de plateis et vicis civitatis facere sublectionem.* | 4.31.6 – *Itaque misit ad alios vocandos ex eadem adhuc civitate. Dehinc loco abundante praecepit etiam de viis et sepibus colligi, ... spem ... de qua illos gustaturos negat dominus,...*<sup>263</sup>

Tertullian attests numerous elements in the parable found in Luke 14:16–24, and its Lukan character (cf. the parallel in Matt 22:2–14) reveals its general reflection of Marcion's text. Based on the citation of v. 16 Harnack reconstructed ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίει δεῖπνον καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλούς.<sup>264</sup> It is possible, however, that *fecit* is rendering ἐποίησε, which NA<sup>27</sup> indicates is the reading of the Majority Text and of A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, and f<sup>13</sup>.<sup>265</sup> In addition, though Harnack believed Marcion's text did not read δεῖπνον μέγα, the absence of μέγα could be a simple omission by Tertullian.<sup>266</sup> For v. 17, Tertullian's general reference in 4.31.3 only reflects the universally attested ἀπέστειλεν. In 4.31.4, the allusion to vv. 18–20 uses an extreme economy of words which attest the unproblematic elements [ἦρξαντο]

---

<sup>263</sup> An additional allusion to this parable occurs in 4.31.7.

<sup>264</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 218\*.

<sup>265</sup> ἐποίει is the reading of P<sup>75</sup>, ℵ, and B.

<sup>266</sup> According to IGNTP μέγα is absent in X, 213, 1080, e, sy<sup>p</sup>, one manuscript of bo, and arm.

παραιτεῖσθαι ... ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα (v. 18), [ζεύγη] βοῶν ἠγόρασα (v. 19), and γυναικὰ ἔγημα (v. 20).<sup>267</sup>

From Tertullian's testimony in 4.31.6, for v. 21, Harnack reconstructed ἀπήγγειλεν ... τότε ἐπαρθεῖς<sup>268</sup> ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ... εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ῥύμας τῆς πόλεως ....<sup>269</sup> Again, nearly all of the elements are unproblematic, though the otherwise unattested ἐπαρθεῖς, from Tertullian's use of *movere*, merits brief comment. According to IGNTP, apart from 1654 (ἐγερθεῖς) and D\* (ὀργεῖς), the entire extant manuscript tradition here reads ὀργισθεῖς. Zahn is probably right when he argued it to be unlikely that Tertullian would have translated ὀργισθεῖς with *motus*, and it is probable that Marcion's text read another Greek verb,<sup>270</sup> however, precisely what that verb was remains obscure. Finally, Tertullian attests only a few unproblematic elements from vv. 22–24: ἔτι τόπος ἐστίν (v. 22), εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς (v. 23), and οὐδεῖς ... γεύσεται (v. 24).

#### 4.1.64 Luke 16:2, 4–7

4.33.1 – ...*secundum servi illius exemplum qui ab actu summotus dominicos debitores diminutis cautionibus relevat in subsidium sibi*:...

In the parable in Luke 16:1–9, v. 9 is multiply cited. In 4.33.1 Tertullian alludes to the servant having been removed from his office (v. 2) and to his creating security for himself by reducing the obligations of his master's debtors (vv. 4–7). For none of these verses, however, can any specific reading of Marcion's text be reconstructed.

---

<sup>267</sup> D, sy<sup>s</sup>, sy<sup>c</sup>, and the Persian Diatessaron read γυναικὰ ἔλαβον.

<sup>268</sup> Though Harnack wrote ἐπαρθεῖς in his text, in the apparatus he noted “ἐπαρθεῖς oder κινήθεις oder ähnlich” (*Marcion*, 219\*). κινήθεις was the reading suggested by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:478.

<sup>269</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 219\*. Based on 4.31.6 ἐξελθε should also be included in the reconstruction.

<sup>270</sup> Harris attempted to argue that *motus* was rendering ὀργισθεῖς here (*Codex Bezae*, 187), though Plooij correctly points out “it seems a little doubtful whether the word *motus* taken by itself and not ... defined by the context, could be used simply as an equivalent for *iratus*” (*A Further Study*, 75). In personal conversation Paul Parvis made the intriguing suggestion that Marcion replaced ὀργισθεῖς with ὀρμηθεῖς, which employs a verb not elsewhere found in the manuscript tradition here and not present in the NT, but similar in orthography to the reading of Luke 14:21.

#### 4.1.65 Luke 16:11–12

4.33.4 – ... *quomodo dictum: Si[t] in mamona iniusto fideles non extitistis, quod verum est quis vobis credet?... Et: Si in alieno fideles inventi non estis, meum quis dabit vobis?... Quis vobis credet quod verius est? et: Quis vobis dabit quod meum est?*

In 4.33.4 Tertullian cites the two questions found in Luke 16:11–12. Harnack reconstructed v. 11 εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῶν πιστεύσει;<sup>271</sup> Most of the verse is unproblematic, though the omission of the conjunction οὐν, also absent in a few other manuscripts and versions, could very well have been due to Tertullian.<sup>272</sup> It is also worth noting that Harnack did not follow Tertullian's word order for *mamona iniusto* or consider the altered order in Tertullian's second citation of the final element of the question. Harnack was probably correct on both counts as μαμωνᾷ ἀδίκῳ is virtually unattested in the manuscript tradition and the second citation, including the otherwise unattested *verius*, seems altered by Tertullian's own hand.<sup>273</sup>

Concerning v. 12, Harnack reconstructed εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐχ εὐρέθητε, τὸ ἐμὸν τίς δώσει ὑμῶν.<sup>274</sup> First, once again, the otherwise unattested omission of the conjunction καί is due to Tertullian having linked his thoughts with *et*. Second, given that Tertullian wrote *fideles non extitistis* in v. 11 and *fideles inventi non estis* here, it is likely that Marcion's text read εὐρέθητε,<sup>275</sup> also attested in sy<sup>s</sup>, sy<sup>p</sup>, and the Arabic Diatessaron. Third, e, i, and l, along with manuscript 157 read ἐμόν, and it is possible that Tertullian's *meum* is reflecting the reading in Marcion's text.<sup>276</sup> Finally, though numerous manuscripts and witnesses, including **Ⲛ** and D, read δώσει ὑμῶν, the fact that Tertullian often alters the position of pronouns

---

<sup>271</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 219\*.

<sup>272</sup> IGNTF lists Marcion as a witness for the omission.

<sup>273</sup> Braun comments “A si proche distance T. ne reprend pas le fragment de verset sous sa forme exacte (*uerum* > *uerius*)” (*Contre Marcion IV*, 405n5).

<sup>274</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 219\*.

<sup>275</sup> The same point is made by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:479.

<sup>276</sup> Unless it is Marcion's reading that appears elsewhere in the manuscript tradition, the presence of some other manuscript evidence for the reading means that Harnack's assumption that the reading reflects a tendentious alteration by Marcion and Evans's comment that the reading was “Marcion's invention” (*Adversus Marcionem*, 445n3) may not be correct. Braun simply observes that Marcion reads τὸ ἐμόν with other witnesses and does not speculate as to the origin of the reading (*Contre Marcion IV*, 404n4).

and in the second citation writes *vobis dabit* reveals that once again it is possible, though not certain, that Harnack's reconstruction is reflecting Marcion's text.

#### 4.1.66 Luke 16:14–15

4.33.2 – *Cui famulatam videns Pharisaeorum cupiditatem ... Inridebant denique Pharisaei pecuniae cupidi,...* | 4.33.6 – *Si autem et iustificantes se coram hominibus Pharisaei ... adicit: Scit autem deus corda vestra, ... Quod elatum est apud homines, perosum est deo,...*

In 4.33.2 Tertullian makes a reference to two elements in Luke 16:14: οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι and ἐξεμυκτήριζον, neither of which provides any difficulties. In 4.33.6 Tertullian alludes to the nearly uniformly attested ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων in v. 15 and then quotes γινώσκει δὲ ὁ θεὸς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, where once again the otherwise unattested order is likely due to Tertullian. The final element in v. 15 is rendered more loosely as Tertullian attests τὸ ὑψηλὸν ἐστὶν παρὰ ἀνθρώποις βδέλυγμα ἐστὶν τῷ θεῷ.<sup>277</sup> Given that the word order ὑψηλὸν παρὰ ἀνθρώποις is weakly attested, with παρὰ instead of ἐν virtually unattested;<sup>278</sup> the absence of ἐνώπιον before “God” is unattested; and ἐστὶν is placed either before ἐνώπιον or omitted altogether;<sup>279</sup> it is possible that Tertullian has here been influenced by the wording of Luke 18:27 (τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστὶν). In any case, the precise reading of Marcion's text remains obscure.

#### 4.1.67 Luke 16:17

4.33.9 – *Transeat igitur caelum et terra citius, sicut et lex et prophetae, quam unus, apex verborum domini.*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 16:17 εὐκοπώτερον (δέ ἐστὶν) τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τῶν λόγων μου μίαν κεραίαν (πεσεῖν), again apparently assuming that the otherwise unattested word order is due to Tertullian.<sup>280</sup>

---

<sup>277</sup> Harnack stated that the final element of this verse was unattested (*Marcion*, 220\*). Tsutsui rightly noted that Harnack's statement appears to have been due to an oversight (“Evangelium,” 111).

<sup>278</sup> 579 and three church fathers read παρὰ.

<sup>279</sup> The former is the case for several manuscripts including most OL witnesses and the omission is attested in numerous manuscripts, including P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, A, B, and D.

<sup>280</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 220\*.

Noteworthy is the otherwise unattested reading τῶν λόγων instead of the canonical τοῦ νόμου, which Harnack attributed to a tendentious alteration by Marcion.<sup>281</sup> Wright, however, notices that Tertullian follows this reference with *Verbum, enim inquit Esaias, dei nostri manet in aevum* (Isa 40:8), and contends that the tendency and reading are “with difficulty” attributed to Marcion as Tertullian’s argument may be responsible for the wording.<sup>282</sup> In addition, though Harnack and Tsutsui noted the point of contact with Luke 21:33, they did not consider the possibility that Tertullian, rather than Marcion’s text, was being influenced by Matt 24:35/Mark 13:31/Luke 21:33. Related to this point is the reading πεσεῖν, which Harnack considered uncertain,<sup>283</sup> as Tertullian implies that *transeat* governs both elements of the verse. This construction is, in fact, found in Matt 24:35 and parallels and thus may be a further indication of the influence of that passage on the wording in 4.33.9.<sup>284</sup> Thus, Marcion’s precise wording cannot be established with certainty.

#### 4.1.68 Luke 16:18

4.34.1 – *Sed Christus divortium prohibet dicens: Qui dimiserit uxorem suam et aliam duxerit, adulterium committet; qui dimissam a viro duxerit, aequae adulter est:...* |

4.34.4 – *Qui dimiserit, inquit, uxorem, et aliam duxerit, adulterium commisit, et qui a marito dimissam duxerit, aequae adulter est.*<sup>285</sup> | 4.34.9 – *... inlicitorum matrimoniorum et adulterii figuras iaculatus est in Herodem, adulterum pronuntians etiam qui dimissam a viro duxerit,...*<sup>286</sup>

Tertullian makes several references to Luke 16:18, two of which are quotations. Harnack privileged the first citation and reconstructed ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν<sup>287</sup> μοιχεύει, καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρ σ

<sup>281</sup> Ibid. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 111 and Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 410n2 share Harnack’s view.

<sup>282</sup> Wright, *Alterations*, 133. The potential influence of Isa 40:8 was also considered with regard to Luke 21:33, discussed in chapter 3.

<sup>283</sup> See Harnack’s comment in the apparatus (*Marcion*, 220\*).

<sup>284</sup> When referring to Luke 21:33 Tertullian writes *transeat age nunc caelum et terra* (4.39.18). It should be noted, though, that παρελθεῖν is also attested by several witnesses here in Luke 16:17.

<sup>285</sup> Moreschini’s text reads *adulter est* with *M*, *X*, and *R*<sub>3</sub>, rejecting *adulter* in *R*<sub>1</sub> and *R*<sub>2</sub> and *est* in *F*.

<sup>286</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 16:18 occurs in 5.7.6.

<sup>287</sup> IGNTF interprets *aliam* in several OL manuscripts as rendering ἄλλην instead of ἑτέραν. This interpretation, however, seems unnecessary.



[sic] γαμῶν ὁμοίως μοιχός ἐστίν.<sup>288</sup> The omission of πᾶς at the outset of the verse is otherwise unattested, and it may be a simple omission on the part of Tertullian, possibly due to the influence of the Synoptic parallels as Matt 19:9/Mark 10:11 do not use the adjective. Thus, the omission of the second πᾶς, though attested in the manuscript tradition, may also be a simple omission.<sup>289</sup> In addition, Tertullian's use of finite verbs was rightly not retained by Harnack, as Tertullian is using them to render the Greek participles.<sup>290</sup> Once again, Tertullian's inclination to alter word order (*qui dimissam a viro duxerit* in 4.34.1, 9 and *qui a marito dimissam duxerit* in 4.34.4), inconsistently render pronouns (*suam* present in 4.34.1 and absent in 4.34.4), and alter vocabulary (*a viro* and *a marito*) are evident. Finally, Harnack's interpretation of the conclusion of the verse (*aeque adulter est*) results in the otherwise unattested ὁμοίως μοιχός ἐστίν, and it may be the case that Tertullian is paraphrasing.

#### 4.1.69 Luke 16:23, 26

4.34.10 – ... *subsequens argumentum divitis apud inferos dolentis et pauperis in sinu Abrahae requiescentis*. | 4.34.11–12 – ... *sive tormenti sive refrigerii apud inferos ... Respondebimus et <ad> haec [Marcion's interpretation], ipsa scriptura revincente oculos eius, qui ad inferos discernit Abrahae sinum pauperi.... Nam et magnum ait intercidere regiones istas profundum et transitum utrimque prohibere. Sed nec adlevasset dives oculos, et quidem de longinquo,...*

These two verses out of the account of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19–31) are also attested in *Adam*. Tertullian's testimony to v. 23 attests ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ,<sup>291</sup> ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, [ὑπάρχων] ἐν βασάνοις, [Ἀβραὰμ] ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, and ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ [αὐτοῦ].<sup>292</sup> In v. 26 the allusion in 4.34.11,

<sup>288</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 220\*.

<sup>289</sup> πᾶς before ὁ ἀπολελυμένην is not present in B, D, L, 69, all OL manuscripts, and various other versions.

<sup>290</sup> According to IGNTP the participles are uniformly attested in the manuscript tradition.

<sup>291</sup> Curiously, IGNTP lists Marcion among the witnesses omitting this element in v. 23. The few OL witnesses with this element all read the singular *inferno*; however, according to the data in Gösta Claesson, *Index Tertullianus* (3 vols.; Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974–1975), 2:776–77 Tertullian only employs the noun *infernus* 7 times in his corpus, and almost exclusively uses a plural form of *infer* as a substantive. Thus, there is no reason to posit a plural Greek noun behind *inferos*.

<sup>292</sup> The singular τῷ κόλπῳ is also read in D and every OL manuscript except, interestingly, d and e.

though the statement of the prohibition to pass from one side to the other clearly arises from the verse, only directly attests the words χάσμα μέγα.<sup>293</sup>

#### 4.1.70 Luke 17:1–3

4.35.1 – *Conversus ibidem ad discipulos, Vae, dicit, auctori scandalorum: expedisse ei, si natus non fuisset, aut si molino<sup>294</sup> saxo ad collum deligato praecipitatus esset in profundum, quam unum ex illis modicis utique discipulis eius scandalizasset.* | 4.35.2 – *Peccantem fratrem iubet corripi;*...

Luke 17:1 is also attested in *Adam*. For vv. 1 and 3 Tertullian’s testimony provides minimal insight. 4.35.1 attests οὐαί and τὰ σκάνδαλα for v. 1, but the precise reading, and the Greek behind *auctori scandalorum*, cannot be determined.<sup>295</sup> 4.35.2 alludes to v. 3, but given the significant variation in the manuscript tradition, minimal insight can be gained into Marcion’s reading. That the verb ἀμαρτάνω appeared is clear, but its precise form cannot be determined. The only other elements attested are the unproblematic ὁ ἀδελφός and ἐπιτίμησον.

Luke 17:2 is attested in greater detail and Harnack reconstructed συνέφερον αὐτῶ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ἢ εἰ μυλικὸς λίθος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ περιέκειτο καὶ ἔρριπτο εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἵνα ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων σκανδαλίση.<sup>296</sup> First, though the attestation of συνέφερον in d (συνφέρει in D and e) makes it possible that Marcion’s text read as Harnack reconstructed, the influence of Matt 18:6 (συνφέρει) on Tertullian cannot be excluded. In addition, the tenses reconstructed by Harnack may be reflecting Marcion’s text; however, despite some attestation in the manuscript tradition, they also may be due to Tertullian’s adaptation.<sup>297</sup> Third, Harnack noted that εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη comes from Matt 26:24,<sup>298</sup>

---

<sup>293</sup> According to IGNTP the word order μέγα χάσμα is only attested in 1194, 1352, and the Arabic Diatessaron and may therefore be due to Tertullian.

<sup>294</sup> For brief comments on this early use of the adjective *molinus* by Tertullian see Andrew Wilson, “Water-Mills at Amida: Ammianus Marcellinus 18.8.11,” *CQ* 51 (2001): 233.

<sup>295</sup> It is also unclear whether Tertullian’s rendering reveals the influence of Matt 18:7 on either Marcion’s text or the reference to it as there, unlike in Luke, τὸ σκάνδαλον is repeated after the “woe.”

<sup>296</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 222\*–23\*.

<sup>297</sup> According to IGNTP, in addition to συνέφερον, discussed above, περιέκειτο and ἔρριπτο are attested by D, a, d, r<sup>1</sup>, e, and Basil of Caesarea. For these verbs Luke reads a present followed by a perfect.

<sup>298</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 222\*. Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 429n4 concurs.

and most OL manuscripts (but not e) also attest this reading along with Rufinus’s translation of Origen’s homilies in Numbers. The possibility that Marcion’s text contained the phrase cannot be excluded.<sup>299</sup> Finally, Harnack is inclined to follow Tertullian’s word order, though the otherwise unattested *μυλικὸς λίθος, περιέκειτο* following the *περί* prepositional phrase, and *σκανδαλίση* occurring at the end of the verse cannot definitively be ascribed to Marcion’s text.

#### 4.1.71 Luke 17:11–12a, 14–19

4.35.4 – ... *Christum ... praevenientem sollemnia legis etiam in curatione decem leprosum, quos tantummodo ire iussos ut se ostenderent sacerdotibus, in itinere purgavit, sine tactu iam et sine verbo, tacita potestate et sola voluntate.*<sup>300</sup> | 4.35.7 – *Sed et quod in manifesto fuit legis praecepit: Ite, ostendite vos sacerdotibus.*<sup>301</sup> | 4.35.9 – *In Samariae regionibus res agebatur, unde erat et unus interim ex leprosis.* | 4.35.11 – *Unde et unum illum solum ex decem memorem divinae gratiae Samariten miratus non mandat offerre munus ex lege, quia satis iam obtulerat gloriam deo reddens, ... Fides tua te salvum fecit ...*

As mentioned above in the discussion of Luke 4:27, both Tertullian and Epiphanius attest that verse’s presence in this pericope.<sup>302</sup> For Luke 17:11–12, 14–19, vv. 12 and 14 are also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian’s testimony to v. 12 attests *δέκα λεπροί*, though whether *ἄνδρες* is to be understood, and if so, where it occurred in the phrase is not clear. Tertullian makes several references, including one

---

<sup>299</sup> Elements from Matt 26:24/Mark 14:21 and Mark 9:42/Matt 18:6/Luke 17:2 also appear together in the often-discussed passage in *1 Clem.* 46.8 (see Donald Alfred Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* [NovTSup 34; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973], 152–64, especially 157–58).

