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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.
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# 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AARAS</td>
<td>AAR Academy Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adam.</em></td>
<td>Pseudo-Origen <em>Adamantius Dialogue</em> (<em>ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣ</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANatG</td>
<td>Aus Natur und Geisteswelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CCER</em></td>
<td><em>Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CCERChs</em></td>
<td><em>Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan</em> [Cahier hors-série]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CEA</em></td>
<td>Collection des Études Augustiniennes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CJA</em></td>
<td>Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ComTh</em></td>
<td><em>Commentationes Theologicae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ECTT</em></td>
<td>Eastern Christian Texts in Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>EH</em></td>
<td>Europäische Hochschulschriften</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ELit</em></td>
<td><em>Ephemerides Liturgicae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FN</em></td>
<td><em>Filologia Neotestamentaria</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FonCh</em></td>
<td><em>Fontes Christiani</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FR</em></td>
<td><em>Fortnightly Review</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>JSSSup</em></td>
<td>Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MREK</em></td>
<td><em>Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NAb</em></td>
<td>Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NHMS</em></td>
<td>Nag Hammadi &amp; Manichean Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NiTT</em></td>
<td><em>Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OECS</em></td>
<td>Oxford Early Christian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PaMS</em></td>
<td>Patristic Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NTTRU</em></td>
<td><em>New Testament Textual Research Update</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further, the following sigla, employed by Sources chrétienes for the manuscripts and editions of Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem*, are utilized.

- **M** Codex Montepessulanus
- **F** Codex Florentinus Magliabechianus
- **X** Codex Luxemburgensis
- **G** Codex Gorziensis
- **R_1** Beati Rhenani edition princeps, Basileae, 1521
- **R_2** Beati Rhenani edition princeps, Basileae, 1528
- **R_3** Beati Rhenani edition princeps, Basileae, 1539
- **θ** consensus codicum M F X et Rhenani editionum
- **β** consensus codicum F X et Rhenani editionum
- **γ** consensus codicum F X
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.¹ 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.² 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.³ 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.⁴

---


² Whenever “Luke” is used in this work without qualification it refers to the text of canonical Luke as we know it.

³ 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).

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.”\(^5\) Confirming Aland’s view is Gerhard May’s comment “die Aufgabe der Rekonstruktion von Markions Bibel [ist] his heute nicht befriedigend gelöst,”\(^6\) as well as Karlmann Beyschlag’s contention that the reconstruction of Marcion’s scriptures “die Hauptaufgabe der heutigen Marcionforschung bildet.”\(^7\)

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.\(^8\) Unfortunately, the most recent works


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. 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. 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

---


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.11 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.12 Finally, since several flaws in earlier studies are due to a lack of an accurate understanding of the *status quaestionis* at various


12 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 Lauret; Patrimoines 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. 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; however, none of these fathers had an interest in merely compiling or setting forth the differences between the texts. 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. 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.

13 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 Tsu tsui’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.

14 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’ comment apparently calling Marcion’s Gospel “Mark” in *Haer.* 7.30.1 is generally recognized as an error (see Harnack, *Marcion*, 240*n1*).

15 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 παρέκαθος or ἀπέκαθος (see *Pan.* 42.11.6).


17 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, 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. 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. At the beginning of the nineteenth century J. G. Eichhorn provided

---


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

1.2.3 Reaffirming the Traditional Position

Although some scholars had previously objected to the conclusions of these critics, 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. 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 and for the first time more sufficiently compiling the data for reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel. Nevertheless, Schulz’s critical review


25 Albrecht Ritschl, who in 1846 strongly argued against Hahn’s conclusions, stated that it is he “derner Verdienst es ist, auf eine vollständig genügende Art die Data zur Herstellung des Marcionistischen Textes zusammenzustellen 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 manu scriptis, 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. 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

1.2.4.1 F. C. Albert Schwegler (1843)

Schwegler’s 1843 review of the 4th 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. Schwegler believed that the theory that Marcion had edited Luke based on his theological proclivities was completely untenable. 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.”


27 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.


30 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.* 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.” 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.

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. 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. 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. Given that Ritschl himself no

---

31 Reference to this work was made in n. 11.
32 Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, v.
33 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).
34 Ibid., vi, 56.
35 See the discussions below of Baar, Hilgenfeld, and Volckmar.
36 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.  

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. Despite the occasional critical remark concerning the manner in which Ritschl had applied his methodology, 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.  

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. The thesis of Volckmar’s article was that

---

37 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 neustamentlichen Kanons (2 vols. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888–1892), 1:683.


39 See Baur, Kritische Untersuchungen, 398–401.

40 Ibid., 404, 424.

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.\(^{42}\) 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.”\(^{43}\) Though Volckmar believed that based on this section alone the fundamental relationship between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke had been revealed,\(^{44}\) he continued in part two of his article to discuss additional passages that essentially, though with a few exceptions, served to confirm his point.\(^{45}\)

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.\(^{46}\) 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,\(^{47}\) and so he commended Ritschl by stating that it is to his credit that “er [Ritschl] zum ersten Mal den Marciontext nicht blos [sic] nach den angegebenen Lücken, sondern nach dem, was er [Marcion] stehen gelassen hat, in seinem Zusammenhang betrachtet hat.”\(^{48}\)

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

\(^{43}\) Ibid., 138.
\(^{44}\) Ibid.
\(^{46}\) Ibid., 123–24.
\(^{47}\) See the critical comments in ibid., 121.
\(^{48}\) Ibid., 124.
and Luke, particularly as it related to passages on which the sources are silent.\textsuperscript{49} 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.\textsuperscript{50} 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.\textsuperscript{51} 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.\textsuperscript{52}

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.\textsuperscript{53} 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.\textsuperscript{54} 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

\textsuperscript{49} 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 (\textit{Kritische Untersuchungen}, 394). Hilgenfeld’s reconstruction with comments is found on pp. 398–442.

\textsuperscript{50} See the criticisms in Volckmar, \textit{Das Evangelium Marcions}, 20–21.