<sup>300</sup> In 4.35.6, 10 Tertullian again makes reference to these “ten.”

<sup>301</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 17:14 occurs in 4.35.10. In 4.35.8 Tertullian makes the confusing statement *Sed cur pristina leproso nihil tale praecepit?* and both Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 461n1 and Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 436n1 point out that this cannot be the leper at Luke 5:12–16 because he did receive such an order. An oversight on the part of Tertullian seems likely.

<sup>302</sup> Harnack contended that it was inserted before *πορευθέντες* in v. 14, which, in the light of how Tertullian introduces the material in 4.35.6 (*Nunc etsi praefatus est*) and Epiphanius’s testimony in *Pan.* 42.11.6(48), is probably correct (*Marcion*, 223\*; Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 114 concurs; this was also the probable position according to Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 425, 442). Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:481 and IGNTP add it after *ἱερεῦσιν*. Zahn rightly criticized the views of Hahn, *Evangelium Marcions*, 189 (insertion after v. 14) and Volekmar, *Evangelium Marcions*, 83, 151 (insertion in v. 18), though he admitted that Hilgenfeld may have been right (*Geschichte*, 2:483).

citation in 4.35.7, to v. 14 attesting πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ... ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν ... ἑκαθαρίσθησαν.<sup>303</sup>

For the verses attested only by Tertullian, in 4.35.9 he alludes to Σαμαρείας in v. 11 and [αὐτὸς ἦν] Σαμαρίτης in v. 16. In 4.35.11 Tertullian attests εἷς ... ἐξ αὐτῶν in v. 15;<sup>304</sup> however, though Jesus' questions in vv. 17 and 18 seem to be assumed, only δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ can be reconstructed. Near the end of the section, Tertullian cites the final element of v. 19: ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.<sup>305</sup>

#### 4.1.72 Luke 17:20–21

4.35.12 – *Sed nec Pharisei possunt videri de alterius dei regno consuluisse dominum, quando venturum sit, ... Non venit, inquit, regnum dei cum observatione, nec dicunt: Ecce hic, ecce illic; ecce enim regnum dei intra vos est.... intra vos est, ...*  
| 4.35.13 – *Hoc erit: non hic nec illic; ecce enim intra vos est regnum dei.*

Though Tertullian only alludes to the first half of Luke 17:20, since the manuscript attestation is fairly uniform, the reconstruction ἐπερωτηθεῖς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is unproblematic. The citation of v. 20b straightforwardly attests the reply οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.<sup>306</sup> V. 21, as cited in 4.35.12 is also relatively unproblematic, though there are slight differences in the repetition in 4.35.13. Harnack and Braun rightly see the second instance as having been altered by Tertullian and it is worth noting once again the ease with which Tertullian changes the wording of a verse (*non* instead of *ecce*) and alters the position of elements (*intra vos est*) in a citation.<sup>307</sup> Harnack reconstructed οὐδὲ ἔρουσιν· ἰδοὺ ᾧδε, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ·

---

<sup>303</sup> Tertullian's use of *ostendere* cannot provide definitive insight into whether Marcion's text employed ἐπιδείκνυμι or δείκνυμι. This point is confirmed by the OL using *ostendere* to render both terms. According to IGNTP, 157, 1424, and 1675 are the only manuscripts reading δείξατε, which is why, without bringing Epiphanius's testimony into the discussion, I here write ἐπιδείξατε.

<sup>304</sup> Harnack apparently used the reference to giving glory to God (v. 18) to also reconstruct δοξάζων τὸν θεόν for v. 15; however, the phrase is actually unattested for v. 15, and the reference to v. 18 should not be used to reconstruct v. 15.

<sup>305</sup> For the word order see n. 104. Harnack apparently believed that *miratus* also reflected an element in Marcion's text and therefore wrote (καὶ) θαυμάσας αὐτὸν (εἶπεν αὐτῷ) at the beginning of v. 19 (*Marcion*, 224\*). The supposition of the presence of such an otherwise unattested element, however, is unnecessary as *miratus* could be Tertullian's interpretation of the sentiment behind the questions in vv. 17–18.

<sup>306</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 224\* reconstructed the verse the same way.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.* and Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 441n4.

ἰδοῦ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν,<sup>308</sup> concerning which three comments need to be made. First, Tsutsui draws attention to Tertullian’s *dicunt* (present instead of future) and notes “Wenn das direkte Zitat Tertullians zuverlässig ist, dann darf man wohl daraus folgern, daß Marcion hier die Gegenwart des Gottesreichs hervorheben wollte.”<sup>309</sup> Tsutsui recognizes that the future is prevalent in the manuscript tradition with only l and s reading *dicunt*.<sup>310</sup> Therefore, in addition to Tsutsui’s suggested reason for a theologically driven alteration by Marcion being unconvincing, it is significantly more likely that Tertullian, who has already been seen to alter the present to the future, may here have rendered a future with the present.<sup>311</sup> This view becomes even more likely when it is recognized that the immediately preceding verb *venit* (present) may have influenced Tertullian and that the focus of Tertullian’s argument is on the final words of v. 21. Second, NA<sup>27</sup> does not include the second ἰδοῦ, noting however that ἡ ἰδοῦ ἐκεῖ is the reading of A, D, (W), Ψ, f<sup>1.13</sup>, the Majority Text, OL, and sy<sup>c.p.h</sup>. Finally, though numerous late witnesses omit ἡ before this second ἰδοῦ, the conjunction may have been omitted by Tertullian.

#### 4.1.73 Luke 17:25–26, 28, 32

4.35.14 – *Dicens enim filium hominis ante multa pati et reprobari oportere, ante adventum suum,...* | 4.35.16 – *Sed si de suo loquitur adventu, cur eum diebus Noe et Loth comparat tetris et atrocibus, deus et lenis et mitis? Cur admonet meminisse uxoris Loth,...*

In 4.35.16 Tertullian adapts Luke 17:25, reconstructed by Harnack πρῶτον δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου (αὐτὸν?) πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι...<sup>312</sup> There are several difficulties with following Harnack’s suggested reading. First, though δέ after πρῶτον is omitted by a handful of manuscripts, it may here be a

<sup>308</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 224\*.

<sup>309</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 115.

<sup>310</sup> e reads *dicens*, and according to IGNTP all other witnesses attest the future.

<sup>311</sup> It appears that this is an instance where Tsutsui’s giving undue weight to a “direct quote” by Tertullian has led him to offer an unlikely reconstruction of Marcion’s reading.

<sup>312</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 224\*. In *Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 206\* Harnack wrote “Ob ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης gefehlt hat? Wahrscheinlich.” In the second edition, however, he removed “Wahrscheinlich.” The element is unattested, and since Tertullian focuses simply on the idea of “rejection” and “honored” in the following argument and citation of Ps 118:22, the omission could well be due to him. In any case, the comment by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:483 that the omission appears certain is overstated.

simple omission by Tertullian. Second, it is highly doubtful that the otherwise unattested τὸν υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου appeared in Marcion's text. Though vv. 22–24 are unattested in Tertullian, Epiphanius attests v. 22 and in all likelihood Tertullian replaced αὐτόν with “Son of Man,” taken from the context, in order to clarify the reference.<sup>313</sup> On the other hand, Harnack rightly did not rearrange the words in the verse based on Tertullian's word order.

In 4.35.16 Tertullian refers to [ἐν] ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε (v. 26) and [ἐν] ταῖς ἡμέραις Λῳτ (v. 28); however, nothing else from these verses can be reconstructed. For Luke 17:32, Tertullian's question references the unproblematic μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λῳτ.<sup>314</sup>

#### 4.1.74 Luke 18:1–3, 5, 7

4.36.1 – *Nam et orandi perseverantiam et instantiam mandans parabolam iudicis ponit coacti audire viduam instantia et perseverantia interpellationum eius.... Sed subiunxit facturum deum vindictam electorum suorum.... quem electorum suorum clamantium ad eum die et nocte vindicem ostendit.*

As was the case with Luke 18:9–14 discussed in the previous chapter, Harnack recognized that Tertullian only alludes to elements in the parable in vv. 1–8.<sup>315</sup> Once again, however, Harnack did not allow this fact to dissuade him from offering a reconstruction of the opening verses. Though there is a clear allusion to a parable concerning perseverance and persistence in prayer (v. 1), a judge (v. 2), a widow (v. 3), and her persistence leading to a hearing (v. 5), specific readings remain elusive.<sup>316</sup> At the same time, Tertullian's adaptation of v. 7 later in 4.36.1 does allow greater insight. Harnack reconstructed ὁ θεὸς ... ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ, where his overlooking Tertullian's reference to τῶν βοῶντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός is only one of several problems.<sup>317</sup> The otherwise unattested omission of δέ has all the hallmarks of a simple omission by Tertullian. In

<sup>313</sup> The same phenomenon occurs in 4.41.1 in Luke 22:22.

<sup>314</sup> Tertullian's *admonet meminisse*, however, could be rendering μνημονεύεται found in **S**, A, N, R, W, and several other manuscripts.

<sup>315</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 224\*.

<sup>316</sup> For example, Harnack reconstructed προσεύχεσθαι αὐτούς, though many manuscripts, including D, omit αὐτούς. Harnack also placed παραβολήν in an otherwise unattested position at the end of v. 1. Decisions such as these simply are not warranted based on Tertullian's allusion.

<sup>317</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 224\*–25\*.

addition, though the TR and most OL manuscripts attest ποιήσει, P<sup>75</sup>, **S**, B, D, and many other manuscripts read ποιήση. Tertullian's use of a future participle *facturum* may not be due to an underlying Greek future indicative. Finally, in the element not reconstructed by Harnack, Tertullian's *ad eum* may reflect the reading of d and the TR (πρὸς αὐτόν).

#### 4.1.75 Luke 18:18–21, 23

4.36.3 – *Sed quis optimus, nisi unus, inquit, deus?* | 4.36.4 – *Denique interrogatus ab illo quodam: Praeceptor optime, quid faciens vitam aeternam possidebo?*<sup>318</sup> *de praeceptis creatoris an ea sciret, id est faceret, expostulavit, ad contestandum praecept[or]is creatoris vitam acquiri sempiternam. Cumque ille principaliora quaeque adfirmasset observasse se ab adolescentia:...* | 4.36.5 – *Resciditne Christus priora praecepta non occidendi, non adulterandi, non furandi, non falsum testandi, diligendi patrem et matrem,...* *uti gloriosissimus ille observator praeceptorum pecuniam multo cariore habiturus traduceretur?* | 4.36.7 – ... *Praecepta, inquit, scis;...*

In Jesus' encounter with the rich ruler in Luke 18:18–23, v. 22 is multiply cited, v. 19 is also attested by Origen and Hippolytus, vv. 18–21 by Epiphanius, and vv. 18–22 in *Adam*. In 4.36.4 Tertullian cites v. 18 attesting διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω. In 4.36.3 his citation of v. 19 attests [οὐδεὶς] ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός. Even apart from the evidence of the other sources, since Tertullian concludes his previous discussion with a reference to *deus optimus et ultro bonus* (4.36.2) and then uses the superlative *optimus* six times in 4.36.3–4 it is more likely that the superlative in both verses is due to Tertullian and not to an otherwise unattested reading in Marcion's text. For v. 20 Tertullian attests τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας (4.36.4, 7) and μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα (4.36.5), though Tertullian's gerundives could also render the Matthean οὐ plus future tense of the verbs. In addition, the order μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης is that of Matt 19:18 and Exod 20:13–14/Deut 5:17–18 in the HB, though it is also attested for Luke in nearly every extant OL manuscript and numerous versions. Finally, Tertullian's allusion to v. 21 in 4.36.4 attests [ταῦτα πάντα] ἐφύλαξα/ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητος.

<sup>318</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 18:18–19 occurs in 4.36.6.

Tertullian is the only witness for v. 23, and it should be noted that Harnack's comments here are confusing. In his reconstruction, for vv. 23–30 he wrote “unbezeugt?”<sup>319</sup> In his apparatus, however, he stated that v. 23 is attested only by Tertullian's allusion. Harnack then states that Zahn's attempt to demonstrate that vv. 23–30 were not missing in Marcion's text was not successful and that a reference in *Adam.* to vv. 24–30 did not arise out of Marcion's text.<sup>320</sup> Tertullian's allusion is not discussed; yet, the reference to a demonstration of the greater love for wealth on the part of the “boastful keeper of the commandments” (shortly after the citation of v. 22 in 4.36.5) seems to require the presence of v. 23 even if the precise wording of the text cannot be reconstructed.<sup>321</sup>

#### **4.1.76 Luke 18:35, 37, 39, 43**

4.36.9 – *Cum igitur praetereuntem illum caecus audisset, ... Sed antecedentes increpabant caecum, uti taceret.* | 4.36.12 – *... exteriore quoque visione donavit, ...* | 4.37.1 – *... et omnis populus laudes referebant deo, ...*

For the pericope in Luke 18:35–43, vv. 38 and 42 are multiply cited. V. 35 is also attested by Epiphanius, and vv. 35, 37, and 43 in *Adam.* Tertullian's allusion in 4.36.9 only attests τυφλός (v. 35) and that Jesus παρέρχεται (v. 37). The adaptation of v. 39, a verse for which Tertullian is the only witness, led Harnack to reconstruct οἱ δὲ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ.<sup>322</sup> οἱ δὲ is attested by D, e, d, r<sup>1</sup>, sa, geo, and Epiphanius Latinus and could also have been the reading in Marcion's text; however, given Tertullian's loose handling of conjunctions the reading καὶ οἱ remains possible. Also, *taceret* could be rendering either σιωπήσῃ or σιγήσῃ, the reading in B, D, L, P, and several other manuscripts. For v. 43 there is an allusion to the healing (4.36.12), and as Tertullian begins his discussion of

<sup>319</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 226\*.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 117 does not note Tertullian's allusion and considers v. 23 unattested.

<sup>321</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 448 also recognizes the allusion to v. 23.

<sup>322</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 227\*. In his first edition, Harnack stated that v. 39 had been omitted in Marcion's Gospel, as is the case in several other manuscripts, due to homoeoteleuton (*Marcion*<sup>1</sup>, 208\*–9\*). In the second edition, however, Harnack stated “von Adamant. durch Homöotel. ausgelassen,” thus accepting Tertullian's testimony concerning its presence in Marcion's Gospel. Harnack also placed the remainder of the verse in parentheses, though it is unattested by Tertullian. Finally, unlike in Luke 17:25, for example, Harnack did not have any difficulty assuming Tertullian had replaced a pronoun with its antecedent (here *caecum*).



Zacchaeus in 4.37.1 he makes a reference back to the final element of the verse: καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ... αἶνον ἔδωκεν τῷ θεῷ. According to IGNTP, the order αἶνον ἔδωκεν is elsewhere only attested in gat, thus it may be due to Tertullian.

#### 4.1.77 Luke 19:2, 6, 8–9

4.37.1 – *Consequitur et Zacchaei domus salutem.... exceptum domo sua pascens dominum.... hoc cum maxime promittebat, in omnia misericordiae opera dimidium substantiae offerens,... dicendo: Et si cui quid per calumniam eripui, quadruplum reddo.... Itaque dominus: Hodie, inquit, salus huic domui.*

For the encounter with Zacchaeus, the final verse (v. 10) is multiply cited. Tertullian's opening words attest Ζακχαῖος (v. 2),<sup>323</sup> and shortly thereafter allude to the fact that Zacchaeus ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν [Jesus] (v.6). The allusion to, followed by citation of, v. 8 led Harnack to reconstruct τὰ ἡμίσεια ... τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ... δίδωμι, καὶ εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα, τετραπλοῦν ἀποδίδωμι.<sup>324</sup> Tertullian's reference to *omnia misericordiae opera* could reveal that τοῖς πτωχοῖς was present in the verse, though its position in relation to δίδωμι is unclear.<sup>325</sup> Also, the order τετραπλοῦν ἀποδίδωμι is attested in several witnesses, including e and f, and might reflect the order in Marcion's text. The citation of v. 9 attests σήμερον σωτηρία τούτῳ τῷ οἴκῳ. The order τούτῳ τῷ οἴκῳ is again attested by a few witnesses, including ff<sup>2</sup> and gat, though again it is not certain that this was the reading of Marcion's text. Harnack's and Tsutsui's confident assertion that the unattested v. 9b was excised because Tertullian, earlier in 4.37.1, refers to Zacchaeus as an *allophylus* is speculative.<sup>326</sup>

#### 4.1.78 Luke 19:11, 13, 22–23, 26

4.37.4 – *Servorum quoque parabola, qui secundum rationem feneratorae pecuniae dominicae diiudicantur,... etiam ex parte severitatis non tantum onerantem,<sup>327</sup> verum*

<sup>323</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 227\* erroneously indicated that the name appears in v. 1.

<sup>324</sup> Ibid.

<sup>325</sup> In **8**, D, and several other witnesses it precedes the verb, though elsewhere it follows.

<sup>326</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 227\* and Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 118. Again, the same view was held by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:485. Braun notes that when Tertullian makes that off-hand remark he "ne fait aucune remarque sur le texte de Marcion et semble tenir pour allant de soi la non judéité de ce publicain" (*Contre Marcion IV*, 457n5).

<sup>327</sup> Moreschini follows the reading suggested by Kroymann. All manuscripts and other editors read *honorantem*.

*et auferentem quod quis videatur habuisse. Aut si et haec creatorem finxerit austerum, tollentem quod non posuerit et metentem quod non severit, hic quoque me ille instruit cuius pecuniam ut fenerem edocet.*<sup>328</sup>

Harnack rightly noted that there are only brief allusions to elements in the parable of the ten minas.<sup>329</sup> In 4.37.4 there appear to be allusions to παραβολήν (v. 11) and δούλους ... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ... μνᾶς (v. 13). The comment that the servants are judged according to their account of their master's money reveals that further elements in the parable are present, though few specifics are attested. Tertullian then alludes to v. 26, which Harnack reconstructed (ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος) καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται.<sup>330</sup> A few witnesses, including Θ, 69, and sy<sup>c</sup>, attest ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν; however, Tertullian may have been influenced by Luke 8:18 in his wording here.<sup>331</sup> 4.37.4 concludes with an adaptation of αὐστηρός ... ἄιρων/ἄιρω ὁ οὐκ ἔθηκα καὶ θερίζων/θερίζω ὁ οὐκ ἔσπειρα (v. 22) and possibly an allusion to τόκος (v. 23). The lack of influence from the differently worded Matt 19:22 increases the likelihood that Marcion's text is in view; however, given that Tertullian has already used participles in rendering the sense of the universally attested finite verbs in v. 26, it is not certain whether the participles here reflect Greek participles or finite verbs.<sup>332</sup>

#### **4.1.79 Luke 20: 5–6, 7–8**

4.38.1 – *Putā illos renuntiāsse humanum Ioannis baptisma: statim lapidibus elisi fuissent.* | 4.38.2 – *Sed de caelis fuit baptisma Iohannis. Et quare, inquit Christus, non credidistis ei?... Certe nolentibus renuntiare quid saperent cum et ipse vicem opponit: Et ego non dico vobis in qua virtute haec facio,...*

In Tertullian's interaction with the pericope in Luke 20:1–8, vv. 1 and 4 are multiply cited. In 4.38.1, Tertullian's allusion to v. 6 reveals the presence of

---

<sup>328</sup> An allusion back to this parable, and v. 13 in particular, occurs in 4.39.11.