\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 474.


verses or in the wording of verses.\textsuperscript{55} 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.\textsuperscript{56} 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.\textsuperscript{57}

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.”\textsuperscript{58} 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.\textsuperscript{59} 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.\textsuperscript{60} 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.”\textsuperscript{61}

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

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 212–14, 219.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 225.
\textsuperscript{58} Ritschl, “Über den gegenwärtigen Stand,” 528–29.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 529–33.
\textsuperscript{61} Quoted in Otto Ritschl, \textit{Albrecht Ritschls Leben} (2 vols.; Freiburg: Mohr [Siebeck], 1892), 1:181.
appeared in 1852. In the preface Volckmar indicated that his views had in no small way diverged from earlier perspectives, including his own, 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. 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, but also that “Die geschichtliche Ansicht also kann, was die Integrität oder Vollständigkeit unseres Lucas-Evangliums betrifft, nicht mehr von Vermittlung reden sondern so weit die ältere Ansicht, die der Kirchenväter und der Apologetik als völlig bestätigt erklären [emphasis original].” Perhaps most telling is Volckmar’s comment that he now believed the view of the church fathers to have been confirmed in its entirety.

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].” In addition, Volckmar did not

---

62 Reference to this work was made in n. 11.
63 Volckmar, Das Evangelium Marcions, vi.
64 Ibid., 255–56.
65 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).
66 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).
67 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 specifisch 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).
68 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. 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.

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. 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. 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. As Hilgenfeld re-engaged numerous arguments in the section “Die ursprüngliche Elemente des marcionitischen Evangeliums,” 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.” 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.

69 See ibid., 113–21.
70 See ibid., 28–54.
72 Ibid., 196–97.
73 Ibid., 192–95.
74 Ibid., 211–43.
75 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 19th 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. 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...
as arising out of his dogmatic system.\textsuperscript{77} 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.”\textsuperscript{78}

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.\textsuperscript{79} 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.”\textsuperscript{80} 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.”\textsuperscript{81} Nevertheless, Sanday did point out to subsequent scholarship the importance of moving beyond a purely theological evaluation of Marcion’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{82}

In his \textit{Marcion en de Marcioniten}, Meyboom devoted one heading of his section on Marcion’s canon to a discussion of Marcion’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{83} 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.\textsuperscript{84} Zahn,\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{77} Sanday, \textit{The Gospels in the Second Century}, 218.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 221.
\textsuperscript{79} See ibid., 223–30.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 230.
\textsuperscript{82} 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.
\textsuperscript{83} Meyboom, \textit{Marcion en de Marcioniten} (Leiden: P. Engels & Zoon, 1888), 125–64.
\textsuperscript{84} 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.\(^{85}\) 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.”\(^{86}\)

Zahn, on the other hand, devoted large sections of his *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* to Marcion and the reconstruction of Marcion’s Scriptures.\(^{87}\) 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.\(^{88}\) 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.\(^{89}\)

For his reconstructions, Zahn embraced a rather positive evaluation of the reliability of the sources for reconstructing Marcion’s text.\(^{90}\) He observed that it was not simply his use and understanding of the sources that commended his reconstruction;\(^{91}\) 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.”\(^{92}\) 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

---


\(^{86}\) Meyboom, *Marcion*, 150 [my translation].


\(^{88}\) Ibid., 1:631 (cf. 2:449–55).

\(^{89}\) See especially ibid., 1:664, 673–78, 681, and 713. The citation is from 1:717.


\(^{91}\) 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.

\(^{92}\) 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.”\textsuperscript{93} 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.\textsuperscript{94}

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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{95} 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.\textsuperscript{96} Even though Zahn went on to employ this criterion primarily for readings or omissions attested in the sources\textsuperscript{97} and recognized that not all differences between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke can or should be explained on the basis of Marcion’s theology,\textsuperscript{98} he also inappropriately used the criterion to “create evidence” for alterations or omissions in Marcion’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 2:451–54.
\textsuperscript{95} 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).
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 1:684.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 1:684–704
\textsuperscript{98} Zahn clearly denied the idea that “alle nachweisbaren oder wahrscheinlichen Unterschiede zwischen beiden Büchern in der Dogmatik begründet sind” (ibid., 1:704).
\textsuperscript{99} 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, 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. 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” 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 20th Century

Zahn’s reconstruction was employed by Hermann Freiherr von Soden in his text-critical work on the NT. Von Soden viewed Marcion’s Gospel as without doubt a mutilated copy of Luke 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.” 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. Pott’s view was supported a few years later by Harnack’s work on Marcion.

---

100 Harnack, Marcion, 41*.
101 Ibid., 41*–42*. Harnack’s discussion of Zahn’s problematic evaluation of Adam. as a source is found in ibid., 56*–63*.
104 Ibid.
105 Ibid., 1:2.1629.
107 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. 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.” Second, Marcion’s Greek and Latin text of Luke is a “pure” “Western” text when considered apart from Marcion’s alterations. 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. 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. 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. Fourth, Harnack saw very minimal influence of Marcion’s text on the Catholic text. And finally, Harnack agreed that Marcion knew Matthew, Mark, and John; consciously rejected them; and provided a rationale for that rejection in his *Antitheses*.

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).

108 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*.

109 Ibid., 240*.

110 Ibid., 242* (cf. p. 73).

111 Ibid., 243*.

112 Ibid. (cf. p. 43).

113 Ibid., 243*n2.

114 Ibid., 247*.

115 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.\textsuperscript{116} 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.\textsuperscript{117} 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.\textsuperscript{118} 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.\textsuperscript{119} 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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} The sources are discussed in ibid., 41*-67*, 177*-83*.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Ibid., 45*.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 65n1.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 66.
\end{itemize}
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.”

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;” and yet, at several points Harnack is guilty of just such a “creation of evidence.” 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. 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.”

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


121 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).

122 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).


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. 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.” 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.” 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.

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.” 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

125 Harnack, Marcion¹, 223* and Marcion, 243*.
126 Pott, “Marcions Evangelientext,” 204.
127 Harnack, Marcion, 243*n3.
128 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 “Sündenkatalog” in “Verwahrung,” TLZ 5 (1926): 119–20.
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.”

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_. 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.” 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. 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, Wilson did

---


134 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. 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.”

In 1936, Paul-Louis Couchoud reasserted Baur’s 1847 position in an article entitled “Is Marcion’s Gospel One of the Synoptics?” 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. Couchoud concluded that Marcion’s Gospel was very similar to Streeter’s and Taylor’s Proto-Luke 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. An

---

135 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).

136 Ibid., 142.


138 Ibid., 265.


140 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, Esnik of Kolb, and Jerome (ibid., 319–20). The curious placement of the “Dialogue of Adamantios” 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.¹⁴¹

As the subtitle to John Knox’s work *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*¹⁴² 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.”¹⁴³ 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].”¹⁴⁴ 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.¹⁴⁵ 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


¹⁴² Reference to this work was made in n. 11.


¹⁴⁴ 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).

¹⁴⁵ 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.\textsuperscript{146} Important for methodological considerations is that after correctly noting the problematic manner in which Sanday had advanced his argument based on vocabulary and style,\textsuperscript{147} Knox presented his own arguments that Marcion’s Gospel, in fact, contains minimal Lukan vocabulary and style.\textsuperscript{148} 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,\textsuperscript{149} 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).”\textsuperscript{150} 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

\textsuperscript{146} 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.”

\textsuperscript{147} See the discussion above under 1.2.5 The Latter Half of the 19th Century.

\textsuperscript{148} Knox, \textit{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 \textit{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” (\textit{The Letter and the Spirit} [London: S.P.C.K., 1957], 115; see also Grant, “Marcion and the Critical Method,” in \textit{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” (\textit{Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature} [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993], 43; see also Grant, “Marcion, Gospel of” in \textit{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 consensual 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” (\textit{Heresy and Criticism}, 34, 46).

\textsuperscript{149} Knox, “Marcion’s Gospel,” 26.

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.”\(^{151}\) Based on his table of Marcionite, non-Marcionite, and uncertain readings,\(^ {152}\) 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].\(^ {153}\)

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.\(^ {154}\) Although there are slight differences in the numbers due to Tyson’s occasionally different evaluation about certain Lukan pericopes, the results are quite similar.\(^ {155}\) 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.”\(^ {156}\) 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.\(^ {157}\) 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


\(^{152}\) See n. 145.


\(^{155}\) 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).

\(^{156}\) Ibid., 87.

\(^{157}\) 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].” Even though Tyson does not wish to press the point too far, 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].” 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.” 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

---

158 Ibid., 117.

159 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).

160 Ibid.

161 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.” On this point Knox is absolutely correct.

In 1948 E. C. Blackman’s work on Marcion appeared, 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.” 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, 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.” 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. 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.”

163 Reference to this work was made in n. 150.
167 See especially the discussion in appendix 7 “Did Marcion’s Text Influence the Old Latin?” in ibid., 128–68.
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.”\textsuperscript{169} 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,\textsuperscript{170} 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”\textsuperscript{171} it should first be noted that he included comments on nine verses from Marcion’s \textit{Apostolikon} that Schmid has shown to be somewhat dubiously attributed to Marcion.\textsuperscript{172} 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 θησαυροῦ. The ‘old’ covenant was made by the God of the Old Testament, whereas Marcion’s God had made no previous covenant with men.”\textsuperscript{173} 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.\textsuperscript{174} 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, \textit{Adamantius}, or Epiphanius may have quoted incorrectly.”\textsuperscript{175} He did not, however, suggest any methodological

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{169} Ibid., 43–44.
\item \textsuperscript{170} Ibid., 47.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{172} Included are 1 Cor 3:17, 15:3; Rom 1:18, 11:33; and Phil 2:7 (see, respectively, Schmid, \textit{Marcion und sein Apostolos}, 80–81; 193–94; 63; 64; 76). Blackman also commented on readings attested solely in \textit{Adam}., which Schmid argues cannot be used as a reliable independent source for Marcion’s text (\textit{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 \textit{Marcion}, 44–45).
\item \textsuperscript{173} Blackman, \textit{Marcion}, 46.
\item \textsuperscript{174} See the discussion under the heading 4.1.90 Luke 22:20, 22.
\item \textsuperscript{175} Blackman, \textit{Marcion}, 51.
\end{itemize}
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.” 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. 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.” 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, nevertheless there are several difficulties in the method Williams employed in

---

176 Both the thesis and subsequent JBL article were referenced in n. 9.

177 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).


179 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.”180 Schmid points out that although Williams employs a “methodisch kontrollerbarer Ausgangspunkt,”181 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.”182 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.”183

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.”184 It is problematic to draw definitive conclusions concerning Marcion’s Gospel while entirely excluding some sources from the discussion.185 In addition, when Williams interacts with the two sources he does consult, he simply compares the readings as found in the text, making no

180 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).

181 Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, 24.

182 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).

183 Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, 24.


185 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 auszuschließen (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.\footnote{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” (\textit{A Lost Edition}, 39). This point is valid not only in considering Marcion’s text but also in comparing readings between church fathers.} 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,”\footnote{Williams, “Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” 481.} 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.”\footnote{Tyson, \textit{Marcion and Luke-Acts}, 43.} 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\footnote{Reference to this work was made in n. 11.}\footnote{\textit{Hoffmann, Marcion}, xv.} 1984 study on Marcion, 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.”\footnote{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, \textit{JTS} 39 (1988): 227–32 and Gerhard May, “Ein neues Markionbild?,” \textit{TRu} 51 (1986): 405–13.} 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 \textit{evangelion} was an \textit{Urlukas,} and without question an abbreviated version of the Third Gospel.”\footnote{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, \textit{JTS} 39 (1988): 227–32 and Gerhard May, “Ein neues Markionbild?,” \textit{TRu} 51 (1986): 405–13.} Hoffmann’s study appears to be another
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.\footnote{192} Tsutsui notes, “Wenn auch Harnacks Name ewig leben wird, so ist seine Rekonstruktion des Textes Marcions doch kein Heiligtum.”\footnote{193} 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.\footnote{194} Tsutsui’s reconstructed text does differ from that of Harnack’s in several places;\footnote{195} 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.”\footnote{196} For example, Tsutsui simply asserts


\footnote{192}{Reference to this work was made in n. 9.}
\footnote{193}{Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 68.}
\footnote{194}{Ibid., 70.}
\footnote{195}{Tsutsui helpfully summarizes the verses where his text differs from that of Harnack’s (ibid., 68n4).}
\footnote{196}{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 Tertullien 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).}
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.” 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. 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. 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.

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.” 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

\[197\] 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.

\[198\] Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, 25.


\[201\] Schmid, “How Can We Access,” 39–50. See the citations referenced by nn. 120 and 121.