<sup>329</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 227\*.

<sup>330</sup> *Ibid.*, 228\*. If the reading *honorantem* is correct (see n. 327), the reference to "honor" could have v. 26a in view.

<sup>331</sup> See the discussion of this verse in chapter 3.

<sup>332</sup> ἄιρω and θερίζω are both attested by several witnesses including D and most OL manuscripts. V. 21 contains the same phrase in the mouth of the slave, though the Master/Creator parallel would tend to point towards v. 22, where the master is speaking, being in view by Tertullian.

ἀνθρώπων, even if the preceding preposition remains unclear.<sup>333</sup> In addition, the reference indicates that the Lukan καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς was present in the text.

There are two citations in 4.38.2, one of v. 5 and the other of v. 8. In v. 5, Harnack first offered an otherwise unattested ἐξ οὐρανῶν. The unlikelihood of the plural was already discussed in the previous chapter as it related to v. 4.<sup>334</sup> His reconstruction of the quoted element of v. 5, διατί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ, is essentially unproblematic;<sup>335</sup> yet, the absence of οὖν after διὰ τί could be a simple omission by Tertullian.<sup>336</sup> Prior to the citation of v. 8, Tertullian's comment on "refusing to respond" alludes to the content of v. 7, though no specific element is attested. The quotation then references the nearly uniformly attested οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.<sup>337</sup>

#### **4.1.80 Luke 20:24**

4.38.3 – *Quae erunt dei, quae similia sint denario Caesaris?*

For the discussion in Luke 20:20–26 Harnack only reconstructed v. 25, discussed in the previous chapter. Tertullian's question immediately following the citation of v. 25, however, reveals that δηνάριον and Καίσαρος must have been mentioned in v. 24. Unfortunately, no further insight into Marcion's text is possible.

#### **4.1.81 Luke 20:27–31, 33–34, 39**

4.38.4 – *Sadducaeī, resurrectionis negatores, de ea habentes interrogationem, proposuerant domino ex lege materiam mulieris quae septem fratribus ex ordine defunctis secundum praeceptum legale nupsisset, cuius viri deputanda esset in resurrectione.* | 4.38.5 – *Respondit igitur huius quidem aevi filios nubere ...* | 4.38.8

---

<sup>333</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 228\* reconstructed ἐξ, which is attested in nearly all manuscripts; however, D, along with a, c, d, ff<sup>2</sup>, and e, read ἀπό.

<sup>334</sup> See the comments in the section on Luke 20:1, 4 and chapter 3, n. 346.

<sup>335</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 228\*.

<sup>336</sup> Many manuscripts, including **N** and B, omit the conjunction, though it is attested in A, D, and numerous OL manuscripts.

<sup>337</sup> Though *virtute* would normally render δυνάμει and not ἐξουσίᾳ, it is likely that its use here is attributable to Tertullian and not to an otherwise unattested occurrence of δυνάμει. The reconstruction above is also the one offered by Harnack, *Marcion*, 228\* and it is interesting that here he did not insist that *et* be rendering καί.

– ... *filiū huius aevi nubunt et nubuntur*<sup>338</sup>... | 4.38.9 – *Atque adeo scribae: Magister, inquit, bene dixisti.*

In the account of Jesus' dispute with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection (Luke 20:27–40), vv. 35 and 36 are multiply cited. In 4.38.4 Tertullian offers an overview of the initial encounter alluding to various elements in vv. 27–31 and v. 33. First, there is an allusion to [τινες τῶν] Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες/ λέγοντες ἀναστασιν [μὴ εἶναι] (v. 27).<sup>339</sup> Second, *ex lege* probably arises due to Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν in v. 28. Third, there is a clear reference to ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοί and [λαβῶν] γυναικα (v. 29a), and it is also apparent that all seven brothers dying (vv. 29b–31) was present in the text, though the precise wording is not given. Finally, for v. 33 Harnack reconstructed τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει.<sup>340</sup> γυνή, however, is unattested here and it does not seem warranted to place ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει in an otherwise unattested position based on Tertullian's allusion.

Tertullian adapts v. 34 in 4.38.5 and then cites it in 4.38.8. The adaptation attests the ἀποκριθεῖς found in several witnesses and the citation attests οἱ υἱοὶ τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται.<sup>341</sup> Curiously, Harnack did not follow Tertullian's word order, reconstructing τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.<sup>342</sup> The different word order in the adaptation again reveals that the reordering of elements here may well be due to Tertullian; yet, most OL witnesses offer the variant order attested by Tertullian. The final citation in 4.38.9 of v. 39 is unproblematic, attesting the Lukan [τινες τῶν] γραμματέων εἶπαν· διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπας.<sup>343</sup>

---

<sup>338</sup> Moreschini follows the reading of R<sub>3</sub>, though *M*, *γ*, R<sub>1</sub>, and R<sub>2</sub> read *nubentur*. Given Tertullian's propensity to use the future tense, the stronger manuscript evidence for a more difficult reading may well be correct; however, even if Tertullian wrote *nubentur* it should be considered due to his own proclivity. No witness to the biblical text attests a future tense.

<sup>339</sup> Tertullian's allusion does not reveal the precise reading or word order of Marcion's text, and therefore cannot disclose which of the various readings attested in the manuscript tradition appeared in Marcion's text.

<sup>340</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*.

<sup>341</sup> IGNTF reveals the considerable variety of forms attested for the final verb in this phrase. Tertullian's Latin cannot reveal the precise reading and I have here simply adopted the reading of NA<sup>27</sup> out of convenience.

<sup>342</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*.

<sup>343</sup> Harnack placed γραμματεῖς in parentheses and commented “γραμματεῖς ergibt sich aus dem folgenden Zitat Tert.” (ibid.). Though the following reference to 20:41 in 4.38.10 does refer to the scribes, the comment here can only be due to an oversight of Tertullian's direct attribution of the

#### 4.1.82 Luke 20:41, 44

4.38.10 – *Si autem scribae Christum filium David existimabant, ipse autem David dominum eum appellat, quid hoc ad Christum?*

Harnack recognized that Tertullian only alludes to vv. 41–44, though he was convinced that v. 41 had been influenced by Matt 22:42. He therefore reconstructed (τί ὑμῖν) δοκεῖ (περὶ τοῦ) Χριστοῦ; (τίνος) υἱός (ἐστιν; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ) Δαυεῖδ [sic].<sup>344</sup> Harnack argued that this influence is revealed in the fact that *existimabant* (δοκεῖ) is only found in Matthew and that only there do the Scribes, though in Matthew it is actually the Pharisees, say that the Christ is David's son.<sup>345</sup> The fact that e contains this harmonization to Matthew makes Harnack's view at least possible; however, his reasoning here does not appear persuasive. Luke reads πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυιδ υἱόν; and it is worth noting that the question itself assumes that the Scribes say that the Christ is David's son. It may simply be that Tertullian is here expressing the reality behind Jesus' question, perhaps under the influence of the wording of the Matthean account.<sup>346</sup> Tertullian's allusion cannot support the view of a clear harmonization being present in Marcion's text. V. 44 is far less problematic as Harnack reconstructed Δαυεῖδ κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ.<sup>347</sup> Though the οὖν after David is omitted in D, several OL manuscripts, and a few other witnesses, the context in Tertullian does not lend itself to the inclusion of this conjunction. Therefore, its absence is uncertain in Marcion's text.

#### 4.1.83 Luke 21:12–17, 19

4.39.4 – *Ante haec autem persecutiones eis praedicat et passiones eventuras, in martirium utique et in salutem.* | 4.39.6 – *Et hic igitur ipse cogitari vetat quid responderi oporteat apud tribunalia, ... Et sapientiam ipsam, cui nemo resistet, ...* |

---

statement to *scribae* in 4.38.9. Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 120 makes the same oversight, presumably under the influence of Harnack.

<sup>344</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*.

<sup>345</sup> *Ibid.*, 230\*.

<sup>346</sup> It is possible, though not necessary, that *existimabant* came from the Matthean δοκεῖ. Of course, even if it did, it could simply be Tertullian using the Matthean encounter to express the assumption behind the question in Luke.

<sup>347</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 229\*.

4.39.7 – *Quid enim sapientius et incontradicibilis*<sup>348</sup> ... *Nec mirum si is cohibuit praecogitationem* ... | 4.39.8 – *A proximis quoque persecutiones et nominis, ex odio utique, blasphemiam praedicatam* ... *Sed per tolerantiam, inquit, salvos facietis vosmetipsos*,...

After the multiply cited Luke 21:9–11, Tertullian references several of the following verses. In 4.39.4, the allusion to vv. 12–13 attests πρὸ δὲ τούτων and διώξουσιν, along with “sufferings,” for v. 12.<sup>349</sup> Significantly more problematic is the reference to v. 13, reconstructed by Harnack (ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν) εἰς μαρτύριον καὶ σωτηρίαν.<sup>350</sup> Harnack recognized that καὶ σωτηρίαν is unattested elsewhere and contended that therefore it was an addition by Marcion.<sup>351</sup> Braun, however, rightly questions this view by noting “L’insertion de *utique*, habituel pour les commentaries de T., éveille des doutes. On pourrait tout aussi bien penser à une explication donné par notre auteur, d’après les v. 13 («témoignage») et v. 18–19 [*sic*] («salut») conservés par Marcion.”<sup>352</sup>

In 4.39.6, 7 the allusions to v. 14 attest μὴ προμελετᾶν<sup>353</sup> ἀπολογηθῆναι and those to v. 15 attest σοφίαν, ἧ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι οὐδὲ/ἢ ἀντειπεῖν [πάντες].<sup>354</sup> In 4.39.8 Tertullian, with the comments about persecution from near kindred, makes reference to the contents of v. 16, though no text can be

---

<sup>348</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 480n3 observes that *incontradicibilis*, restored by Rigalti, is a neologism resulting from the biblical text where ἀντειπεῖν = *contradicere* follows ἀντιστῆναι = *resistere*.

<sup>349</sup> The reference to *apud tribunalia* in 4.39.6 could be referring to being brought ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας at the end of v. 12.

<sup>350</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 230\*.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 121 agrees, and the same view was held by Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:488.

<sup>352</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 477n3. The reference to vv. 18–19, instead of just v. 19, is erroneous as Tertullian does not attest v. 18 and Epiphanius explicitly notes its omission. For a few examples of *utique* used in glosses by Tertullian, see the discussion of Luke 12:5 (4.28.3) in chapter 3, and the discussions of Luke 4:31 (4.7.1), 6:12 (4.13.1), and 17:2 (4.35.1) above. Tsutsui argues that the addition is certain “weil Tertullian gleich darauf Sach 9,15f., wo nicht von ‘salus’, sondern nur von ‘martyrium’ die Rede ist, zitiert” (“Evangelium,” 121). This claim is quite strange in that the citation obviously refers to martyrdom, but also contains the phrase *et salvos eos faciet dominus illo die velut oves* (4.39.4).

<sup>353</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 481n5 notes that the hapax *praecogitatio* (4.39.7) once again arises from the biblical text.

<sup>354</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 230\* overlooked *cui nemo resistet* (4.39.6) and therefore only reconstructed (ἐγὼ δώσω ὑμῖν . .) σοφίαν. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 121 included this allusion, but Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 480n3 rightly notes that both Harnack and Tsutsui overlooked the allusion to v. 15 in 4.39.7 and the unique Latin term arising from the biblical text (see n. 348).

reconstructed. In v. 17, however, the allusion reveals the presence of μισούμενοι and διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. Finally, the citation of v. 19 attests a singular reading reconstructed by Harnack ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ σώσετε ἑαυτούς.<sup>355</sup> Concerning this reading, though δέ is attested in some of the Syriac versions, it is here most likely due to Tertullian's flow of argument and not part of the citation.<sup>356</sup> In addition, it is difficult to determine whether *salvos facietis vosmetipsos* corresponds to a supposed σώσετε ἑαυτούς in Marcion's text. Harnack raises the possible influence of Matt 24:13 for the reading,<sup>357</sup> but in that case it is not clear if the influence was on Marcion's text or on Tertullian when he cited it. Tsutsui's contention that a "Textänderung stilistischer Art" occurred here is quite speculative and is largely based on the questionable view, discussed above, that v. 13 had been altered. The likelihood that Tertullian is providing a very inaccurate rendering of the final element in v. 19 is also increased by the fact that his interest in the verse is focused on *per tolerantiam* (ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ). It is this word that Tertullian connects to the citations of Ps 9:19 [LXX] and Zech 6:14 [LXX] immediately following. Thus, Marcion's text at this point appears unrecoverable.

#### 4.1.84 Luke 21:20

4.39.9 – *Sed monstrato dehinc tempore excidii, <cum> coepisse<t> vallari exercitibus Hierusalem,...*<sup>358</sup>

The allusion to Luke 21:20 attests κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἰερουσαλήμ and ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. Harnack only reconstructed the first element,<sup>359</sup> though the time *excidii* would seem also to attest the presence of the second.

---

<sup>355</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*.

<sup>356</sup> Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 485 has "but" in italics indicating it is part of the citation, but in Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 482–3 it is kept outside of the citation.

<sup>357</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*.

<sup>358</sup> Moreschini follows the reading of R<sub>3</sub>. M, γ, R<sub>1</sub>, and R<sub>2</sub> read an almost impossible *Sed monstrato dehinc tempore excidium coepisse vallari exercitibus Hierusalem ....* One could imagine that *EXCIDIICUM* was erroneously copied as *EXCIDIUM*, thus partially explaining the origin of the reading.

<sup>359</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*.

#### 4.1.85 Luke 21:29–30, 32

4.39.16 – *In summa ipsius parabolae considera exemplum: Adspice<sup>360</sup> ficum et arbores omnes; cum fructum protulerint, intellegunt<sup>361</sup> homines<sup>362</sup> aestatem adpropinquasse;...<sup>363</sup> | 4.39.18 – *Adhuc ingerit non transiturum caelum ac terram, nisi omnia peragantur.**

In Luke 21:29–33, vv. 31 and 33 are multiply cited. In 4.39.16 the citation is introduced with a reference to παραβολήν and continues with a rendering of the nearly universally attested ἴδετε τὴν συκῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα (v. 29). Braun observes that *adspice* already hints at a loose citation by Tertullian, and it is also likely that the otherwise unattested word order (*arbores omnes*) is due to Tertullian.<sup>364</sup> V. 30 presents considerable challenges, and it was already noted in the previous chapter that Braun argued that Harnack was wrong to have seen Marcion’s text represented accurately in the citation.<sup>365</sup> Harnack reconstructed ὅταν προβάλωσιν τὸν καρπὸν (αὐτῶν), γινώσκουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅτι τὸ θέρος ἤγγικεν.<sup>366</sup> The opening words in Harnack’s reconstruction follow the reading of D and d, though numerous other potential witnesses to the “Western” text, including OL manuscripts and Syriac witnesses, also explicitly state that “fruit” is brought forth. The precise readings attested, however, are variable as aptly demonstrated by the apparatus in IGNTP. Tertullian’s wording may attest the reading in D, though notice again his unique word order *fructum protulerint*; yet, it is not certain that this was the reading of Marcion’s text. γινώσκουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι is unattested elsewhere and Braun calls *intellegunt homines* a “tournoire générale” that shows “qu’il s’agit d’une citation très libre.”<sup>367</sup> Harnack noted that the final phrase was

---

<sup>360</sup> Kroymann corrected the reading to *aspicite*, a correction for which Braun contends there is no reason (*Contre Marcion IV*, 491n3).

<sup>361</sup> Moreschini follows the reading of *M*, γ, Pamelius, and the subsequent editors. *R* and Gelenius read *intellegent*.

<sup>362</sup> Moreschini rightly does not follow *M* in omitting *homines* as it is likely due to an attempt to bring the citation into closer conformity with the biblical text.

<sup>363</sup> Additional allusions to Luke 21:29–30 occur in 4.39.13, 16.

<sup>364</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 491n3. Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\* reconstructed the text as above, thus also not following Tertullian’s word order.

<sup>365</sup> See the discussion on Luke 21:31.

<sup>366</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 231\*–32\*.

<sup>367</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 491n3.



unattested,<sup>368</sup> though it should be noted that IGNTP lists several witnesses for the very similar τὸ θέρος ἐγγὺς ἐστίν. At the same time, however, if the reasoning in the previous chapter in the discussion of Luke 21:31 was correct, the *adpropinquasse* here, as in 4.39.10 may be due to Tertullian's own turn of phrase. Overall, it appears that Braun's assessment is correct and it should not be assumed that Tertullian is providing considerable, or even modest, accuracy in this citation.<sup>369</sup>

V. 32 presents another significant difficulty in that it is not clear whether 4.39.18 should be understood as an adaptation of only v. 32, or if Tertullian has conflated elements from v. 33 with v. 32. Harnack, following Zahn, believed the former and that Marcion had tendentiously replaced ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη with ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ.<sup>370</sup> This view, however, though possible cannot be proved with certainty.<sup>371</sup> Therefore, it is also not possible to know how closely *nisi omnia peragantur* is rendering Marcion's text.<sup>372</sup>

#### 4.1.86 Luke 21:34–35a

4.39.18 – *Admoneantur et discipuli, ne quando grauentur corda eorum crapula et ebrietate et saecularibus curis, et insistat eis repentinus dies ille velut laqueus,...*

Based on Tertullian's adaptation in 4.39.18 Harnack reconstructed (προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς), μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι (ἐν) κραιπάλη καὶ μέθη καὶ βιωτικαῖς μερίμναις, καὶ ἐπιστῆ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ὡς παγίς.<sup>373</sup> It is curious that Harnack followed Tertullian's word order for

---

<sup>368</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 232\*.

<sup>369</sup> It may be observed that in chapter 3 I argued that Luke 20:31 was an accurate citation, though here v. 29 is seen as basically accurate and v. 30 as considerably less so. This phenomenon does pose some difficulties, but it may be that Tertullian read all three verses in Marcion's text, began writing the citation and then re-checked the text for v. 31. This supposition, though not provable, at least explains a fairly accurate opening verse that quickly deteriorates into only providing the general sense of the second verse and then suddenly offers a precisely verbatim quotation of the final verse.

<sup>370</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 232\*. Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:489. The same view had already been advanced by Hahn, *Evangelium Marcions*, 202. Harnack's dependence on Zahn is evident in the statement on p. 232\* "die Verse 32.33 hat Zahn zuerst in Ordnung gebracht."

<sup>371</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 492 refers to both vv. 32 and 33 in the note at the end of Tertullian's statement. Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, 44 and Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen*, 431 also thought Tertullian had conflated the verses and that Marcion's text read as Luke does. Also, it is worth noting the reading *transiet caelum istut* in e.

<sup>372</sup> Harnack reconstructed εἰ μὴ πάντα γένηται (?) (*Marcion*, 232\*).