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

Matthias Klinghardt also relies heavily on Knox’s work and he explicitly states that in his article he will renew Knox’s thesis. 204 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. 205 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. 206 In addition, Klinghardt interprets the Lukan prologue as “antimarkionitisch.” 207 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.” 208

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.” 209 Indeed, the challenges to reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel have often been noted. 210 Therefore,

204 Klinghardt, “Markion vs. Lukas,” 491.
205 For Klinghardt’s criticism of Harnack’s text see n. 129. The entirety of Klinghardt’s discussion is found in ibid., 491–94.
206 Ibid., 499.
207 Ibid., 508. The entire discussion of the prologue is found on pp. 500–508.
210 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. 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. 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.” 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 and the 1906 Emil Kroymann edition of *Adversus Marcionem*, a revised edition of the Kroymann text by Eligius Dekkers and a new edition by Claudio...
Moreschini\textsuperscript{7} were published. In addition, a text and English translation of \textit{Adversus Marcionem} by Ernest Evans\textsuperscript{8} and a French translation by René Braun based on an updated critical text by Moreschini\textsuperscript{9} have become available.\textsuperscript{10} More significantly, several new scriptural indices to Tertullian’s works have improved on Hermann Roensch’s study of Tertullian’s NT.\textsuperscript{11} 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.\textsuperscript{12}

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 \textit{Apostolikon} and \textit{Euangelion}.\textsuperscript{13} In a


\textsuperscript{7} \textit{Tertulliani Adversus Marcionem} (ed. Claudio Moreschini; TDSA 35; Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1971).


\textsuperscript{10} Helpful overviews of the manuscripts and editions of \textit{Adversus Marcionem} are found in Braun, \textit{Contre Marcion}, 19–30 and Volker Lukas, \textit{Rhetorik und literarischer Kampf: Tertullians Streitschrift gegen Marcion als Paradigma der Selbstvergewisserung der orthodoxie gegenüber der H"{a}resie: Eine philologisch-theologische Analyse} (EH 23.859; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008), 33–35.


\textsuperscript{13} For Harnack’s view and arguments, see \textit{Marcion}, 178*–181*. Ulrich Schmid comments that Harnack was also the first to posit that Tertullian used a Latin translation of Marcion’s \textit{Apostolikon} (see Schmid, \textit{Marcion und sein Apostolos}, 40). In 1914 Harnack still believed that Tertullian had Greek copies of Marcion’s works (see “Tertullians Bibliothek christlicher Schriften,” \textit{SKP/AWB} 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 \textit{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. 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. 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. 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

---

14 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.

15 See Dieter T. Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion’s Gospel?,“ VC (forthcoming).

16 This point was also made by Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, 46.
Marcionem.\textsuperscript{17} 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.\textsuperscript{18}

For Epiphanius, the critical text of his works remains the edition by Karl Holl,\textsuperscript{19} though the second and third volumes have been corrected and supplemented in second editions by Jürgen Dummer.\textsuperscript{20} More notably, an index volume has now been published\textsuperscript{21} which, together with the Biblia Patristica index,\textsuperscript{22} 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.\textsuperscript{23} 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.\textsuperscript{24} For the Gospels’ text used by Epiphanius, the study by Lawrence Allen Eldridge\textsuperscript{25} is unfortunately rather significantly flawed in both data and methodology,\textsuperscript{26} and therefore of limited value for evaluating Epiphanius’s text in this section of the NT canon.

\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{17} For the full argument the interested reader is referred to the article referenced in n. 15.
\item\textsuperscript{18} See also the observations by Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, 40 and 40n31.
\item\textsuperscript{19} Holl’s original editions are Epiphanius, Epiphanius (ed. Karl Holl; 3 vols.; GCS 25, 31, 37; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1915–1933).
\item\textsuperscript{20} 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).
\item\textsuperscript{21} 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).
\item\textsuperscript{22} J. Allenbach et al., eds., Eusèbe de Césarée, Cyrille de Jérusalem, Épiphane 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).
\item\textsuperscript{25} Lawrence Allen Eldridge, The Gospel Text of Epiphanius of Salamis (SD 41; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1969).
\end{enumerate}
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.\textsuperscript{27} 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.\textsuperscript{28} For the Latin translation by Rufinus, a complete new critical edition has been provided by Vinzenz Buchheit.\textsuperscript{29}

In addition, Schmid’s study of the citation customs found in these works, which comprises the majority of his study on Marcion’s \textit{Apostolikon}, has identified numerous trends in citations of Marcion’s text that also must be considered when reconstructing Marcion’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{30} 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.\textsuperscript{31}

\subsection*{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.\textsuperscript{32} This observation remains true even for the list of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Pseudo-Origen, \textit{Der Dialog des Adamantius: ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣ} (ed. W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen; GCS 4; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1901).
\item \textsuperscript{28} Kenji Tsutsui, \textit{Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Markioniten im Adamantios-Dialog: Ein Kommentar zu den Büchern I-II} (PTS 55; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).
\item \textsuperscript{29} Vinzenz Buchheit, \textit{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,” \textit{Byz} 51 (1958): 314–28.
\item \textsuperscript{30} See Schmid, \textit{Marcion und sein Apostolos}, 35–235 for his discussion of Tertullian, Epiphanius, and the \textit{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).
\item \textsuperscript{31} References to editions of these additional sources can be found in the notes to the table in 2.1.2.1 Attested Verses (Present).
\item \textsuperscript{32} 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
\end{itemize}
passages in Knox’s work, which provides an often helpful general overview.\textsuperscript{33} 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.\textsuperscript{34}

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 ἐξετάζει or by referring to an opening, medial, and closing verse.\textsuperscript{35} 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.\textsuperscript{36} 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.\textsuperscript{37} Nevertheless, Harnack tended rather liberally to include data from the Dialogue in his reconstruction.\textsuperscript{38} Though Marcionite readings may appear in citations not identified as arising from Marcion’s text or not made by Megethius 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

\textsuperscript{33} Knox’s list contains only references to the verses with no mention of the sources.

\textsuperscript{34} Knox himself was aware of this latter weakness (see chapter 1, n. 145).

\textsuperscript{35} See Pan. 42.11.4, 42.11.5, and 42.11.6 in scholia 5, 59, 64, and probably 38.

\textsuperscript{36} 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.

\textsuperscript{37} 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).

\textsuperscript{38} 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse in Luke</th>
<th>Tertullian</th>
<th>Epiphanius(^{39})</th>
<th>Adam.(^{40})</th>
<th>Other(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1</td>
<td>Marc. 4.7.1</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.5</td>
<td>Adam. 64.14–15 (2.3); 98.2–3 (2.18); 102.68–69 (2.19)</td>
<td>Irenaeus, <em>Haer</em>. 1.27.2; 4.6.2(^{41})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hippolytus, <em>Haer</em>. 7.31.5(^{42})</td>
<td>(Pseudo-)Ephrem, <em>An Exposition of the Gospel</em> (^{43})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Origen, <em>Ex libro Origenis in Epistolam ad Titum</em> (^{44})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ephrem, <em>Commentary on the Diatessaron</em> 11.23(^{45})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{39}\) 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 (Ἐξ.), a reference is made to a verse other than the one(s) found in the scholia, it is noted in the chart.

\(^{40}\) 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 anecke: nebst neuen Ausgaben patristischer und kirchlich-mittelalterlicher Schriften / I. Lateinische Schriften: die Texte und die Anmerkungen* (Oslo: Malling, 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).

\(^{41}\) 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).

\(^{42}\) Section numbers are taken from the Miroslav Marcovich edition *Hippolytus: Refutatio Omnium Haeressium* (PTS 25; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986).

\(^{43}\) 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.

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

\(^{45}\) 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:23</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.2</td>
<td>Ephrem, Commentary on the Diatessaron 11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:27&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.6</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:29</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.2</td>
<td>Ephrem, Commentary on the Diatessaron 11.23, Jerome, Contra Johannem 34&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.3</td>
<td>Jerome, Contra Johannem 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>Marc. 4.7.1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Origen, Ex libro Origenis in Epistolam ad Titum, Hippolytus, Haer. 7.31.6, An anonymous Syriac manuscript preserved in the British Museum (cod. Add. 17215 fol. 30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:32</td>
<td>Marc. 4.7.7, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:34</td>
<td>Marc. 4.7.9, 10, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35</td>
<td>Marc. 4.7.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:41</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:42</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:43</td>
<td>Marc. 4.8.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.4, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:14</td>
<td>Marc. 4.9.9, 10</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:17</td>
<td>Marc. 4.10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:18&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Marc. 4.10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>Marc. 4.10.13, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21</td>
<td>Marc. 4.10.1, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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 Johannem (CCSL 79A; Turnhout: 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 the 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:24</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.10.1, 13</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:26</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:27</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:31</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:33</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.5</td>
<td><em>Ephrem, Hymns Against Heresies, 47.4</em>&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:34</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.6</td>
<td><em>Ephrem, Hymns Against Heresies, 47.4</em>&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:36</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.9, 10</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:37</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.11.9, 10</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.1, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.1, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:3</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.5</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:4</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.5</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.11; 16.5</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:6</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.11, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.12.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:12</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:13</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:16</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 2.28.2</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:17</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.13.7</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:19</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.14.1, 9, 13</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>50</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Edmund Beck edition and translation *Des Heiligen Ephraem des Syrers 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 Brixensis: Diversarum Heresoe Liber* (CSEL 38; Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1898).

<sup>52</sup> Section numbers are taken from *A Treatise on God Written in Armenian by Eznik 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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marc. 4.15.1</th>
<th>Pan. 42.11.6(6)</th>
<th>Eznik, De deo 405</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:24</td>
<td>Marc. 4.15.3, 9</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(6)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:25</td>
<td>Marc. 4.15.13</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(6)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:26</td>
<td>Marc. 4.15.14</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(6)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:27</td>
<td>Marc. 4.16.1</td>
<td>Adam. 26.20–21 (1.12); 88.27 (2.15)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:28</td>
<td>Marc. 4.16.1</td>
<td>Adam. 26.20–21 (1.12)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:29</td>
<td>Marc. 4.16.2, 6</td>
<td>Adam. 32.5–6 (1.15); 38.2–3 (1.18)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30a</td>
<td>Marc. 4.16.8</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:31</td>
<td>Marc. 4.16.13, 16</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:34a</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.1</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:35b</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.5, 6</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:36</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.8</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:37</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.9</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:38</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.9</td>
<td>Adam. 32.17 (1.15); 66.33–34 (2.5)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:39</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:41</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:42</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(7)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:43</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Adam. 56.14–16; 58.11–13 (1.28)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:44</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Adam. 56.14–16; 58.11–13 (1.28)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:44</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Adam. 56.14–16; 58.11–13 (1.28)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.12</td>
<td>Adam. 56.14–16; 58.11–13 (1.28)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:46</td>
<td>Marc. 4.17.13, 14</td>
<td>Adam. 56.14–16; 58.11–13 (1.28)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:2</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.1</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:9</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.1</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:12</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.2</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.2</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.2</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:16</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.2</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:18</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.4</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:19</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.6</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:22</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.6</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:23</td>
<td>Marc. 4.18.8</td>
<td>Adam. 50.13–14 (1.26)</td>
<td>Eznik, De deo 358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

It is not certain that Adamantius is here referring to the Marcionite text.

Epiphanius referenced Luke 8:21 in *Pan.* 42.11.17 (ēl. 12); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion’s Gospel.

Epiphanius referenced Luke 8:27 in *Pan.* 42.11.17 (ēl. 24); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion’s Gospel.
| 9:3 | *Marc.* 4.21.1 | *Adam.* 22.7–9 (1.10) |
| 9:5 | *Marc.* 4.21.1 | |
| 9:6 |  | *Adam.* 82.6–7 (2.12) |
| 9:7 | *Marc.* 4.21.2 | |
| 9:8 | *Marc.* 4.21.2 | |
| 9:12 | *Marc.* 4.21.3 | |
| 9:13 | *Marc.* 4.21.3 | |
| 9:14 | *Marc.* 4.21.3 | |
| 9:16 |  | *Pan.* 42.11.6(15) |
| 9:17 | *Marc.* 4.21.4 | |
| 9:18 |  | *Adam.* 84.1–2 (2.13) |
| 9:19 |  | *Adam.* 84.2–4 (2.13) |
| 9:20 | *Marc.* 4.21.6 | *Adam.* 84.4–5 (2.13) |
| 9:21 | *Marc.* 4.21.6 | |
| 9:22 | *Marc.* 4.21.7 | *Pan.* 42.11.6(16) |
| 9:24 | *Marc.* 4.21.9, 10 | |
| 9:26a | *Marc.* 4.21.10, 12 | |
| 9:28 | *Marc.* 4.22.1, 7 | |
| 9:29 | *Marc.* 4.22.13 | |
| 9:30 | *Marc.* 4.22.1, 2, 3, 12 | *Pan.* 42.11.6(17); 42.11.17 (ἐλ., 63)58 | *Ephrem,* Against *Marcion I* xxxix/87  
|  |  | *Ephrem,* Commentary on the *Diatessaron* 14.9 |
| 9:31a | *Marc.* 4.22.12 | *Pan.* 42.11.6(17); 42.11.17 (ἐλ., 63) | *Ephrem,* Against *Marcion I* xlii/91 |
| 9:32 | *Marc.* 4.22.16 | |
| 9:33 | *Marc.* 4.22.4, 16 | |
| 9:34 | *Marc.* 4.22.7, 13 | |
| 9:35 | *Marc.* 4.22.1, 8, 10, 12 | *Pan.* 42.11.6(18) | *Ephrem,* Against *Marcion I* xli–xliii/93–95  
|  |  | *Ephrem,* Commentary on the *Diatessaron* 14.9 |
| 9:40 |  | *Pan.* 42.11.6(19) |
| 9:41 | *Marc.* 4.23.1, 2 | *Pan.* 42.11.6(19) |
| 9:44 |  | *Pan.* 42.11.6(20) |
| 9:46 | *Marc.* 4.23.4 | |
| 9:47 | *Marc.* 4.23.4 | |
| 9:48 | *Marc.* 4.23.4 | |
| 9:54 | *Marc.* 4.23.7 | |
| 9:55 | *Marc.* 4.23.7 | |
| 9:57 | *Marc.* 4.23.9 | |
| 9:58 | *Marc.* 4.23.9 | |
| 9:59 | *Marc.* 4.23.10 | |