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*

*saecularibus curis* (βιωτικαῖς μερίμναις), which Harnack stated was otherwise unattested and IGNTP indicates is only attested in the Armenian translation of Irenaeus, but not for *corda eorum* (αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν), which is attested by many witnesses including A, B, W, and most OL manuscripts. In addition, though Tertullian attests the order ἐπιστῆ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀφνίδιος, given that Tertullian, throughout this citation, may not be reflecting the precise reading of Marcion's text, the reading ἀφνίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστῆ, attested by numerous manuscripts, cannot be ruled out. Two final, minor points are that Tertullian's Latin cannot reveal whether Marcion's text read βαρηθῶσιν or βαρυνθῶσιν with D and the TR, amongst others, or whether the definite article appeared before ἡμέρα.<sup>374</sup>

#### **4.1.87 Luke 21:37–38**

4.39.19 – *Sed enim per diem in templo docebat,... Ad noctem vero in Elaeonem secedebat;... Erant horae quoque auditorio competentes. Diluculo conveniendum erat,...*

Tertullian's references to Luke 21:37–38 are tied to his citations of Hos 12:5 (LXX), Zech 14:4, and Isa 50:4, and therefore focus on elements that can be connected to those OT passages. For v. 37 Tertullian attests τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδασκῶν and τὰς [δὲ] νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ... εἰς ... Ἐλαιῶν. Once again, however, the word order is not certain as Tertullian has rendered the participles as finite verbs and has placed them at the end of the phrases. For v. 37b it is unlikely that the participle was in an otherwise unattested position after Ἐλαιῶν; however, for v. 37a, though most manuscripts have the participle at the end of the phrase, B, K, most OL manuscripts, and several other witnesses attest διδασκῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. This order remains possible for Marcion's text. The allusion to v. 38 is less precise, though Tertullian does attest the essentially unproblematic ὄρθηριζεν and ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

#### **4.1.88 Luke 22:1**

4.40.1 – *Nam e[st] tot festis Iudaeorum paschae diem <el>egit.*

---

<sup>374</sup> The article is absent in D, K, V, and several other manuscripts.

As Tertullian begins his discussion of several passages from Luke 22 he alludes to v. 1, though only πάσχα is definitively referenced.<sup>375</sup>

#### **4.1.89 Luke 22:3–5**

4.40.2 – *Poterat et ab extraneo quolibet tradi, ... Poterat et sine praemio tradi.*<sup>376</sup> |

5.6.7 – ... *scriptum est enim apud me Satanam in Iudam introisse.*

In the account of Judas's intention to betray Jesus, v. 4 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's reference in 5.6.7 reveals that the statement concerning Satan's entering into Judas was not in Marcion's Gospel.<sup>377</sup> Tsutsui argues that the verse was omitted, but that nevertheless the name "Judas," as required by the context of Tertullian's discussion, somehow appeared in the text.<sup>378</sup> This view, however, does not take into account that Tertullian's reference to an *extraneus* and the citation of Ps 41:9 (*Qui mecum panem edit, levavit in me plantam*) seem to have the final element of v. 3 (ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα) in view, even if the precise wording is unrecoverable. For v. 4, Tertullian only attests παραδῶ, and for v. 5 that there was a reference to ἀργύριον.

#### **4.1.90 Luke 22:20, 22**

4.40.4 – *Sic et in calicis mentione testamentum constituens sanguine suo obsignatum substantiam corporis confirmavit.*<sup>379</sup> | 4.41.1 – *Vae, ait, per quem traditur filius hominis.*

In Tertullian's discussion of the Lord's Supper, v. 19 is multiply cited. Based on the allusion to v. 20 in 4.40.4 Harnack reconstructed καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως ... (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον) ἢ (καινή gestrichen!) διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου.<sup>380</sup> Several problems with this reconstruction need to be addressed. First, it is not entirely clear that *sic et in calicis mentione* refers to v. 20a, as opposed to the words of Jesus τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον; yet, even if it does, it is not clear that ὡσαύτως

---

<sup>375</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 232\* also reconstructed ἑορτή; however, it is not clear that the *festis* in Tertullian's phrase is referring to ἑορτή in the phrase ἢ ἑορτή τῶν ἀζύμων.

<sup>376</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 22:5 occurs in 3.23.5.

<sup>377</sup> Also noted by Harnack, *Marcion*, 232\* and Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:490.

<sup>378</sup> Tsutsui, "Evangelium," 122–23.

<sup>379</sup> An additional allusion to Luke 22:20 occurs in 4.40.6.

<sup>380</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 233\*.

followed ποτήριον in Marcion’s text instead of being clause initial.<sup>381</sup> Second, Harnack contended that Marcion omitted καινή in the verse based on Tertullian’s silence. Tsutsui cautiously agrees, though he notes that in 2 Cor 3:6 Marcion retained “new testament” revealing that the reason for the omission here is not obvious.<sup>382</sup> Given this fact, and that the Matthean and Markan parallels do not contain καινή, it should perhaps be questioned how certain the omission really is.<sup>383</sup> Not only is it based on Tertullian’s silence, but, as Braun also notes, Tertullian adds the word *obsignatum* to the reference.<sup>384</sup> Thus, it is possible that Tertullian is both omitting and adding words.

In 4.41.1 Tertullian quotes v. 22 and Harnack reconstructed quite literally οὐαὶ δι’ οὗ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.<sup>385</sup> Tsutsui contends that v. 22a must have been excised by Marcion because of the κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον, an omission confirmed by the introduction of an explicit subject in v. 22b.<sup>386</sup> Though possible, Tertullian’s silence does not necessitate the excision, and *filius homines* could be Tertullian’s own clarification of the subject of *traditur* or due to the influence of Matt 26:24.<sup>387</sup> Finally, Harnack believed that Marcion’s text read “mit D e syr<sup>cu</sup>”; however, D and e actually attest οὐαὶ ἐκείνω. Based on the likelihood that Tertullian’s citation here is not particularly precise, what followed immediately after οὐαὶ in Marcion’s text remains unclear.

#### 4.1.91 Luke 22:33–34

4.41.2 – *Nam et Petrum praesumptorie aliquid elocutum negationi potius destinando zeloten deum tibi ostendit.*

---

<sup>381</sup> The former is the reading of P<sup>75</sup>, Ⓝ, B, L, and a few other witnesses.

<sup>382</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 123.

<sup>383</sup> Williams observes that the reading, even if present in Marcion’s text, may not have been a theological omission by Marcion, but the prior Matthean and/or Markan influence on his text (“Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” 483).

<sup>384</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 500n3.

<sup>385</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 233\*.

<sup>386</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 123–24.

<sup>387</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 233\* noted the possible Matthean influence, but did not note the presence of “the Son of Man” in a handful of witnesses, including the OL manuscript b. Zahn considered the words to be added due to Tertullian’s desire to clarify (*Geschichte*, 2:491). This same phenomenon has already been observed in previous passages (cf. Luke 17:25, for example).

Tertullian's allusion to the conversation between Jesus and Peter attests the presence of Peter's statement in v. 33 without revealing any specifics concerning its wording. For v. 34 the reference to "denial" attests the presence of ἀπαρνῆση.<sup>388</sup>

#### 4.1.92 Luke 22:48

4.41.2 – *Debuit etiam osculo tradi ...*

In Tertullian's passing reference to Luke 22:48, a verse also attested by Epiphanius, the only words attested are φιλήματι and παραδίδως.

#### 4.1.93 Luke 22:66–67, 70–71

4.41.3 – *Perductus in consessum an ipse esset Christus interrogator.... Si dixero enim, inquit, vobis, non credetis.*<sup>389</sup> | 4.41.4 – ... *Ergo, inquit, tu dei filius es.* |

4.41.5 – *Sed respondit: Vos dicitis, quasi: Non ego.... Ergo tu filius dei es,... Ergo tu dei es filius,... Vos dicitis,... et adeo sic fuit pronuntiatio eius, ut perseveraverint in eo quod pronuntiatio sapiebat.* | 4.42.1 – ... *Vos dicitis ...*

In the account of Jesus before τὸ συνέδριον, v. 69 is multiply cited. Tertullian's opening reference in 4.41.3 attests ἀπήγαγον<sup>390</sup> εἰς τὸ συνέδριον (v. 66) and σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός (v. 67a). It is not entirely clear if the words from v. 67a are part of the generally attested εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰ πὸν ἡμῖν, as Harnack apparently believed,<sup>391</sup> or if Marcion's text simply read the four words as a question as in D and d. The fact that Tertullian writes *interrogatur* certainly makes the latter possible. The citation of v. 67b attests ἐὰν εἴπω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε;<sup>392</sup> however, though the order εἴπω ὑμῖν is attested by a few late manuscripts, Tertullian's propensity to alter the position of pronouns means that Marcion's text may well have read ὑμῖν εἴπω.

In 4.41.4–5 Tertullian makes three references to v. 70a, and it is noteworthy that in each instance the word order is different. Harnack reconstructed this element

---

<sup>388</sup> This word is also the only one reconstructed by Harnack, *Marcion*, 233\*.

<sup>389</sup> Though θ and Gelanius read *creditis*, Moreschini follows Pamelius and the other editors in reading *credetis*.

<sup>390</sup> The reading ἀνήγαγον, attested in manuscripts including A, L, W, and the Majority Text is less likely but cannot be ruled out entirely.

<sup>391</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 234\* reconstructed εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ...

<sup>392</sup> Harnack omits οὐ, but this may simply have been an oversight as it is attested in the entire manuscript tradition (*ibid.*).

according to the order in the first citation (placing the verb at the end of the phrase), but since IGNTP lists Marcion as the only witness for the variant order, it is far more likely that in each instance Tertullian is responsible for the word order and that Marcion's text read σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. V. 70b also presents difficulties in that Tertullian three times only makes reference to *vos dicitis*. This fact led Harnack to reconstruct ὑμεῖς λέγετε (ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι, gestrichen).<sup>393</sup> This view is possible, though ultimately not provable.<sup>394</sup> Some element of ambiguity is present in Jesus' reply and the presence of the last three words would not necessarily negate Marcion's interpretation.<sup>395</sup> In addition, Tertullian stating only *vos dicitis* may have been influenced by Luke 23:3 (*tu dicis*) as in 4.42.1 both references occur in close proximity.

Finally, though Harnack and Tsutsui view v. 71 as unattested,<sup>396</sup> Braun argues that the final statement of 4.41.5 reveals the response of the Sanhedrin, which interpreted Jesus' reply as an affirmation.<sup>397</sup> Braun may be correct, though the faint allusion obviously does not reveal any specifics about the verse.

#### 4.1.94 Luke 23:1–3

4.42.1 – *Perductum enim illum ad Pilatum onerare coeperunt quod se regem diceret Christum:… Pilato quoque interroganti: Tu es Christus? proinde: Tu dicis,...*

---

<sup>393</sup> Ibid. Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 323 agrees, writing “Bei der postwendend erfolgenden Antwort Jesu änderte Marcion offensichtlich den biblischen Text ab. Er las einzig: *vos dicitis* und ließ die ursprüngliche Ergänzung ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι außen vor.” Braun incorrectly states that Harnack “pense que le texte marcionite était ici: «Vos dicitis, non ego» (p. 305\*)” (*Contre Marcion IV*, 508n2). Harnack's reconstructed text does not render *non ego*, and on the page cited by Braun Harnack simply stated “M. faßte die Antwort Jesu so: „Vos dicitis, non ego“,” which is the very point Braun goes on to make in his note.

<sup>394</sup> It is worth noting that i also omits these words.

<sup>395</sup> Plummer referred to an “ambiguous ὅτι” (*Luke*, 519). Joseph Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986), 127 places similar emphasis on the ambiguity of the reply. Of course, it is possible, and perhaps even likely, that Luke intends the response to be understood affirmatively (see Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives of the Four Gospels* [ABRL; Garden City: Doubleday, 1994], 1:493 and John Paul Heil, “Reader-Response and the Irony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin in Luke 22:66–71,” *CBQ* 51 [1989]: 281–82). Joseph A. Fitzmyer seems to combine both ambiguity and affirmation by calling it a “half-affirmative answer” (*The Gospel according to Luke* [AB28A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1985], 1463) See also the discussion by David R. Catchpole who concludes that σὺ εἶπας or ὑμεῖς λέγετε is “affirmative in content, and reluctant or circumlocutory in formulation” (“The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt xxvi. 64),” *NTS* 17 [1971]: 226).

<sup>396</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 234\* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 124.

<sup>397</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 509n6.

In the opening encounter between Jesus and Pilate, v. 2 is also attested by Epiphanius. In 4.42.1, Tertullian alludes to ἡγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον (v. 1) and the final accusation of v. 2, which Harnack reconstructed λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν βασιλέα Χριστόν.<sup>398</sup> Again, however, it is not clear from Tertullian’s testimony that Marcion’s text actually had the otherwise unattested order βασιλέα Χριστόν or that it omitted εἶναι.

The introduction to the citation from Luke 23:3 attests ὁ Πιλάτος [ἐπ]ηρώτησεν.<sup>399</sup> Pilate’s question as represented here is noteworthy as in Luke it is σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Harnack believed that Tertullian accurately represents Marcion’s text as reading σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, arguing that this is the case “da Jesus diese Frage des Pilatus bejaht.”<sup>400</sup> This argument is not particularly persuasive given that Tertullian had just shown that Marcion interpreted *vos dicitis* as a negation of the question by the Sanhedrin, and therefore one would expect that the answer *tu dicis* (σὺ λέγεις) could also be understood as a negation.<sup>401</sup> On the other hand, Tsutsui’s contention that Marcion altered the text in order to highlight his doctrine of the two “Christs” may be possible, but remains speculative.<sup>402</sup> Marcion may have altered his text here; yet, it cannot be ruled out that Tertullian has provided an inaccurate citation. It is worth considering that Tertullian had already mentioned the accusation of Jesus saying he was “Christ a King,” and continues his argument with a citation from Ps 2, including the gathering *adversus dominum et adversus Christum eius*.<sup>403</sup>

#### 4.1.95 Luke 23:7–9

4.42.3 – *Nam et Herodi velut munus a Pilato missus ... Delectatus est denique Herodes viso Iesu, nec vocem ullam ab eo audivit.*

---

<sup>398</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 235\*.

<sup>399</sup> Since only one Coptic manuscript attests the omission of δέ it was probably present in Marcion’s text. Tertullian’s Latin also cannot reveal whether Marcion read ἡρώτησεν or ἐπηρώτησεν. The former is the reading of NA<sup>27</sup>, though the latter is supported by A, D, and the Majority Text, amongst other manuscripts.

<sup>400</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 60.

<sup>401</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 125 also questions Harnack’s view.

<sup>402</sup> Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 72–73, 125.

<sup>403</sup> In addition, though it is slightly further removed (4.41.2), Tertullian’s comments, discussed above, on the Sanhedrin asking Jesus whether he was the Christ may also be relevant.

Tertullian's allusion in 4.42.3 begins by attesting the unproblematic ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἡρώδη (v. 7).<sup>404</sup> In v. 8 Tertullian alludes to the opening phrase, nearly uniformly attested in the manuscript tradition, ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν.<sup>405</sup> Finally, though Tertullian's comment *nec vocem ullam ab eo audivit* reveals the presence of the end of v. 9 no insight can be gained into the reading of Marcion's text.

#### 4.1.96 Luke 23:18–19, 22–23, 25

4.42.4 – *Et Barrabas quidem nocentissimus vita ut bonus donatur, Christus vero iustissimus ut homicida morti expostulatur.*

Tertullian devotes only one sentence to the account involving Barabbas in Luke 23:18–25. It is clear that Marcion's text contained a reference to Βαραββᾶν (v. 18) and probably to the crimes of insurrection and murder (v. 19).<sup>406</sup> The reference to Christ being *iustissimus* appears to have Pilate's protestations of his innocence in view (v. 22) and the demand for Christ's death, the cries for crucifixion (v. 23); yet, in neither case can any text be reconstructed. In addition, the outcome in v. 25 is also in view, though nothing more than the verb ἀπέλυσεν is clearly attested.

#### 4.1.97 Luke 23:32–34

4.42.4 – *Sed et duo scelesti circumfiguntur illi,... Vestitum plane eius a militibus divisum, partim sorti concessum, Marcion abstulit,...*

Luke 23:32–34 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian's allusion to vv. 32–33 attests the “two criminals” (v. 32)<sup>407</sup> and the *circumfiguntur* probably refers to the criminals being crucified on either side of Jesus (v. 33), even if the precise wording

<sup>404</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 235\* noted that v. 6 is indirectly attested by Tertullian's discussion, but since the allusion does not overtly make reference to it, v. 6 is here considered unattested. Also, Harnack reconstructed an explicit external subject (Πειλάτος) for ἀνέπεμψεν in v. 7, which is not required by Tertullian's comment and is otherwise unattested.

<sup>405</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 235\* reconstructed the text without the δέ, though once again its omission is likely due to Tertullian. According to IGNTP it is elsewhere absent only in the corrector of **Σ**, the Persian Diatessaron, and three manuscripts of sa.

<sup>406</sup> διὰ στάσιν and φόνον are nearly universally attested in the manuscript tradition with the latter only absent in a and the Persian Diatessaron.

<sup>407</sup> The allusion cannot determine whether the order was κακοῦργοι δύο, with P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, and B, or δύο κακοῦργοι.



cannot be reconstructed. In addition, Tertullian overtly states that Marcion excised διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους (v. 34).<sup>408</sup>

#### **4.1.98 Luke 23:50–53, 55**

4.42.7 – ... *nihil de Pilato postulatum, nihil de patibulo detractum, nihil sindone involutum, nihil sepulcro novo conditum.* | 4.42.8 – *Sed si et Ioseph corpus fuisse noverat, quod tota pietate tractavit? ille Ioseph, qui non consenserat in scelere Iudaeis?* | 4.43.1 – *Oportuerat etiam sepulchrum domini prophetari* [Tertullian had cited Ps 1:1] *ac iam tunc merito benedici, si nec mulierum illarum officium praeterit prophetia quae ante lucem convenerunt ad sepulchrum cum odorum paratura* [Tertullian goes on to cite Hos 5:15–6:2].

In Luke 23:50–56, vv. 50 and 53 are also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian’s argument against Marcion’s Docetic view leading up to the above-cited portion of 4.42.7 has concluded that if Christ as a phantasm/spirit gave up his spirit (v. 46), then nothing remained on the cross. Tertullian then draws a series of conclusions related to the content of vv. 52–53 for which he attests τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα (v. 52) and καθελῶν ἐνετύλιξεν [αὐτὸ] σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν [αὐτὸν] ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ (v. 53). It is not entirely clear whether Tertullian’s *novo* arises from the statement that no one had yet been laid in the tomb or from Matt 27:60 where the adjective actually occurs.

Tertullian then makes reference to Joseph being the actor in caring for the body (v. 50) and attests that this Joseph οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος (v. 51). In addition, the *in scelere* seems to allude to τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν to which Joseph did not consent. Both of the references in v. 51 are relatively unproblematic even if the reconstruction of the second phrase must remain tentative. Finally, as Tertullian begins to discuss Luke 24, he indicates that it is with the actions of αἱ γυναῖκες (v. 55) with whom the account continues.