---

58 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:60</td>
<td>Marc. 4.23.10</td>
<td>Clement of Alexandria, <em>Strom.</em> 3.4.25&lt;sup&gt;59&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:61</td>
<td>Marc. 4.23.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:62</td>
<td>Marc. 4.23.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:5</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:7</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:8</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:9</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:11</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:19</td>
<td>Marc. 4.24.9, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21</td>
<td>Marc. 4.25.1, 3</td>
<td><em>Pan.</em> 42.11.6&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:22 | Marc. 4.25.7, 10 | *Adam*. 44.1–2 (1.23)  
*Irenaeus, Haer.* 4.6.1  
Eznik, *De deo* 392 |
| 10:23 | Marc. 4.25.12 |  |
| 10:24 | Marc. 4.25.12 |  |
| 10:25 | Marc. 4.25.15, 18 | *Pan.* 42.11.6<sup>23</sup> |
| 10:26 | Marc. 4.25.15 | *Pan.* 42.11.6<sup>23</sup> |
| 10:27 | Marc. 4.25.15 | *Pan.* 42.11.6<sup>23</sup> |
| 10:28 | Marc. 4.25.15 | *Pan.* 42.11.6<sup>23</sup> |
| 11:1 | Marc. 4.26.1 |  |
| 11:2 | Marc. 4.26.3, 4 |  |
| 11:3 | Marc. 4.26.4 | *Origen, Fragment 180*<sup>60</sup> |
| 11:4 | Marc. 4.26.4 |  |
| 11:5 | Marc. 4.26.8 | *Pan.* 42.11.6<sup>24</sup> |
| 11:7 | Marc. 4.26.8 |  |
| 11:8 | Marc. 4.26.9 |  |
| 11:9 | Marc. 4.26.5, 6 | *Pan.* 42.11.6<sup>24</sup> |
| 11:11 | Marc. 4.26.10 | *Adam*. 110.3–4 (2.20)<sup>61</sup> |
| 11:12 | Marc. 4.26.10 | *Adam*. 110.4–5 (2.20) |
| 11:13 | Marc. 4.26.10 | *Adam*. 110.5–6 (2.20) |
| 11:14 | Marc. 4.26.11 |  |
| 11:15 | Marc. 4.26.11 |  |
| 11:18 | Marc. 4.26.11 |  |
| 11:19 | Marc. 4.26.11 |  |
| 11:20 | Marc. 4.26.11 |  |
| 11:21 | Marc. 4.26.12 |  |
| 11:22 | Marc. 4.26.12 |  |

<sup>59</sup> Section numbers are taken from the Stühlin, 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.
62 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 Ketzer 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.

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

---

64 It is not certain that Adamantius is referring to the Marcionite text in Luke 12:47–48.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Reference 1</th>
<th>Reference 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:14</td>
<td>Marc. 4.33.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>Marc. 4.33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>Marc. 4.33.7</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:17</td>
<td>Marc. 4.33.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>Marc. 4.34.1, 4, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(44)</td>
<td>Adam. 76.16–17 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(44)</td>
<td>Adam. 76.17–18 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam. 76.19–21 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:22</td>
<td>Marc. 4.34.10, 11</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:23</td>
<td>Marc. 4.34.10, 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:25</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(45)</td>
<td>Adam. 76.29–31 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:26</td>
<td>Marc. 4.34.11</td>
<td>Adam. 76.31–34 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam. 76.34–35 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam. 76.35–78.2 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:29</td>
<td>Marc. 4.34.10, 17</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(46); 42.11.17(ἐλ. 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adam. 78.3–5 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:31</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(46)</td>
<td>Adam. 78.5–6 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:1</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.1</td>
<td>Adam. 88.4–5 (2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:2</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:3</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:4</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:11</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:12</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.4, 6</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.4, 7, 8, 10</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:16</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:17</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:18</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:19</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:21</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:22</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:25</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:26</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:28</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:32</td>
<td>Marc. 4.35.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:1</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:2</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:3</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:5</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:7</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:11</td>
<td>Marc. 4.36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Along with these other sources, Harnack also noted, “Vielleicht gehört auch Clem. hom. XVIII, 1 hierher, wo wohl Marcion als Simon Magus spricht: μὴ με λέγε ἁγαθὸν ὁ γὰρ ἁγαθός εἶς ἔστιν, ὅ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οἴρονοις.” (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.

66 In *Marc*. 4.37.4 Tertullian also makes the barest of allusions to the contents of vv. 16–24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19:13</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.37.4; 39.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:22</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:23</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:26</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:1</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:4</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:5</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:6</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:7</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:8</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:19</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(54); 42.11.17(Ïµ, 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:24</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:25</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:27</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:28</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:29</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:30</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:31</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:33</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:34</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.5, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:35</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:36</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:39</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:41</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:44</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:8</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:9</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:10</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:11</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:12</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:13</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:14</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:15</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:16</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:17</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:19</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:20</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:25</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:26</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:27</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:29</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.10, 13, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:30</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:31</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.10, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:32</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:33</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:34</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:35a</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:37</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:38</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.39.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:1</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:3</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:4</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:5</td>
<td><em>Marc</em>. 4.40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:8</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:14</td>
<td><em>Pan</em>. 42.11.6(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:15</td>
<td>Marc. 4.40.1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:19</td>
<td>Marc. 4.40.3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:20</td>
<td>Marc. 4.40.4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:22b</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:33</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:48</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:66</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:67</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:69</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:70</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.4, 5; 42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:71</td>
<td>Marc. 4.41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:1</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:2</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:3</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:7</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:8</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:9</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:18</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:19</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:22</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:23</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:25</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:32</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:33</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:34</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:44</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:45</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:46</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:50</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:51</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:52</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:53</td>
<td>Marc. 4.42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:55</td>
<td>Marc. 4.43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:1</td>
<td>Marc. 4.43.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 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.

68 Epiphanius referenced Luke 22:20 in Pan. 42.11.17 (τ.λ. 61); however, it is not clear that he is here referring to Marcion’s Gospel.

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

2.1.2.2 Attested Verses (Absent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse(s) in Luke</th>
<th>Tertullian</th>
<th>Epiphanius</th>
<th>Adam. Dial.</th>
<th>Other(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1–2:52(^70)</td>
<td>Marc. 4.7.11 [Marc. 4.7.1 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.9.1–2; 42.11.4–5</td>
<td>Hippolytus, Haer. 7.31.5; Origen, Ex libro Origenis in Epistolam ad Titum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1–13 (*^71)</td>
<td>Marc. 5.6.7</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.19.6–7 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:31b</td>
<td>Marc. 4.22.16</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–32</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.27.1 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:49–51</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.27.8 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:6</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.28.3 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:28a</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(39)</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:1–9</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.30.1 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:29–35</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.31.1 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11–32</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.33.1 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10b</td>
<td>[Marc. 4.35.4 tacitus]</td>
<td>Pan. 42.11.6(51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^71\) This passage, though found in Tertullian’s discussion of 1 Cor, clearly reveals that these verses were not in Marcion’s Gospel.
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 απέκοψεν 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 πολλά. 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.

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]).

In Pan. 42.11.17 (öl. 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.

Though Epiphanius cites the beginning of v. 35 followed by καὶ τὰ ἔξησ before referencing v. 37, the context strongly suggests that v. 36 was also missing.

Though Tertullian explicitly notes the excision of v. 34b, Epiphanius quotes from it in Pan. 42.11.6(71).
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

---

77 There is an indirect indication that 3:2–22 was missing as an implication of Tertullian’s comments in Marc. 4.11.4.

78 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=ἀματωλοι])” is contextually unlikely. Harnack is surely right when in the main text of his reconstruction he indicated that vv. 32–33 are “unbezeugt.”

79 Epiphanius referenced Luke 14:26 in Pan. 42.11.17 (τὰ. 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. With very few exceptions, Tertullian appears to be commenting on the verses in Marcion’s Gospel in the order in which he found them. 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 μόχαρσαν to διαμερίσον 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 13th-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.

---

80 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.


82 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.\textsuperscript{83}

\section*{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.

\subsection*{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.\textsuperscript{84} 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 \textit{Apostolikon}, and in many below (\textit{Evangelium Marcions}, 30–31). Along similar lines Zahn, \textit{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 \textit{Adversus Marcionem}, “whether according to his own text, or Marcion’s, or both, is as usual uncertain” (\textit{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 (\textit{Geschichte}, 1:604).

\textsuperscript{83} For Tertullian’s “hastening towards the conclusion,” see, for example, Zahn, \textit{Geschichte}, 1:604–5 and Lukas, \textit{Rhetorik}, 320, 322.

\textsuperscript{84} See May, “Markion in seiner Zeit,” 9.
ways the present work embraces his methodology and begins to apply it to Marcion’s *Euangelion*. 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” 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.” 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. 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. 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. Only

---


86 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).

87 Ibid.

88 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.


90 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.91 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.92

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.93 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.”94 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.

91 Schmid, Marcion und sein Apostolos, 27.
92 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).
93 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.
94 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.\textsuperscript{95} 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.

\textbf{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,\textsuperscript{96} von Soden,\textsuperscript{97} NA\textsuperscript{27}, and the two Luke volumes edited by the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project.\textsuperscript{98} 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.\textsuperscript{99} 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.

\textsuperscript{95} At relevant points questions relating to the manuscript evidence for Tertullian’s own works will also be considered.


\textsuperscript{97} Von Soden, \textit{Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments: II. Teil: Text mit Apparat}.

\textsuperscript{98} 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).

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. 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. 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

---

100 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).

101 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 *και* may twice be rendered with *autem*; in Luke 9:24 he may have used *et* for *δὲ* in *Adversus Marcionem* (though the parallel Matt 10:39 reads *και*), but no conjunction appears in the citation in *Scorp.* 11.1; in Luke 9:26 Tertullian omits the nearly uniformly attested opening *γὰρ* 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 *γὰρ*; 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.\(^{102}\)

### 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.\(^{103}\) 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.”\(^{104}\)

---

\(^{102}\) 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.

\(^{103}\) Once again, it is noteworthy how often Harnack relies on Tertullian’s testimony for the specific ordering of elements in Marcion’s text.

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.”

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. 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. 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*). 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

---


106 This point was already noted and discussed, though in less detail than here, by Volekmar, *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.

107 For further comments on this memory slip see Roth, “Matthean Texts,” 596–97.

108 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.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{109} 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.¹ 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.² At times, however, the works and views of other scholars who have studied Marcion’s text will also be referenced.³

3.1.1 Luke 4:32

4.7.7⁴ – 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 obstupescebat 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 ἔξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.⁵ According to IGNTP this verse is quite uniform in the manuscript tradition,

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

⁵ Harnack, Marcion, 184*.
though two readings require comment. First, ἔξεπλήσσοντο δὲ is elsewhere attested only in ff⁶, and even Harnack recognized that δὲ instead of καὶ is “nicht sicher.” In addition, πάντες is only attested elsewhere in r¹, sa, and Vaticani Syriaci 268.⁷ 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 disceto, 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. 22.1⁸ – 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.⁹

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 τι ᾳμίν καὶ σοί. Tertullian also attests est before Iesu, though the opening interjection ἔσται and Ναζαρηνὲς after Ἰησοῦ are not attested. Harnack believed the interjection to be missing, but apparently did not believe ἐστίν to be present.¹⁰ The interjection is not attested in D or any OL

---

⁶ Ibid., 185*. The sigla employed for referencing manuscripts are those found in NA²⁷, pp. 64*–76*, 684–720. The only additional siglum used is “OL” for the Old Latin version.
⁷ In the NT πάντες occurs with ἐκπλήσσοντο only in Luke 9:43.
⁸ 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.
¹⁰ Harnack, Marcion, 185*.
manuscript, and it may have been absent in Marcion’s text. It is also possible, however, that Tertullian simply omitted the interjection at the outset of his citation. ἐστὶν is attested in c and r¹, 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 Ναζαρηνε, Harnack succinctly stated “Ναζαρηνε tendenziös gestrichen.” 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. 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 Ναζαρηνε.