#### **4.1.99 Luke 24:1, 3–4, 6–7, 9, 11**

4.43.2 – *Quis enim haec* [the words of Hos 5:12–6:2] *non credat in recogitatu mulierum illarum volutata inter dolorem praesentis destitutionis, qua percussae sibi*

---

<sup>408</sup> Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 513n6 states “*partim* semble propre à T.” though Zahn, *Geschichte*, 1:604 suggested that Tertullian is being influenced by John 19:23 when referring to what Marcion omitted.

*videbantur a domino, et spem resurrectionis ipsius, qua restitui rite arbitra<ba>ntur? Corpore autem non invento ... Sed et duo ibidem angeli apparuerunt.... Revertentes quoque a sepulcro mulieres et ab illa angelorum visione ... ad renuntiandam scilicet domini resurrectionem. | 4.43.3 – Bene autem quod incredulitas discipulorum perseverabat,... | 4.43.5 – An eadem et angeli ad mulieres: Rememoramini quae locutus sit vobis in Galilaea, dicens quod oportet tradi filium hominis et crucifigi<sup>409</sup> et tertia die resurgere?*

In Luke 24:1–12, vv. 4–7 are also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian’s adaptation of v. 1 in 4.43.1 was already cited in the discussion of Luke 23:55 due to the explicit mentioning of the “women.” Based on Tertullian’s comment Harnack reconstructed (ὄρθρου βαθέως) ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα (φέρεισαι) ἃ ἠτοίμασαν ἄρώματα.<sup>410</sup> Most of this reconstruction is unproblematic, though Tertullian’s reference to *ante lucem* seems quite clearly to refer to ὄρθρου βαθέως and the precise position of ἦλθον in the sentence remains obscure.<sup>411</sup>

In 4.43.2 Tertullian first may allude to ἐν τῷ ἀπορεῖσθαι αὐτὰς περὶ τούτου (v. 4a) and then provide the reason by referencing the unproblematic οὐχ εἶρον τὸ σῶμα in v. 3.<sup>412</sup> Tertullian continues by mentioning the “two men” in v. 4b,<sup>413</sup> where Harnack rightly noted that *angeli* is likely Tertullian’s own terminology.<sup>414</sup> Tertullian then skips to the conclusion of this pericope before later quoting the words of the “angels” in vv. 6–7. For v. 9 he attests ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα,<sup>415</sup> and in 4.43.3 the persistence of unbelief alludes to καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς (v. 11). Tertullian’s testimony to the words

---

<sup>409</sup> Moreschini follows the reading of R<sub>2</sub> and R<sub>3</sub>. M, γ, and R<sub>1</sub> read *tamen figi*, though in his first edition Rhenanus also conjectured *carnem figi* as the reading.

<sup>410</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 237\*.

<sup>411</sup> IGNTF indicates that it is attested before ὄρθρου, after βαθέως, and after μνήμα.

<sup>412</sup> The conclusion of the verse, however, is problematic as τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ is one of Westcott and Hort’s “Western non-interpolations” (*New Testament: Introduction, Appendix*, 295); however, Amphoux’s statement “Marcion, semble-t-il, n’avait pas non plus cette précision emphatique” (“Le chapitre 24,” 27) cannot be substantiated by Tertullian’s silence.

<sup>413</sup> Yet again, whether the word order was ἄνδρες δύο or δύο ἄνδρες cannot be determined.

<sup>414</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 238\*. Harnack’s recognition of this point makes his reconstruction ἄγγελοι (ἄνδρες?) curious. Tertullian’s use of *angeli* either arose from the description of the men wearing gleaming clothing or from Matt 28 where an ἄγγελος is expressly identified.

<sup>415</sup> The order πάντα ταῦτα found in ℵ, D, and numerous other manuscripts is also possible. The “possible Western non-interpolation” (i.e., placed in single brackets by Westcott and Hort) ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου is attested as present by Tertullian.

of the men to the women attests μνήσθητε ὅσα ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ... ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ (v. 6)<sup>416</sup> λέγων ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ... καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι (v. 7). The word order *tradi filium hominis*, however, may be due to Tertullian as IGNTTP lists no other witnesses for the verb before “Son of Man.”

#### **4.1.100 Luke 24:13, 15–16, 19, 21a, 25**

4.43.3 – *Nam cum duo ex illis iter agerent et dominus eis adhaesisset, non comparens quod ipse esset, etiam dissimulans de conscientia rei gestae, Nos autem putabamus, inquiunt, ipsum esse redemptorem Israhelis...* | 4.43.4 – *Plane invectus est in illos: O insensati et tardi corde in non credendo omnibus, quae locutus est ad vos.*

In the encounter between Jesus and the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, v. 25 is also attested by Epiphanius. In 4.43.3 Tertullian alludes to several elements in the account. δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν (v. 13) and Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσσας (v. 15) can be reconstructed, though there is also a reference to their traveling (v. 13), the fact that they did not recognize him (v. 16), and Jesus’ question concerning the things they were discussing (v. 19). Tertullian then cites v. 21a, based on which Harnack reconstructed ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνομίζομεν, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ λυτρωτῆς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.<sup>417</sup> Harnack believed ἐνομίζομεν to be otherwise unattested, but IGNTTP indicates that it is also attested by the Arabic and Persian Diatessaron, as well as Ambrosiaster. At the same time, it is not impossible for Tertullian to have rendered ἡ[or ἐ]λπίζομεν with *putabamus*.<sup>418</sup> In addition, Lukas observes “Wohl von Tertullian selbst, nicht von Marcion, wird hier der Infinitiv λυτροῦσθαι zum Substantiv *redemptor* umgewandelt,” and he may well be right concerning this otherwise unattested reading.<sup>419</sup> Tertullian’s testimony to v. 25 is found in the quotation in 4.43.4, which

---

<sup>416</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 238\* rightly observed “Das bei Tert. fehlende ἔτι ὡν nach ὑμῖν ist vielleicht zufällig von ihm übergangen.” IGNTTP lists only lectionary 184 as also attesting the omission.

<sup>417</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 238\*.

<sup>418</sup> Braun states that ἐνομίζομεν was “sans doute” the reading of Marcion as the idea of “thinking” is the basis for Tertullian’s subsequent argument in 4.43.4 (though there he uses the verb *existimare*). This observation, however, could be interpreted differently in that Tertullian may have rendered the wording of the verse more loosely along the lines of his intended argument.

<sup>419</sup> Lukas, *Rhetorik*, 326n1465. Harnack had considered the reading “nur wahrscheinlich” and considered the possibility that the canonical reading was present (*Marcion*, 238\*). Braun, similarly to

attests ὧ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πάσιν οἷς ἐλάλησεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Though Epiphanius's testimony must also be taken into account before a final verdict on the wording can be made, it is worth noting the clearly different conclusion to the verse in Luke (οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφήται).<sup>420</sup>

#### **4.1.101 Luke 24:41**

4.43.8 – *Atquin adhuc eis non credentibus propterea cibum desideravit, ut se ostenderet etiam dentes habere.*

Based on Tertullian's allusion Harnack reconstructed ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ... τι βρώσιμον.<sup>421</sup> Once again Harnack did not follow Tertullian's word order (*eis non credentibus*), which is attested by 1675 and a few OL manuscripts. Harnack's reconstruction may well reflect Marcion's order, but certainty is not possible.

#### **4.1.102 Luke 24:47**

4.43.9 – ... *siquidem et apostolos mittens ad praedicandum universis nationibus ...*

The final verse attested in Marcion's Gospel is Luke 24:47. Tertullian's allusion attests κηρυχθῆναι ... εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.<sup>422</sup>

## **4.2 Conclusion**

An examination of every verse of Marcion's Gospel attested by Tertullian has, at this point, provided a large amount of data and discussion in both this and the previous chapter. The foregoing discussions have presented all the relevant issues for gaining insight into Marcion's text, though admittedly those insights have not yet been distilled into easily and readily accessible conclusions concerning the text of Marcion's Gospel. It is to this task that we now turn in the following chapter.

---

Lukas, states "La liberté de notre auteur dans sa façon de citer peut être ici en cause [for the reading]" (*Contre Marcion IV*, 522n1).

<sup>420</sup> It may already be noted, however, that v. 25 is also marshaled by Wolter as evidence for Lukan redaction being present in Marcion's Gospel (*Lukasevangelium*, 3).

<sup>421</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 239\*–40\*.

<sup>422</sup> *Ibid.*, 240\* provides the same reconstruction, though without the ellipses.

## Chapter 5

### 5.1 Marcion's Gospel according to Tertullian

The previous two chapters have analyzed every verse from Marcion's Gospel attested by Tertullian. Though numerous of these verses cannot be reconstructed without the testimony of additional witnesses to Marcion's text, the results of this investigation can be summarized for those verses for which Tertullian is the only witness. Of considerable importance is the observation that numerous readings in the verses reconstructed below differ to varying degrees from Harnack's reconstruction.<sup>1</sup> These differences are due to my attempt more accurately to reflect Marcion's text. At the same time, however, this increased accuracy, though important, is not the most significant contribution in the following reconstruction. Rather, since perhaps the most pronounced weaknesses of all previous reconstructions, including Harnack's, is the lack of distinction between various levels of certainty for attested readings, the following reconstruction clearly reveals what level of confidence can be assigned to any particular reading for Marcion's text. Therefore, even when the wording of this reconstruction agrees with that of Harnack's, the ability to see the relative confidence which one can place in a specific reading allows significantly more helpful insight into Marcion's Gospel. In order to accomplish this goal, the following markers have been used in the reconstruction:

1. Text that is set in bold and underlined reveals **secure** readings confirmed both by the methodological consideration of citation habit and attestation in the extant manuscript tradition. The highest level of confidence can be ascribed to these readings or only to the words utilized, if the word order is unclear (see point 6).
2. Text in bold reveals **very likely** readings where Tertullian's citation habit provides confirmation of the reading, but either corroboratory evidence from

---

<sup>1</sup> Verses different from Harnack's are 4:40–42; 5:2, 9, 10–12, 21; 6:9, 12, 22, 25, 34a; 7:16, 24, 28; 8:3, 18, 25, 27, 43; 9:5, 7–8, 13, 32–34, 46; 10:1, 9, 11; 11:1–2, 4, 14–15, 20–22, 28, 33, 37–41, 46, 48; 12:9, 12–13, 16, 24, 36–37, 40, 43, 49, 51, 56–57, 59; 13:15, 18, 25–26; 14:12, 16, 21; 15:3–6, 8–9; 16:11, 15, 17; 17:15, 19, 21, 26, 28; 18:7, 10, 14, 39; 19:11, 13, 23; 20:4–5, 24, 29, 35–36, 39, 41; 21:13, 15, 20, 26, 28, 32–33, 37; 22:1, 3, 20, 66–67, 70–71; 23:32, 55; 24:4, 9, 13, 15, and 37. In addition, comments in brackets or allusions in parentheses in 4:34; 5:13, 18, 26, 30; 6:7, 26, 36, 37, 46; 8:16, 32; 9:29; 10:7, 10; 11:7–8, 52; 12:2, 10, 14, 39, 44; 13:14; 15:7, 10; 16:9, 12, 18; 17:4, 25; 19:8, 10; 20:25, 27; 21:7–9, 12, 27, 34; 22:69; 23:3; 24:11, 21, and 41 reveal elements where Marcion's reading may have been or probably was different from Harnack's reconstruction.

the manuscript tradition is lacking or some uncertainty arises due to Tertullian's adaptation or allusion to the passage.<sup>2</sup> Alternatively, a reading can be **very likely** when the manuscript tradition is essentially uniform or a group of witnesses clearly attest a reading, even if Tertullian's citation habits do not provide significant insight into the verse.

3. Text set in regular type reveals probable readings where citation habits or the manuscript tradition have provided some, but not determinative, evidence for a reading.<sup>3</sup> In addition, some allusions of relatively unproblematic elements in verses are included here. Only slight confidence can be placed in these readings being those of Marcion's text.
4. Text set in italics reveals *possible* readings that are attested by Tertullian, though ultimately no confidence can be placed in these readings definitely being those of Marcion's text.
5. Italic text set in (parentheses) reveals those instances where Tertullian attests certain elements from verses, but where, despite some allusion to the reading, precise wording is not attested.
6. Text set in {curly brackets} is attested text where the word order for Marcion's text is uncertain. The words set inside these brackets, however, may reflect any of the levels of confidence discussed above. In other words, it may be secure, very likely, probable, or possible that certain words appeared in Marcion's text even if their order cannot be determined.
7. Ellipses are used to indicate unattested elements in the verses and comments made on readings are placed in [brackets].<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> It may also be the case that Tertullian's citation habit tends to confirm a reading other than the one attested by Tertullian. In such cases the negative evidence cannot create a reading evaluated as "secure" and thus will never be more than "very likely."

<sup>3</sup> Concerning this latter point, for example, in 4.1.51 it was noted that in Luke 12:14 Tertullian's *iudicem* could be rendering either κριτήν or δικαστήν and that the NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus reflects this fact. Given, however, that the former is the reading of both early and varied witnesses such as P<sup>75</sup>, **Σ**, B, and D it seems slightly more likely that this reading was also found in Marcion's text. Thus, I have considered Tertullian's *iudicem* to be "probably" instead of simply "possibly" rendering κριτήν. Consonant with the explanations of these levels of confidence in the main text above, I would argue that the manuscript tradition offers slight confidence instead of no confidence for κριτήν having appeared in Marcion's Gospel.

<sup>4</sup> Unattested elements most often will include those elements that may be unattested due to simple omission by Tertullian. Even though there may therefore be grounds for positing that some of those elements were present in Marcion's text, doing so would involve the precarious "drawing

## 5.2 Reconstruction of Marcion's Text

4:32 ... ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

4:34 ... τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ Ἰησοῦ [Ναζαρηνέ may have been omitted]; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδα [σε likely present] τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

4:35 ... ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ...

4:40 ... τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.

4:41 ἐξήρχοντο [δὲ καὶ likely present] δαιμόνια ... κραυγάζοντα ... σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. [καὶ likely present] ἐπιτιμῶν (οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν) ...

4:42 ... ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον ... οἱ ὄχλοι ... κατεῖχον αὐτόν ...

4:43 ... {δεῖ με καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι} τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ...

5:2 ... (οἱ ἀλιεῖς) ...

5:9 θάμβος (γὰρ περιέσχειν) αὐτόν ... ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρα τῶν ἰχθύων ...

5:10 ... υἱοῦς Ζεβεδαίου ... (τῷ Σίμωνι) ... (εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα) μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γὰρ ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγρῶν.

5:11 ... πλοῖα ... ἀφέντες ... ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

5:12 ... λέπρας ...

5:13 ... ἦψατο ... (λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπηλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ).

5:17 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

5:18 ... (ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος) ...

5:20 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

5:21 ... τίς [δύναται likely present] {ἀφεῖναι ἁμαρτίας} εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ θεός.

5:26 ... (εἶδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον).

5:27 ... τελώνην ... (εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι)

---

conclusions from Tertullian's silence"; however, a comment in brackets can draw attention to the likely presence or absence of an unattested element based on a consideration of Tertullian's citation habits and the manuscript evidence.

5:30 ... μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν (καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν) ...

5:31 ... οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλὰ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες.

5:35 ... ὅταν ἀπαρθῆ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νύμφιος ... νηστεύσουσιν ...

6:1 ... ἐν σαββάτῳ ... ἐπέινασαν οἱ μαθηταί, ἔτιλλον τοὺς στάχυας ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν.

6:2 ... τῶν Φαρισαίων ...

6:6 ... χεῖρ ... ξηρά.

6:7 παρετηροῦντο ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει, ἵνα εὕρωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ).

6:9 ... ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ μή; ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;

6:12 ... ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος ... διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ...

6:13 ... ἐκλεξάμενος ... δώδεκα ... ἀποστόλους ...

6:14 Σίμωνα ... ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον ...

6:21 μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες ... ὅτι χορτασθήσονται. μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες ... ὅτι γελάσουσιν.

6:22 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν {μισήσουσιν ὑμᾶς} οἱ ἄνθρωποι ... καὶ ὀνειδίσουσιν καὶ ἐκβαλοῦσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

6:25 οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν may have been present] οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι [νῦν likely not present], ὅτι πεινάσετε. οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν may have been present] οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.

6:26 οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν may have been present] ὅταν {ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν} [πάντες may not have been present] οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα [γάρ may have been present] ἐποίουν καὶ τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

6:30a παντί ... αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου ...

6:31 καὶ καθὼς {ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι θέλετε} παρὰ [τῶν may have been present] ἀνθρώπων, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.

6:34a καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ὑμεῖς ἀπολαβεῖν, ποία {χάρις ἐστὶν ὑμῖν}...



6:35b ... **καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ θεοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.**

6:36 γίνεσθε [οὖν likely not present] οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς [καὶ may not have been present] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν *ᾠκτειρεν ὑμᾶς.*

6:37 [καὶ likely not present] **μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· [καὶ likely not present] μὴ καταδικάζετε, ἵνα μὴ καταδικασθῆτε· ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.**

6:39 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

6:40 **οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητῆς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον** [αὐτοῦ likely not present] ...

6:41 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

6:42 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

6:46 **τί [δέ may have been present, με likely present] καλεῖτε· κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;**

7:2 [Tertullian indicates that the account involves a centurion]

7:12 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:14 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:15 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:16 ... **ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν** ... [ὅτι likely present] {**μέγας προφήτης**} *ἐγγήγερται ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ [ὅτι likely present] ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.*

7:18 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:20 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:24 ... **περὶ Ἰωάννου· τί ἐξήλθατε {θεάσασθαι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον};...**

7:26 ... **προφήτην** ... *ναὶ ... καὶ περισσότερον.*

7:28 ... **μείζων (ἐν γεννητοῖς) γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου (οὐδεὶς ἐστίν)· (ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν).**

7:47 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:48 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

7:50 ... **ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε** ...

8:2 ... **γυναῖκες** ...

8:3 ... γυνή ... ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου ... αἴτινες καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς.

8:4 ... διὰ παραβολῆς.

8:8 ... ὁ ἔχων ὧτα ἀκουέτω.

8:16 (οὐδεὶς) ... λύχνον ... καλύπτει ...

8:17 ... κρυπτόν ... φανερόν γενήσεται ...

8:18 βλέπετε ... πῶς ἀκούετε· ὅς { ... ἂν } ἔχη δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· [δέ likely not present, though καὶ may have been present] ὅς ἂν μὴ ἔχη, καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

8:21 τίς μοι μήτηρ καὶ τίνες μοι ἀδελφοί, εἰ μὴ οἱ τοὺς λόγους μου ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιούντες αὐτούς.

8:22 ... διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν ...

8:25 ... τίς δὲ οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅς [καὶ may have been present] τοῖς ἀνέμοις {καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ ἐπιτάσσει};

8:27 ... ἀνὴρ ... δαιμόνια ...

8:28 ... Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ... μὴ με βασανίσῃς.

8:31 ... παρεκάλουν ... εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ...

8:32 ... (ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς).

8:43 ... γυνὴ τις (οὐσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος) ...

8:48 ... ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε ...

9:5 ... μὴ δέξωνται [ὑμᾶς likely present] ... { τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν [ὑμῶν likely present] ἀποτινάξατε } εἰς μαρτύριον ...

9:7 ... Ἡρώδης ... ὑπὸ τινων (ὅτι) Ἰωάννης (ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν).

9:8 ὑπὸ τινων ... Ἡλίας ... ἄλλων ... (ὅτι) προφήτης εἰς τῶν ἀρχαίων (ἀνέστη).

9:12 ... ἐν ἐρήμῳ ...

9:13 ... ἄρτοι ... καὶ ἰχθύες ...

9:14 ... { ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι } ...

9:17 ... τὸ περισσεῦσαν ...

9:21 ... παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο.

9:24 ὅς [γὰρ ἂν likely present] **θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· καὶ ὅς ἀπολέσῃ αὐτὴν ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ ... σώσει αὐτήν.**

9:26 ὅς [γὰρ likely present] **ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῆ με** {κἀγὼ ἐπαισχυνθήσομαι} αὐτόν [v. 26b may have been omitted]

9:28 ... ( παραλαβὼν Πετρόν καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον) ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος ...

9:29 ... **καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ** [λευκός likely present] **ἕξαστράπτων.**

9:32 ... εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ... [Moses and Elijah] συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ.<sup>5</sup>

9:33 ... (ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι) ... ὁ Πέτρος ... **καλὸν ἐστίν** {ὧδε ἡμᾶς} εἶναι, **καὶ ποιήσωμεν ὧδε** τρεῖς σκηνάς, {μῖαν σοὶ καὶ Μωϋσεὶ μῖαν καὶ Ἠλίᾳ μῖαν}, **μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει.**

9:34 ... νεφέλη ... (ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς) ...

9:46 ... **μείζων** ...

9:47 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

9:48 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

9:54 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

9:55 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

9:57 ... **ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ.**

9:58 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

9:59 ... **θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.**

9:61 ... **ἀποτάξασθαι** (τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου).

9:62 ... βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ...

10:1 ... **ἀνέδειξεν** ... ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα ... **ἀπέστειλεν** ... εἰς ... πόλιν ...

10:4 ... **μηδε ράβδον, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα** ... **μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσηθε.**

---

<sup>5</sup> If the argument that Tertullian is referring to v. 32 in 4.22.16 is valid (see the discussion in chapter 3, under 3.1.35), then perhaps greater certainty could be assigned to this reading.

10:5 **εἰς ἧν** ... ἂν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν ... **λέγετε· εἰρήνη** ( τῶ οἴκῳ τούτῳ).

10:7 ... **ἄξιος** [γάρ may have been present] **ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ** ...

10:8 ... δέχονται ...

10:9 ... (λέγετε αὐτοῖς) **ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἤγγικεν**

10:10 ... **μὴ δέχονται ὑμᾶς** ... (εἴπατε).

10:11 ... **τὸν κοινορτόν** ... (ἀπομασσόμεθα)... **πλήν ... γινώσκετε** [ὅτι likely present] **ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.**

10:16 ... **ὁ {ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς} ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ** ...

10:19 ... (δίδωμι or δέδωκα) ... **τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ... ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων** ...

10:23 ... **μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε.**

10:24 **λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι** *προφητῆται οὐκ εἶδαν, ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε.*

11:1 ... ἐν τῷ εἶναι ... **{ἐν τόπῳ τινί}** προσευχόμενον ... (εἰπέν) **τις τῶν μαθητῶν** (πρὸς αὐτόν)· **κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς** [καὶ may have been present] **Ἰωάννης ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ.**

11:2 **πάτερ** [ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς likely not present] ... **τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ... ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.**

11:4 ... ἄφες ... τὰς ἁμαρτίας ... **μὴ ἄφες ἡμᾶς εἰσενεχθῆναι εἰς πειρασμόν.**

11:7 ... (καὶ τὰ παιδία μου μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν) ...

11:8 ... (εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ ἀναστᾶς διὰ τὸ εἶναι φίλον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γε τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ) ...

11:14 ... **δαιμόνιον ... κωφόν** ...

11:15 ... **ἐν βεελζεβούλ ... ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.**

11:18 (εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διμερίσθη) ...

11:19 εἰ [δέ likely present] **ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβαλλουσιν;**...

11:20 εἰ δ' ἐγὼ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα **ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.**

11:21 ... **ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος** ...

11:22 ... ἰσχυρότερος ... (νικῆση or νικῆσει) ...

11:28 ... μενοῦν ... μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ποιοῦντες ...

11:33 ... λύχνον ... (εἰς κρύπτῃν) ... ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ... ἵνα πᾶσι λάμπῃ ...

11:37 ... ἔρωτᾶ αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖος ... ὅπως {ἀριστήση (παρ' αὐτῶ)} ... ἀνέπεσεν.

11:38 ... (ἤρξατο) {διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ} (λέγειν) διὰ τι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη ...

11:39 ... (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι) {τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος τὸ ἔξωθεν} καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας.

11:40 ... οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν;

11:41 ... δοτε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐλεημοσύνην ... πάντα καθαρὰ {ἔσται ὑμῖν}.

11:43 ... πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ... ἀσπασμούς ...

11:46 ... (καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαί) ὅτι φορτίζετε (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους) φορτία δυσβάστακτα ... τῷ δακτύλῳ ... (οὐ) προσψάυετε ...

11:48 ... μαρτυρεῖτε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ...

11:52 ... τοῖς νομικοῖς ... τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως (αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε).

12:1 ... (ἤρξατο λέγειν) πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς ... προσέχετε ... ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης {τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις}.

12:2 οὐδὲν δὲ συ(ν)γεκαλυμμένον [ἐστὶν likely present], ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ οὐδὲν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

12:3 ... (πρὸς τὸ οὐς ἐλάλησατε) ... (κηρυχθήσεται) ...

12:9 ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενος με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ [τῶν ἀγγέλων likely not present, though a final decision requires the reconstruction of 12:8 where the evidence of Eriphanius must be taken into account]

12:10 [καὶ πᾶς may have been present] ὅς ἂν εἶπη [λόγον likely present] εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὅς δ' ἂν εἶπη εἰς {τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον}, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.

12:11 ... προσφέρωσιν ... ἐπί ... τὰς ἀρχάς ... (μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί ἀπολογήσησθε ἢ τί εἴπητε).

12:12 τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν.

12:13 ... τις ... εἶπὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν κληρονομίαν.

12:14 ... τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν [ἢ μεριστὴν may not have been present] ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

12:16 ... παραβολὴν ... (ἀνθρώπου τινὸς) πλουσίου ...

12:19 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

12:20 εἶπεν [δέ likely present] αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς· ἄφρων, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν [ἀπὸ σοῦ may have been present]· ἃ δὲ ἠτοίμασας, τίνος ἔσται;

12:22 ... (μὴ μεριμνᾶτε) τῇ ψυχῇ (τί φάγητε, μηδὲ) τῷ σώματι (τί ἐνδύσησθε).

12:23 ἢ ... ψυχὴ (πλεῖόν ἐστιν) τῆς τροφῆς ... τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος.

12:24 ... κόρακας ... οὐ σπεύρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας [καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς attested though likely not present] ...

12:27 ... τὰ κρίνα ... { οὐχ ὑφαίνει οὐδὲ νήθει } ... οὐδὲ Σολομῶν (ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἐν τούτων).

12:28 [... τὸν χόρτον ... ὁ θεὸς ἀμφιέζει attested though likely not present] ... ὀλιγόπιστοι.

12:35 ... αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμένοι ... οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι.

12:36 ... προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ... ἀναλύση ἐκ τῶν γάμων ...

12:37 ... δούλοι ... κύριος ...

12:39 ... εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης (ἔρχεται), [ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ likely not present] οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

12:40 ... γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

12:41 ... ὁ Πέτρος ... πρὸς ἡμᾶς { ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας τὴν παραβολὴν ... λέγεις };

12:42 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

12:43 ... ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος ...

12:44 ... ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν [αὐτοῦ likely present] καταστήσει αὐτόν.

12:45 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

12:49a πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν ...

12:51 δοκεῖτε [ὅτι likely present] { *παρεγενόμην εἰρήνην βαλεῖν* } ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ διαμερισμόν.

12:53 διαμερισθήσεται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῶ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί, καὶ μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρὶ, καὶ πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην ... καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν ...

12:56 ὑποκριταί, τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς δοκιμάζετε, { τὸν δὲ καιρὸν } τούτον [πῶς may not have been present] οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν.

12:57 ... καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον.

12:59 ... οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως καὶ ἀποδῶς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην.

13:14 ... ( τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσεν ) ...

13:15 ... ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τοῖς σάββασιν οὐ λύει { τὸν ὄνον ἢ τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ } ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγῶν ποτίζει.

13:19 ὅμοια ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ κήπῳ ἑαυτοῦ.

13:20 ... τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

13:21 ὅμοια ἐστὶν ζύμη ...

13:25 ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν ... κρούειν ... ἀποκριθεὶς ( ἐρεῖ ) ... οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμᾶς likely present] πόθεν ἐστέ.

13:26 ... ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας.

13:27 ... ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ἀνομίας.

14:12 ... ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον ... φώνει ...

14:14 ... οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναι ... ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ...

14:16 ... ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίησε δεῖπνον [μέγα may have been present] καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλούς.

14:17 ... ἀπέστειλεν ...

14:18 ... (ἤρξαντο) ... παραιτεῖσθαι ... ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα ...

14:19 ... (ζεύγη) βοῶν ἠγόρασα ...

14:20 ... γυναῖκα ἔγημα ...

14:21 ... ἀπήγγειλεν ... τότε ἐπαρθεῖς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ... ἔξελθε ... εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ρύμας τῆς πόλεως ...

14:22 ... ἔτι τόπος ἐστίν.

14:23 ... εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς ...

14:24 ... οὐδεὶς ... γεύσεται ...

15:3 ... παραβολήν ...

15:4 ... πρόβατα ... ἀπολέσας ...

15:5 ... εὐρών ...

15:6 ... συγχάρητέ ...

15:7 [the allusion to χαρά ... ἐπί ... ἀμαρτωλῶ μετανοοῦντι may have come from this verse]

15:8 ... δραχμάς ... ἀπολέση ... ζητεῖ ...

15:9 ... εὐρούσα ... συγχάρητέ ...

15:10 [the allusion to χαρά ... ἐπί ... ἀμαρτωλῶ μετανοοῦντι may have come from this verse; τῶν ἀγγέλων may not have been present]

16:2 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

16:4 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

16:5 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

16:6 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

16:7 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

16:9 (καὶ ἐγὼ or κἀγώ) {λέγω ὑμῖν}, {ποιήσατε ὑμῖν} φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας ...

16:11 εἰ [οὖν may have been present] ἐν τῷ {μαμωνᾶ ἀδίκῳ} πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει;



16:12 [καί likely present] εἰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐχ εὐρέθητε, τὸ ἐμὸν τίς {δώσει ὑμῖν};

16:14 ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ... ἐξεμυκτήριζον ...

16:15 ... ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ... ὁ δὲ θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, τὸ ὑψηλὸν ἐστὶν παρὰ ἀνθρώποις βδέλυγμα ἐστὶν τῷ θεῷ.

16:17 εὐκοπώτερον ... τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τῶν λόγων μου μίαν κεραίαν παρελθεῖν.

16:18 [πᾶς likely present] ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ [πᾶς may have been present] γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ ... ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν ὁμοίως μοιχὸς ἐστὶν.

17:2 *συνέφερον αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ἢ εἰ* {μυλικὸς λίθος} {περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ *περιέκειτο*} καὶ ἔρριπτο εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ {ἵνα ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων σκανδαλίση}.

17:3 ... ἄμαρτη ... ὁ ἀδελφός ... ἐπιτίμησον ...

17:4 ... ἐὰν ἐπτάκις [τῆς ἡμέρας likely present] ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σε ... (ἀφήσεις or ἄφες) ...

17:11 ... Σαμαρείας ...

17:15 εἷς [δέ likely present] ἐξ αὐτῶν ...

17:16 ... (αὐτὸς ἦν) Σαμαρίτης.

17:17 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

17:18 ... δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ ...

17:19 ... ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

17:20 ἐπερωτηθεῖς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ... οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.

17:21 οὐδὲ λέγουσιν ἰδοὺ ᾧδε ... ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.

17:25 πρῶτον [δέ may have been present] δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ...

17:26 ... (έν) ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε ...

17:28 ... (έν) ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ ...

17:32 μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ.

18:1 ... παραβολήν ... (πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ μὴ ἐγκακεῖν)

18:2 ... κριτῆς ...

18:3 χήρα ...

18:5 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

18:7 ὁ [δέ likely present] θεός ... ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βωόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός ...

18:10 {ἄνθρωποι δύο} ... εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσεύξασθαι ... Φαρισαῖος ... τελώνης.

18:11 [an arrogant prayer attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

18:12 [an arrogant prayer attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

18:13 [a humble prayer attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

18:14 ... κατέβη (οὗτος) δεδικαιωμένος ... (παρ' ἐκείνου) ...

18:23 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

18:39 οἱ δὲ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων τῷ τυφλῷ ἵνα σιγήσῃ ...

19:2 ... Ζακχαῖος ...

19:6 ... ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν ...

19:8 ... τὰ ἡμίσια ... τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ... {(τοῖς πτωχοῖς) δίδωμι}, καὶ εἴτινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα, {τετραπλοῦν ἀποδίδωμι}.

19:9 ... σήμερον σωτηρία {τούτῳ τῷ οἴκῳ} ...

19:10 ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ζητῆσαι καὶ may not have been present] σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

19:11 ... παραβολήν ...

19:13 ... δούλους ... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ... μᾶς ...

19:22 ... αὐστηρός ... ἄρων ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκα καὶ θερίζων ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρα.

19:23 ... (σὺν τόκῳ) ...

19:26 ... καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ...

20:1 ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ...

20:4 τὸ βάπτισμα [the presence or absence of τό cannot be determined] Ἰωάννου  
ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (ἦν ἢ) ἐξ ἀνθρώπων.

20:5 ... ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ... διὰ τί ... οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ.

20:6 ... ἀνθρώπων ... καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς ...

20:7 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

20:8 ... οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

20:24 ... δηνάριον ... Καίσαρος.

20:25 ... ἀπόδοτε [τοῖνυν may have been present here or before the verb] τὰ [the  
presence or absence of τοῦ cannot be determined] Κάσαρος [the presence or  
absence of τῷ cannot be determined] Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

20:27 ... (τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ λέγοντες ἀναστασιν μὴ εἶναι) ...

20:28 ... (Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν) ...

20:29 {ἐπτὰ ... ἀδελφοί} ... (λαβῶν) γυναῖκα ...

20:30 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

20:31 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

20:33 ... {ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει (τίνας αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή)} ...

20:34 ... ἀποκριθεὶς ... οἱ υἱοὶ {τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος} γαμοῦσιν καὶ  
γαμίζονται.

20:35 οὓς [δὲ likely present] κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τῆς  
κληρονομίας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε  
γαμίζονται.

20:36 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι μέλλουσιν, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν [καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν  
may have been present] ... θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες.

20:39 ... (τινες τῶν) γραμματέων εἶπαν· διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπας.

20:41 ... (πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυὶδ υἱόν;)

- 20:44 Δαυίδ ... κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ ...
- 21:7 ἐπηρώτησαν [δέ likely present] αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί ...
- 21:8 ... πολλοὶ [γάρ likely present] ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί [μου likely present], λέγοντες [ὅτι may have been present]· ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ Χριστός... [the final element in the verse may be attested but no insight into wording can be gained]
- 21:9 ... πολέμους ... δεῖ [γάρ likely present] {ταῦτα γενέσθαι} ...
- 21:10 ... {βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος}.
- 21:11 {λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ σεισμοὶ τε} ... {φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ}...
- 21:12 πρὸ δὲ τούτων ... διώξουσιν ... (ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας) ...
- 21:13 (ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν) εἰς μαρτύριον.
- 21:14 ... μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι.
- 21:15 ... σοφίαν, ἣ οὐ δυνήσονται {ἀντιστῆναι οὐδὲ ἀντειπεῖν} (πάντες) ...
- 21:16 (παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων) ...
- 21:17 ... μισούμενοι ... διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου.
- 21:19 ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ σώσετε ἑαυτοὺς.
- 21:20 ... κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ ... ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς.
- 21:25 ... {ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις σημεῖα}, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ὡς ἤχους θαλάσσης κυμαινούσης
- 21:26 ... προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένη κακῶν {αὐταὶ γὰρ αἱ} δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται.
- 21:27 καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν μετὰ δυνάμεως [καὶ δόξης likely not present] πολλῆς.
- 21:28 τούτων δὲ γινομένων ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς [ὑμῶν likely not present], διότι ἐγγίξει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.
- 21:29 ... παραβολὴν ... ἴδετε τὴν συκὴν καὶ {τὰ δένδρα πάντα}.

21:30 ὅταν προβάλωσιν τὸν καρπὸν, γινώσκουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅτι τὸ θέρος ἤγγικεν.

21:31 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

21:32 ... οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ εἰ μὴ πάντα γένηται.

21:33 {ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ} παρελεύσεται, ὁ δὲ λόγος μου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

21:34 (προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς), μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν {αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν} (ἐν) **κραিপάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ {βιωτικαῖς μερίμναις} καὶ {ἐπιστῆ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος}** [ἡ may not have been present] **ἡμέρα ἐκείνη**

21:35a ὡς παγίς ...

21:37 ... τὰς ἡμέρας {ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδασκῶν}, τὰς ... νύκτας **ἐξερχόμενος ... εἰς ... Ἐλαιῶν.**

21:38 ... ὠρθηρίζεν ... ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

22:1 ... πάσχα.

22:3 [Εἰσηλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς was not present] Ἰούδαν ... (ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα).

22:5 ... ἀργύριον ...

22:20 ... τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ ... διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου ...

22:22b ... οὐαί ... δι' οὗ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

22:33 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

22:34 ... ἀπαρνήση ...

22:66 ... ἀπήγαγον ... εἰς τὸ συνέδριον ...

22:67 ... σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ... ἐὰν {εἶπω ὑμῖν}, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε.

22:69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν [δέ may have been present] ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ.

22:70 ... σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ... ὑμεῖς λέγετε ...

22:71 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

23:1 ... ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον.

23:3 ὁ [δέ likely present] Πιλᾶτος ἠρώτησεν ... σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός;... σὺ λέγεις.

23:7 ... ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἡρώδη ...

23:8 ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν ...

23:9 ... (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ).

23:18 ... βαραββᾶν.

23:19 ... (διὰ στάσιν... καὶ φόνον βληθεὶς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ).

23:22 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

23:23 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

23:25 ἀπέλυσεν ...

23:32 ... {κακοῦργοι δύο} ...

23:51 ... οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος (τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν) ...

23:52 ... τῷ Πιλᾶτῳ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα ...

23:55 ... αἱ γυναῖκες ...

24:1 ... {ὄρθρου βαθέως ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα} (φέρουσαι αἱ) ἠτοίμασαν ἀρώματα.

24:3 ... οὐχ εὔρον τὸ σῶμα ...

24:4 ... (ἐν τῷ ἀπορεῖσθαι αὐτάς περὶ τούτου) ... (ἄνδρες δύο) ...

24:9 ... ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήγγειλαν (ταῦτα πάντα) ...

24:11 ... (καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς).

24:13 ... δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ... [Their travelling attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

24:15 ... Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας ...

24:16 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

24:19 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

24:21a ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνομίζομεν, [ὅτι likely present] αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ λυτρωτὴς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ...

24:37 ... ἐδόκουν φάντασμα θεωρεῖν.

24:41 ἔτι [δὲ likely present] {ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν} ... τι βρώσιμον ...

24:47 ... κηρυχθῆναι ... εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ...

## Chapter 6

### 6.1 Summary and Conclusions

This thesis, after providing a necessary and previously unavailable history of research on Marcion's Gospel in chapter one, provided the first full overview of the attestation for this text in the extant sources in chapter two. In addition, the overview clearly illustrated the crucial and vital nature of Tertullian's testimony by revealing that he attests 90%, and is the sole witness for 67%, of the verses attested as present in Marcion's Gospel. At the same time, since in chapter one it was consistently emphasized that it is not simply knowledge of the sources, but the methodology employed in approaching the sources that is vitally important for a critical reconstruction of Marcion's text, the second half of chapter two was devoted to issues of methodology and highlighting the central importance of understanding a church father's citation customs when analyzing his testimony for Marcion's Gospel. Based on the foundation laid in the first two chapters, chapters three and four then provided a comprehensive study of Tertullian's testimony. Arising out of the analysis of those two chapters, chapter five offered a new reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel of all the verses for which Tertullian is the only witness. That reconstruction not only provided a Greek text of Marcion's Gospel but also, based on Tertullian's evidence, for the first time represented the relative level of certainty for reconstructed readings. Bearing in mind the introductory comment in this thesis concerning the importance of Marcion's Gospel for numerous current discussions concerning Luke and the gospels in the second century, readings from Tertullian's testimony already provide some significant insight into some of these issues.

As an initial observation, all of the secure readings presented in the previous chapter are the same readings found in NA<sup>27</sup>.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, however, numerous very likely readings are interesting to note. First, concerning the relative priority of Luke or Marcion's Gospel, in Luke 4:43 it is very likely that Marcion read ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται. Wolter already noted that this turn of phrase appears only in Luke-Acts, and though far from conclusive, this phrase may be an example of a redactional trace left by the author of Luke-Acts being found in the text

---

<sup>1</sup> There are 57 verses in chapter 5 containing secure readings or wordings.



Marcion used.<sup>2</sup> Second, several examples exist where Marcion’s text exhibits “Western” readings. The most obvious of these examples is in Luke 11:38 where the “Western” reading is ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τι. Also worth noting are the second ἵνα μή in 6:37, ὑφαίνει and νήθει in 12:27, and possibly εὐρέθητε in 16:12. On the other hand, though the precise wording is only probable, Marcion’s text clearly included 22:20, part of the famous “Western non-interpolation” in vv. 19b–20. In addition, there are omissions attested by some witnesses to the “Western” text in 8:28, 24:1, and 24:9, for example, of elements very likely to be present in Marcion’s text.

Concerning the question of Marcion and the fourfold Gospel, one of the primary ways in which the emerging fourfold Gospel began influencing the text of the Synoptic Gospels is through harmonization. Scribes familiar with parallel passages began unconsciously or consciously bringing the passages into closer agreement. Though Tertullian attests numerous harmonized readings, a significant challenge when only Tertullian’s testimony is available is that the harmonization could easily be due to Tertullian and therefore not actually found in Marcion’s text. In these cases some uncertainty remains when considering Tertullian’s testimony alone.

Finally, it is interesting to consider the apparatus for Luke in NA<sup>27</sup> in the light of the findings of this study. For the verses reconstructed in chapter 5 NA<sup>27</sup> has 37 references to Mcion<sup>T</sup> in 29 verses.<sup>3</sup> Several of these references are problematic: (1) in 6:9 the particle εἰ is technically unattested; (2) in 6:21 νῦν twice is not attested by Tertullian, but whether his testimony reveals that Marcion’s text twice omitted the adverb is not certain; (3) in 6:22 the unattested καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς is not definitively absent from Marcion’s text; (4) in 6:26 πάντες and in 6:36 καί, though they may have been absent from Marcion’s text, are again unattested by Tertullian; (5) in 10:24 καὶ βασιλεῖς is not attested, but it is unclear if it was absent; (6) in 11:2 Mcion<sup>T</sup> is problematically listed as supporting the reading of 700 and GrNy and related reading in 162. The parentheses around Mcion<sup>T</sup> do not really alleviate the problem as 162 is also set in parentheses but its points of contact with 700 and GrNy

---

<sup>2</sup> See chapter 3, n. 326. Concerning the other two examples in Luke, 8:1 is unattested for Marcion’s text and 16:16 can only be reconstructed after considering Epiphanius’s testimony as well.

<sup>3</sup> See the NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus for 4:41; 6:9 (2x), 21 (3x), 22, 25, 26, 31, 36, 37 (2x); 8:3 (2x); 10:11, 24; 11:2 (3x), 4, 38, 41, 48; 12:1, 9, 14, 27, 39, 51 (2x); 16:12, 17, 18; 19:26; 20:36; and 21:19.

are significantly greater than what Tertullian actually attests for Marcion;<sup>4</sup> and (7) in 16:18, the unattested  $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$  is viewed as omitted, but it may have been present. In addition, it may also be noted that there are several readings admittedly attested by Tertullian, though considered merely possible in the reconstruction that are referenced as readings for Marcion's text in NA<sup>27</sup>.<sup>5</sup> These verses include 6:21, 31 (the two instances of third person plural verbs); 8:3 (2x); 11:41; 12:51 ( $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ ); 19:26; and 21:19.

## 6.2 Avenues for Future Research

Though the analysis of Tertullian's testimony has allowed some initial insight into the scholarly contribution of a new, and more critically established, text of Marcion's Gospel, the full scope of that contribution will only become clear after the entire attested text has been critically reconstructed. Therefore, the obvious next step in scholarship on Marcion's Gospel is the analysis of the remaining sources, particularly Epiphanius and *Adam.*, in order to complete the reconstruction of the text. With that text in hand an analysis of its general content and readings could further support or nuance the preliminary conclusions offered above, and provide significantly more insight into the relationship between Marcion's Gospel and Luke, the text of Luke and its transmission in the second century, and the developing fourfold Gospel collection. Thus, it is hoped that this foundational study for a new reconstruction of the text of Marcion's Gospel has not only provided tantalizing initial conclusions based on the value of Tertullian's testimony, but may also have highlighted the value of and encouraged future work towards reconstructing the remainder of Marcion's Gospel. Without a doubt, this text stands and will remain at the crossroads of scholarly knowledge and insight into Luke and the Gospels during the fascinating second century era.

---

<sup>4</sup> In the introduction NA<sup>27</sup> states “( ) The quotation supports the given reading, but with some slight variation” (73\*). None of the reading, other than the mention of the “Holy Spirit” is attested for Marcion's text.

<sup>5</sup> Chapter 5 indicated that no confidence can be placed in possible readings definitely being those of Marcion's text.

## **Bibliography**

- Aalders, G. J. D. "Tertullian's Quotations from St Luke." *Mnemosyne* 5 (1937): 241–82.
- Aland, Barbara. "Marcion (ca. 85-160)/Marcioniten." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 22:1 (1992): 90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Rezeption des neutestamentlichen Textes in den ersten Jahrhunderten." Pages 1–38 in *The New Testament in Early Christianity*. Edited by Jean-Marie Sevrin. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 86. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Allenbach, J., A. Benoît, D. A. Bertrand, A. Hanriot-Coustet, P. Maraval, A. Pautler, and P. Prigent, eds. *Des origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien*. Vol. 1 of *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*. Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eusèbe de Césarée, Cyrille de Jérusalem, Épiphanie de Salamine*. Vol. 4 of *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*. Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1987.
- American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, ed. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. 2 vols. The New Testament in Greek 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984–1987.
- Amphoux, Christian-Bernard. "Le chapitre 24 de *Luc* et l'origine de la tradition textuelle du *Codex de Bèze* (D.05 du NT)." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 4 (1991): 21–49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les premières éditions de Luc I. Le texte de Luc 5." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 67 (1991): 312–27.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “La révision marcionite du «Notre Père» de Luc (11, 2-4) et sa place dans l’histoire du texte.” Pages 105–21 in *Recherches sur l’histoire de la Bible latine: Colloque organisé à Louvain-la-Neuve pour la promotion de H. J. Frede au doctorat honoris causa en théologie le 18 avril 1986*. Edited by R. Gryson and P. Bogaert. Cahiers de la revue théologique de Louvain 19. Louvain-la-Neuve: la Faculté de Théologie, 1987.
- Arneth, Michael. *Ueber die Bekanntschaft Marcions mit unserem Canon des neuen Bundes, und insbesondere über das Evangelium desselben*. Linz: C. Haslinger, 1809.
- Baarda, T. “De korte tekst van het Onze Vader in Lucas 11:2-4: een Marcionitische corruptie?.” *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 44 (1990): 273–87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Luke 12, 13-14 Text and Transmission: From Marcion to Augustine.” Pages 107–62 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. 4 vols. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.
- Balás, David L. “Marcion Revisited: A ‘Post-Harnack’ Perspective.” Pages 95–108 in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*. Edited by W. Eugene March. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.
- Bammel, C. P. Review of R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 227–32.
- Bandstra, Andrew J. “The Lord’s Prayer and Textual Criticism: A Response.” *Calvin Theological Journal* 17 (1982): 88–97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Original Form of the Lord’s Prayer.” *Calvin Theological Journal* 16 (1981): 15–37.
- Baring-Gould, S. *The Lost and Hostile Gospels: An Essay on the Toledoth Jeschu, and the Petrine and Pauline Gospels of the First Three Centuries of which Fragments Remain*. London: Williams & Northgate, 1874.
- Baur, F. C. *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung*. Tübingen: Ludw. Fr. Fues., 1847.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “Der Ursprung und Charakter des Lukas-Evangeliums,” *Theologische Jahrbücher* 5 (1846): 413–615.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Charakter, nebst einem Anhang über das Evangelium Marcion's*. Tübingen: Ludw. Friedr. Fues., 1851.
- BeDuhn, Jason. “Biblical Antitheses, Adda, and the Acts of Archelaus.” Pages 131–47 in *Frontiers of Faith: The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus*. Edited by Jason BeDuhn and Paul Mirecki. Nag Hammadi & Manichean Studies 61. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007.
- Bertholdt, Leonhard. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des alten und neuen Testaments*. 5 vols. Erlangen: Johann Jacob Palm, 1813.
- Beyschlag, Karlmann. “Marcion von Sinope.” Pages 69–81 in *Alte Kirche I*. Edited by Martin Greschat. Vol. 1 of *Gestalten der Kirchengeschichte*. Edited by Martin Greschat. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. “The Western Text in the Second Century.” Pages 3-17 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Blackman, E. C. *Marcion and His Influence*. London: S.P.C.K., 1948. Repr., Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 2004.
- Bleek, Johannes Friedrich. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by William Urwick from the 2d ed. 2 vols. Clark's Foreign Theological Library 4th series, 24. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1864.
- Bolton, Johann Adrian. *Der Bericht des Lukas von Jesu dem Messia: Uebersetzt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet*. Altona: Johann Heinrich Kaven, 1796.
- Bovon, François. *Studies in Early Christianity*. Paperback edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect.” *Harvard Theological Review* 85 (1992): 175–96.

- Braun, René. "Le témoignage des Psaumes dans la polémique antimarcionite de Tertullien." *Augustinianum* 22 (1982): 149–63.
- Braun, René, Frédéric Chapot, Simone Deléani, François Dolbeau, Jean-Claude Fredouille, Pierre Petitmengin, eds. *Chronica Tertulliana et Cypriana 1975-1994: Bibliographie critique de la première littérature latine chrétienne*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes 157. Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1999.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives of the Four Gospels*. 2 volumes. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City: Doubleday, 1994.
- de Bruyne, D. Donatien. "Les plus anciens prologues latins des évangiles." *Revue Bénédictine* 40 (1928): 193-214.
- van Bruggen, Jacob. "The Lord's Prayer and Textual Criticism." *Calvin Theological Journal* 17 (1982): 78–87.
- Buchheit, Vinzenz. "Rufinus von Aquileja als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialogs." *Byzantische Zeitschrift* 51 (1958): 314–28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tyranni Rufini librorum Adamantii Origenis Adversus haereticos interpretatio*. Studia et Testimonia Antiqua 1. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1966.
- Bundy, David. "The Anti-Marcionite Commentary on the Lucan Parables (*Pseudo Ephrem A*): Images in Tension." *Le Muséon: Revue d'études orientales* 103 (1990): 111-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marcion and the Marcionites in Early Syriac Apologetics." *Le Muséon: Revue d'études orientales* 101 (1988): 21-32.
- Burkitt, F. C. Review of B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1925): 278–94.
- Burton, Philip. *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language*. Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- von Campenhausen, Hans. *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

- Caspari, C. P. *Kirchenhistorische anecdote: nebst neuen Ausgaben patristischer und kirchlich-mittelaltlicher Schriften / 1, Lateinische Schriften: die Texte und die Anmerkungen*. Oslo: Malling, 1883.
- [Cassels, Walter Richard]. *Supernatural Religion: An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation*. 2 vols.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874. (2d ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874; 3d ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874; 4<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874; 5<sup>th</sup> ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1875; 6<sup>th</sup> ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1875; 3 vols.; Complete ed.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1879; Popular ed. in one vol.; Watts & Co., 1902; Popular ed. repr.; Watts & Co., 1905).
- Catchpole, David R. "The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt xxvi. 64)." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 213–26.
- Charteris, A. H. *Canonicity: A Collection of Early Testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament based on Kirchhoffer's 'Quellensammlung'*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons, 1880.
- Chase, Frederic Henry. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*. Texts and Studies 1.3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.
- Clabeaux, John J. *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 21. Washington, D.C.; The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.
- Claesson, Gösta. *Index Tertullianus*. 3 vols. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974–1975.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Clemens Alexandrinus: Zweiter Band: Stromata Buch I–VI*. Edited by Otto Stählin, Ludwig Früchtel, and Ursula Treu. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985.
- Clivaz, Claire. "The Angel and the Sweat Like 'Drops of Blood' (Lk 22:43–44): P<sup>69</sup> and f<sup>13</sup>." *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005): 419–40.
- Corrodi, Heinrich. *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüdischen und christlichen Bibelkanons*. 2 vols. Halle: Curts Witwe, 1792.

- Corssen, Petrus. "Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem in librum quartum animadversions." *Mnemosyne* 51 (1923): 242–61, 390–411, and *Mnemosyne* 52 (1924): 225–49.
- Côté, Dominique. "La fonction littéraire de Simon le Magicien dans les *Pseudo-Clémentines*." *Laval théologique et philosophique* 57 (2001): 513–23.
- Couchoud, Paul-Louis. *The Creation of Christ: An Outline of the Beginnings of Christianity*. Translated by C. Bradlaugh Bonner. 2 vols. London: Watts & Co., 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is Marcion's Gospel One of the Synoptics?" *Hibbert Journal* 34 (1936): 265–77.
- Delobel, Joël. "Extra-Canonical Sayings of Jesus: Marcion and Some 'Non-received' Logia." Pages 105–16 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lord's Prayer in the Textual Tradition: A Critique of Recent Theories and Their View on Marcion's Role." Pages 293–309 in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitive*. Edited by Jean-Marie Sevrin. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 86. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Luke 6, 5 in Codex Bezae: The Man who Worked on Sabbath." Pages 453–77 in *À cause de l'évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes: Offerts au P. Jacques Dupont, O. S. B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire*. Lectio Divina 123. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Luke 6:5D Reexamined." *Novum Testamentum* 37 (1995): 232–48.
- Dungan, David Laird. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1999.



- Dunn, Geoffrey G. "Mary's Virginit<sup>y</sup> *in partu* and Tertullian's Anti-Docetism in *De Carne Christi* Reconsidered." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007): 467–84.
- Edwards, M. J. "The *Clementina*: A Christian Response to the Pagan Novel." *Classical Quarterly* 42 (1992): 459–74.
- Egan, George A. *An Analysis of the Biblical Quotations of Ephrem in "An Exposition of the Gospel" (Armenian Version)*. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientali<sup>um</sup> 443. Leuven: Peeters, 1983.
- Ehrman, Bart D., Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. Society of Biblical Literature: The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 5 volumes. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1804. (2d ed. of vol. 1; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1820).
- Eldridge, Lawrence Allen. *The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Studies and Documents 41. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1969.
- Elliott, J. K. "The New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century." *New Testament Textual Research Update* 8 (2000): 1–14.
- Ephrem. *Éphrem de Nisebe: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant ou diatessaron: Traduit du syriaque et de l'arménien*. Translated by Louis Leloir. Sources chrétiennes 121. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Des Heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen Contra Haereses*. Edited and translated by Edmund Beck. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientali<sup>um</sup> 169, 170. Leuven: L. Durbecq, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*. Edited and translated by C. W. Mitchell, A. A. Bevan, and F. C. Burkitt. 2 vols.; London: Williams & Norgate, 1912–1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Ephrem: An Exposition of the Gospel*. Edited by George A. Egan. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientali<sup>um</sup> 291. Leuven: Peeters, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant: Texte Syriaque [Manuscript Chester Beatty 709]*. Edited and translated by Louis Leloir. Chester Beatty Monographs 8. Dublin: Hodges Figgis & Co., 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes*. Translated by Carmel McCarthy. *Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement* 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Epiphanius. *Epiphanius*. Edited by Karl Holl. 3 volumes. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 25, 31, 37. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915–1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Epiphanius II*. Edited by Jürgen Dummer. 2d edition. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 31. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Epiphanius III*. Edited by Jürgen Dummer. 2d edition. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 37. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Epiphanius IV: Register zu den Bänden I-III (Ankoratus, Panarion haer. 1-80 und De fide)*. Edited by Christian-Friedrich Collatz, Arnd Rattmann, Marietheres Döhler, Dorothea Hollnagel, and Christoph Marksches. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 13. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Translated by Frank Williams. 2 vols. Nag Hammadi (and Manichean) Studies 35, 36. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987–1994.

Ezrik. *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Ezrik of Kolb (flourit c.430-c.450): An English Translation, with Introduction and Notes*. Translated by Monica J. Blanchard and Robin Darling Young. Eastern Christian Texts in Translation. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Fee, Gordon D. Review of Lawrence Allen Eldridge, *The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 368, 370.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?" Pages 174–97 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D.*

*Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by J. K. Elliot. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976. Repr., pages 124–40 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Studies and Documents 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations.” *Biblica* 52 (1971): 357–94.

Fischer, Bonifatius. “Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache: Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte.” Pages 1–92 in *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte*. Edited by K. Aland. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 5. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke*. 2 volumes. Anchor Bible 28, 28A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981–1985.

Franck, G. Fr. “Ueber das Evangelium Marcion’s und sein Verhältnis zum Lukas-Evangelium.” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 28 (1855): 296–364.

Frede, Hermann Josef, ed. *Epistulae ad Ephesios. Vetus Latina* 24/1. Freiburg: Herder, 1962–1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Epistulae ad Philippenses et ad Colossenses. Vetus Latina* 24/2. Freiburg: Herder, 1966–1971.

Freudenberger, Rudolf. “Zum Text der zweiten Vaterunserbitte.” *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968–1969): 419–32.

van der Geest, J. E. L. *Le Christ et l’ancien testament chez Tertullien: Recherche terminologique*. *Latinitas christianorum primaeva: Studia ad sermonem latinum christianum pertinentia* 22. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1972.

Gieseler, Johann Karl Ludwig. *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1818.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*. 4 vols. 4th ed. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1844.
- Grant, Robert M. *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marcion and the Critical Method." Pages 207-15 in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marcion, Gospel of." Pages 516-20 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Gratz, Peter Alois. *Kritische Untersuchungen über Marcions Evangelium*. Tübingen: in der C. F. Oslanderschen Buchhandlung, 1818.
- Grotius, Hugo. *Annotationes in libros evangeliorum: cum tribus tractatibus & appendice eo spectantibus*. Amsterdam: Ioh. & Cornelium Bleuv, 1641.
- Gregory, Andrew. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Greschat, Katharina and Martin Meiser, eds. *Gerhard May: Markion: Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für europäische Geschichte Mainz: Abteilung für abendländische Religionsgeschichte 68. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2005.
- Hagner, Donald Alfred. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Hahn, August. *Das Evangelium Marcions in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt, nebst dem vollständigsten Beweise dargestellt, daß es nicht selbstständig, sondern ein verstümmeltes und verfälschtes Lukas-Evangelium war, den Freunden des Neuen Testaments und den Kritikern insbesondere, namentlich Herrn Hofrath, Ritter und Professor Dr. Eichhorn zur strengen Prüfung vorgelegt*. Königsberg: Universitäts Buchhandlung, 1823.

- von Harnack, Adolf. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 45. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*. 2d ed. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 45. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924. Repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Marcion: L'évangile du Dieu étranger: Contribution à l'histoire de la foundation de l'Église catholique*. Translated by Bernard Lauret. Patrimoines christianisme. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Adolf Harnack, Marcion: der moderne Gläubige des 2. Jahrhunderts, der erste Reformator, die Dorpater Preisschrift (1870): kritische Edition des handschriftlichen Exemplars mit einem Anhang*. Edited by Friedemann Steck. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 149. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tertullians Bibliothek christlicher Schriften." *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 10 (1914): 303–34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Über einige Worte Jesu, die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen, nebst einem Anhang über die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vater-Unsers." *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1904): 170–208.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der ursprüngliche Text des Vater-Unsers und seine älteste Geschichte." Pages 24-35 in *Erforshtes und Erlebtes*. Reden und Aufsätze 4. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Verwahrung," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 5 (1926): 119–20.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New Testament*. Texts and Studies 2.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.

- Harting, D. *Quaestionem de Marcione Lucani Evangelii, ut fertur, adulteratore, collatis Hahnii, Ritschelii aliorumque sententiis, novo examini submitit.* Utrecht: Paddenburg, 1849.
- Hays, Christopher M. "Marcion vs. Luke: A Response to the *Plädoyer* of Matthias Klinghardt." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 99 (2008): 213–32.
- Heil, John Paul. "Reader-Response and the Irony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin in Luke 22:66–71," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 271–84.
- Higgins, A. J. B. "The Latin Text of Luke in Marcion and Tertullian." *Vigiliae Christianae* 5 (1951): 1–42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "‘Lead Us Not Into Temptation’: Some Latin Variants." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1945): 179–83.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin’s, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion’s: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ältesten Evangelien-Literatur.* Halle: C. A. Schwetschke, 1850.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Das Marcionitische Evangelium und seine neueste Bearbeitung." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 12 (1853): 192–244.
- Hill, James Hamlyn. *The Gospel of the Lord: An Early Version which was Circulated by Marcion of Sinope as the Original Gospel.* Guernsey: John Whitehead / T. M. Bichard, 1891.
- Hippolytus. *Refutation Omnium Haeresium.* Edited by Miroslav Marcovich. Patristische Texte und Studien 25. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity, An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century.* AAR Academy Series 46. Chico, Calif.; Scholars, 1984.
- Hollard, Auguste. *Deux hérétiques: Marcion et Montan.* Paris: Éditions de la nouvelle revue critique, 1935.
- Hoppe, Heinrich. *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians.* Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societen i Lund 14. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1932.

- Hug, John Leonhard. *An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament*.  
Translated by Daniel Guildford Wait. 2 vols. London: C. & J. Rivington,  
1827.
- Irenaeus. *Irenäus von Lyon: Epideixis, Adversus Haereses / Darlegung der  
apostolischen Verkündigung, Gegen die Häresien*. Edited and translated by  
Nobert Brox. 5 vols. Fontes Christiani 8. Freiburg: Herder, 1993–2001.
- Jerome. *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Opera III, Opera Polemica 2: Contra  
Iohannem*. Edited by J.-L. Feiertag. Corpus Christianorum: Series latina 79A.  
Turhout: Brepols, 1999.
- Klijn, A. F. J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. Supplements to Vigiliae  
Christianae 17. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Matthew 11:25 // Luke 10:21.” Pages 3-14 in *New Testament Textual  
Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M.  
Metzger*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon,  
1981.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. “„Gesetz“ bei Markion und Lukas.” Pages 99–128 in *Das  
Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für  
Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dieter Sänger and  
Matthias Konradt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion,”  
*Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008): 1–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Markion vs. Lukas: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten  
Falles.” *New Testament Studies* 52 (2006): 484–513.
- Knox, John. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the  
Canon*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Marcion’s Gospel and the Synoptic Problem.” Pages 25–31 in *Jesus, the  
Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*. Edited by  
E. P. Sanders. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987
- \_\_\_\_\_. “On the Vocabulary of Marcion’s Gospel.” *Journal of Biblical Literature*  
58 (1939): 193–201.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Edwin Cyril Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*. *Church History* 19 (1950): 295.
- Koester, Helmut. *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. Vol. 2 of *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Helmut Köster. Philadelphia; Fortress, 1982.
- Köstlin, Karl Reinhold. *Der Ursprung und die Komposition der synoptischen Evangelien*. Stuttgart: Carl Mäcken, 1853.
- Loeffler, Josias F. C. “Marcionem Pauli epistolas et Lucae euangelium adulterasse dubitatur.” *Commentationes Theologicae* 1 (1794): 180–218.
- Loisy, Alfred. “Marcion’s Gospel: A Reply.” *Hibbert Journal* 34 (1936): 378–87.
- Lukas, Volker. *Rhetorik und literarischer ‚Kampf‘: Tertullians Streitschrift gegen Marcion als Paradigma der Selbstvergewisserung der Orthodoxie gegenüber der Häresie: Eine philologisch-theologische Analyse*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 23.859. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Magne, Jean. “La réception de la variante «vienne ton esprit saint sur nous et qu’il nous purifie» (Lc 11,2) et l’origine des épîclèses, du baptême et du «Notre Père».” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988): 81–106.
- May, Gerhard. “„Ein ächter Protestant“. Markion in der Sicht August Neanders.” Pages 111–17 in *Gerhard May: Markion: Gesammelte Aufsätze*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions.” *Second Century* 6 (1987-1988): 129-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Marcion ohne Harnack.” Pages 1–7 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Marcion and His Impact on Church History*.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Katharina Greschat, and Martin Meiser, eds. *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Marcion and His Impact on Church History*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 150. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Markion in seiner Zeit.” Pages 1–12 in *Gerhard May: Markion: Gesammelte Aufsätze*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Ein neues Markionbild?” (review of R. Joseph Hoffmann, *Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical*



- Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*). *Theologische Rundschau* 51 (1986): 405–13.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional and Patristic*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Meyboom, Hajo Uden. *Marcion en de Marcionieten*. Leiden: P. Engels & Zoon, 1888.
- Michaelis, Johann David. *Introduction to the New Testament: Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German and Considerably Augmented with Notes and a Dissertation on the Origin and Composition of the Three First Gospels*. Translated by Herbert Marsh. 4 vol. London: F. & C. Rivington, 1793–1801.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. “Almsgiving and the Kingdom Within: Tertullian on Luke 17:21.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 475-83.
- Monselewski, Werner. *Der barmherzige Samariter: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10,25–37*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 5. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1967.
- Muehlenberg, Ekkehard. “Marcion’s Jealous God.” Pages 93–113 in *Disciplina Nostra: Essays in Memory of Robert F. Evans*. Patristic Monograph Series 6. Cambridge, Mass.; Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.
- Olshausen, Hermann. *Die Echtheit der vier canonischen Evangelien aus der Geschichte der zwei ersten Jahrhunderte erwiesen*. Königsberg: Aug. Wilh. Unzer., 1823.
- O’Malley, T. P. *Tertullian and the Bible: Language-Imagery-Exegesis*. Latinitas Christianorum Primæva 21. Dekker & Van de Vegt: Nijmegen-Utrecht, 1967.
- Origen. *Origenes opera omnia*. Edited by Carol Henric Eduard Lommatzsch. 25 vols. Berlin: Haude & Spener, 1831–1848.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Origenes Werke: Fünfter Band: De principiis*. Edited by Paul Koetschau. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 22. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1913.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Origenes Werke: Neunter Band: Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas Kommentars*. Edited by Max Rauer. 2d ed. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 49; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.

Ory, Georges. *Marcion*. Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan (Cahier hors-série). Paris: Cercle Ernest-Renan, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Marcion et Luc: Interpolés par des Esséniens?.” *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan* 50 (1966): 56–66.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Paul-Louis Couchoud.” *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan* 112 (1979): 161–63.

Osburn, Carroll D. *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis*. Society of Biblical Literature: The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Epiphanius of Salamis.” Ph.D. diss., University of St. Andrews, 1974.

Philastrus. *Sancti Philastrii Episcopi Brixienensis: Diversarum Hereseon Liber*. Edited by Friderich Marx. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum 38. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1898.

Plooi, D. “Eine enkratische Glosse im Diatessaron.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 22 (1923): 1–16.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1925.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron: The Liège Manuscript of a Mediæval Dutch Translation, A Preliminary Study*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmij, 1923.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tendentieuse Varianten in den Text der Evangelien: Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het hoogleeraarsambt aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam op 1 Maart 1926*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1926.

Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

Pott, August. "Marcions Evangelientext." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 42 (1923): 202–23.

\_\_\_\_\_. "De textu evangeliorum in saeculo secundo." *Mnemosyne* 48 (1920): 267–309 and 338–65.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments nach seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. 2d ed. *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt* 134. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1919.

Pseudo-Origen. *Der Dialog des Adamantius: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ*. Edited by W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen. *Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* 4. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901.

Quispel, Gilles. *De Bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem*. Leiden: Burgersdijk & Niermans Templum Salomonis, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament." *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 349–60.

Raschke, Hermann. "Marcion und sein Evangelium." *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 12 (1923): 28–44.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Die Werkstatt des Markusevangelisten—eine neue Evangelientheorie*. Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1924.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Heresiology in the (Jewish-)Christian Novel: Narrativized Polemics in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*." Pages 273–98 in *Heresy and Self-Definition in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin. *Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum* 119. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- Regul, Jürgen. *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 6. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.
- Reuss, Eduard. *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments*. 4th ed.; Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke & Sohn (M. Bruhn), 1864.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas*. Tübingen: Osiander'sche Buchhandlung, 1846.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien." *Theologische Jahrbücher* 10 (1851): 480–538.
- Ritschl, Otto. *Albrecht Ritschls Leben*. 2 vols. Freiburg: Mohr, 1892–1896.
- Roensch, Hermann. *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's: Aus den Schriften des Letzteren möglichst vollständig rekonstruiert, mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen textkritischen und sprachlichen Inhaltes*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1871.
- Ross, J. M. "The Rejected Words in Luke 9:54-56." *The Expository Times* 84 (1972): 85–88.
- Roth, Dieter T. "Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?." *Vigiliae Christianae* (forthcoming).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 513–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (2008): 580-97.
- Roukema, Riemer. "The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity." *Vigiliae Christianae* 58 (2004): 56–74.
- Salles, A. "Simon le Magicien ou Marcion?." *Vigiliae christianae* 12 (1958): 197–224.
- Sanday, William *The Gospels in the Second Century: An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work Entitled 'Supernatural Religion.'* London: MacMillan and Co., 1876.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marcion's Gospel." *Fortnightly Review* 23 (1875): 855–75.

- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Einleitung ins neue Testament: Aus Schleiermacher's handschriftlichen Nachlasse und nachgeschriebenen Vorlesungen, mit einer Vorrede von Dr. Friedrich Lücke*. Vol. 1 of *Friedrich Schleiermacher's sämtliche Werke: Erste Abtheilung, Zur Theologie*. Edited by G. Wolde. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1845.
- Schmid, Ulrich. "How Can We Access Second Century Gospel Texts? The Cases of Marcion and Tatian." Pages 139–50 in *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille colloquium, July 2000 / Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000*. Edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott. *Histoire du Texte Biblique* 6. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbrieffausgabe*. *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung* 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Marcions Evangelium und die neutestamentlichen Evangelien: Rückfragen zur Geschichte und Kanonisierung der Evangelienüberlieferung." Pages 67–77 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Marcion and His Impact on Church History*.
- Schmidt, Johann Ernst Christian. *Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte*. 7 vols. 2d ed. Giessen: Georg Friedrich Heyer, 1824–1834.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ueber das ächte Evangelium des Lucas, eine Vermuthung." *Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte* (1796): 468–520.
- Schneider, Gerhard. "Die Bitte um das Kommen des Geistes im lukanischen Vaterunser (Lk 11,2 v.l.)." Pages 344–73 in *Studien zum Text und Ethik des Neuen Testaments: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven*. Edited by Wolfgang Schragel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 47. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986. Repr. pages 86–115 in *Jesusüberlieferung & Christologie: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970–1990*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 57. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Schulz, David. Review of J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* and W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die*

*kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments. Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 2 (1829): 563–636.

Schwegler, F. C. Albert. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues., 1846.

\_\_\_\_\_. Review of W. M. L. De Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. *Theologische Jahrbücher* 2 (1843): 544–90.

Scott, Ernest Findlay. Review of John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament*. *Church History* 12 (1943): 64.

Semler, Johann Salomo. *Paraphrasis Epistolae ad Galatas cum prolegomenis, notis, et varietate lectionis latinae*. Halle: Carol Hermann Hemmerde, 1779.

Simon, Richard. *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament, où l'on établit la vérité des actes sur lesquels la religion Chrétienne est fondée*. Rotterdam: Reiner Leers, 1689.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Richard Simons Kritische Historie des Textes des neuen Testaments*. Translated by Heinrich Matthias August Cramer. Preface and notes by D. Johann Salomon Semler. Halle: Bey J. J. Gebauers Witwe und Joh. Jacob Gebauer, 1776.

von Soden, Hermann Freiherr. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–1913.

Storr, Gottlob Christian. *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis*. Tübingen: Jakob Friedrich Heerbrandt, 1786. (2d ed.; Tübingen: Jakob Friedrich Heerbrandt, 1810).

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. London: MacMillan, 1924. (2d ed.; London: MacMillan, 1930).

Taylor, Vincent. *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.

- Tenney, Merrill Chapin. "The Quotations from Luke in Tertullian as Related to the Texts of the Second and Third Centuries." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1944.
- Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem*. Edited and Translated by Ernest Evans. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Contre Marcion*. Critical text by Claudio Moreschini. Translated by René Braun. 5 vols. Sources Chrétiennes 365, 368, 399, 456, 483. Paris: Cerf, 1990–2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. 2 vols. Corpus Christianorum: Series latina 1 and 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. Edited by Emil Kroymann. Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum 47. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1906.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Quae Supersunt Omnia*. Edited by Francis Oehler. 3 vols. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1851–1854.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem*. Edited by Claudio Moreschini. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' antichità 35. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1971.
- Thilo, Ioannis Caroli. *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti: e libris editis et manuscriptis, maxime gallicanis, germanicis et italicis, collectus, recensitus notisque et prolegomenis illustratus*. Leipzig: Frid. Christ. Guilielmi Vogel, 1832.
- Thorly, John. "Subjunctive Aktionsart in New Testament Greek: A Reassessment." *Novum Testamentum* 30 (1988): 193–211.
- Tischendorf, Constantin. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Volumen I*. 8<sup>th</sup> ed. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869.
- Townson, Thomas. *Abhandlungen über die vier Evangelien: Erster Theil mit vielen Zusätzen und einer Vorrede über Markions Evangelium von D. Joh. Salomo Semler*. Translated by Joh. Salomo Semler. Leipzig: In der Weygandschen Buchhandlung, 1783.

- Tsutsui, Kenji. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Markioniten im Adamantios-Dialog: Ein Kommentar zu den Büchern I-II*. Patristische Texte und Studien 55. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Das Evangelium Marcions: Ein neuer Versuch der Textrekonstruktion.” *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 18 (1992): 67–132.
- Tyson, Joseph B. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: a defining struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. *Evangelium Palatinum: Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der lateinischen Evangelienübersetzung*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 12.3. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. *Theologische Revue* 3/4 (1922): 55–59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. *Theologische Revue* 12 (1925): 442–46.
- Volckmar, Gustav. *Das Evangelium Marcions: Text und Kritik mit Rücksicht auf die Evangelien des Märtyrers Justin, der Clementinen und der apostolischen Väter: Eine Revision der neuern Untersuchungen nach den Quellen selbst zur Textesbestimmung und Erklärung des Lucas-Evangeliums*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1852.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Ueber das Lukas-Evangelium nach seinem Verhältnis zu Marcion und seinem dogmatischen Charakter, mit besonderer Beziehung auf die kritischen Untersuchungen F. Ch. Baur’s und A. Ritschl’s.” *Theologische Jahrbücher* 9 (1850): 110–38 and 185–235.
- Waite, Charles B. *History of the Christian Religion*. Chicago: C. V. Waite, 1881.
- Waszink, J. H. “Tertulliana.” *Mnemosyne* 3 (1935–1936): 165–74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Varia critica et exegetica.” *Mnemosyne* 11 (1943): 68–77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Varia critica et exegetica.” *Mnemosyne* 13 (1947): 121–29.



- Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*. 2d ed. London: MacMillan & Co., 1896.
- de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht. *An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament*. Translated by Frederick Frothingham from the 5th ed. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, and Co., 1858.
- Williams, C. S. C. *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospel and Acts*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.
- Williams, David S. "Marcion's Gospel: Reconsidered." MA Thesis, The University of Georgia, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On Tertullian's Text of Luke." *Second Century* 8 (1991): 193–99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 477–96.
- Wilshire, Leland Edward. "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? — A Continuing Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 246–53.
- Wilson, Andrew. "Water-Mills at Amida: Ammianus Marcellinus 18.8.11." *Classical Quarterly* 51 (2001): 231–36.
- Wilson, Robert Smith. *Marcion: A Study of a Second-Century Heretic*. London: James Clarke, 1932.
- Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Wright, Leon E. *Alterations of the Words of Jesus: As Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century*. Harvard Historical Monographs 25. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Lucas*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Leipzig: Deichert, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Dialoge des „Adamantius“ mit den Gnostikern." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 9 (1888): 193–239.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. 2 vols. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888–1892.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Ein verkanntes Fragment von Marcions Antithesen." *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 21 (1910): 371–77.

Zuntz, G. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.