Tertullian twice (4.7.9, 12) cites the unproblematic ἡλθες ἀπολέσαι ἰμάς. For the final element of the verse Harnack reconstructed οἶδα τίς ἐί, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. 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. 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.

---

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

12 Harnack, Marcion, 186*.

13 Tertullian here is in the midst of an argument against Marcion’s interpretation of 1 Cor 2:8.

14 Harnack, Marcion, 185*.

15 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.\(^{16}\)

### 3.1.3 Luke 5:11

4.9.2 – Denique relictis nauclis\(^{17}\) 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\(^{18}\) as opposed to the singular navem, which Tertullian uses in Bapt. 12.9, rendering πλοίον in Matt 4:22.\(^{19}\) 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).\(^{20}\) Harnack offered only ὁφέντες ἥκολούθησαν αὐτῷ for Marcion’s text of Luke 5:11, though πλοίον should also be considered as attested in 5:11a.\(^{21}\)

### 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

---

\(^{16}\) 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, and references by Augustine, Hilary, and Quadrivultdeus (according to IGNTP) and in Mark 1:24 no manuscripts (according to Tischendorf and von Soden) attest its absence, this view is less likely.

\(^{17}\) 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.

\(^{18}\) τὸ πλοίον is read in Luke 5:11 in only two minuscules (472, 1009), along with a few Armenian and Georgian manuscripts.

\(^{19}\) The use of navicula and navis in these allusions to Luke 5:11 and Matt 4:22 are simply variant translations of πλοίον. 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 πλοίον in Matt 8:24.

\(^{20}\) Thus, Tsutsui’s suggestion that Tertullian is attesting a Marcionite alteration, though perhaps possible, is unnecessary (“Evangelium,” 78–79).

\(^{21}\) 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. 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 ὁφείναι ἀμαρτίας εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεὸς. It should be noted, though, that the reading ὁφείναι ἀμαρτίας is elsewhere unattested. B, D, and Ξ read ἀμαρτίας ὁφείναι and all other witnesses read ὁφείναι ἀμαρτίας, 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


______________________________________________

22 It is therefore not quite correct when IGNTP states “‘will forgive’ Marcion ap TE.”
23 Harnack, Marcion, 189*. 

76
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 oι κοκως 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. When Tertullian’s argument remains close to the wording of the biblical text he continues to use male or malus; 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 praedictat, ab eo magis praestari medicum ad quem pertinent qui langent).

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,… 14.11.9 – Errasti in illa etiam domini pronuntiatione qua videtur nova et vetera discernere. Inflatus es utribus veteribus et excerebratus es novo vino, atque ita veteri, id est priori evangelio, pannum haereticae novitatis adsuisti. 14.11.10 – 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. 1 Or. 1.1 – Oportebat enim in hac quoque specie novum vinum novis utribus recondi et novam plagulam novo adsui vestimento. 1 Res. 44.3 – Perituriis 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.27 The parable is also attested by Hippolytus, Epiphanius, Ephrem, Philastrius, and in Adam., which means

24 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 ἔχοντες in the former and ὑγιεινοντες in the latter.

25 Tertullian uses this adverb/adjecitice twice as he continues his argument in 4.11.2.

26 Tertullian also uses langueo 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 (OECS; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 132–33.

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 haereticae novitatis*\(^{28}\) seems to play on ἐπιβλημα ὄκους ἁγνάφου (as in Matt 9:16/Mark 2:21) and not on the Lukan ἐπιβλημα ἀπὸ ἰματίου καινοῦ (Luke 5:36).\(^{29}\)

### 3.1.7 Luke 6:5

4.12.11 – … *dominus sabbati dictus …* \(^{30}\) | 14.16.5 – … *dominus et sabbati et legis et omnium paternarum dispositionum Christus …* | Carn. Chr. 15.1 – … *Dominus est sabbati filius hominis.*

---

\(^{28}\) There is no real significance in the various renderings of ἐπιβλημα (*plagula, additamentum, and probably pannus*) and ἐπιβλαλω (*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]).

\(^{29}\) Tsutsui also notes Tertullian’s word-play (“Evangelium,” 80).

\(^{30}\) 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 Verlagbuchhandlung, 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. J.*, 78
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.*\(^{31}\) | 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,…*\(^{32}\)

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

---

\(^{31}\) Moreschini follows the reading of M and Kroymann. β and the other editors, except Pamellus and Rigaltus who read regnum coelorum, read regnum dei.

cites the Matthean text in *Pat.* 11.6 he writes *beatis pauperes spiritu.* 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 σῶτων and not the Lukan ὑμετέρα in Marcion’s text. Nevertheless, Tertullian’s citations always offering *illorum* means that an unconscious Matthean influence cannot be ruled out entirely.

### 3.1.9 Luke 6:21


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

---

33 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]).

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

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

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 *vôv* 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.\(^{37}\) 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 *vôv* 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 *vôv*” is overstated.\(^{38}\) 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


---

\(^{37}\) According to IGNTP no other witnesses attest the omission of the first *vôv* and very few attest the omission of the second.

\(^{38}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 191*.

\(^{39}\) 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 ἐσεσθε instead of ἔστε, and noted that the future form is “sonst unbezeugt.”\(^{40}\) This claim, however, is erroneous.\(^{41}\) According to IGNTP, the future appears in ḧ, 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.\(^{42}\) It is possible that both Marcion’s Gospel and Tertullian’s copy of Matthew contained ἐσεσθε, but it may also be that Tertullian simply chose to translate ἔστε 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, ἐσεσθε 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.\(^{43}\)

Second, Harnack also believed that Marcion’s text read ὑμᾶς before the verb μισεω because of the placement of vos in Tertullian’s citation, again wrongly stating the reading to be otherwise unattested.\(^{44}\) It is true that Tertullian follows the Greek

\(^{40}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 192*.

\(^{41}\) D. Plooij also noted the error (*A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1925], 78n1).

\(^{42}\) b, f, q, and k, according to *Itala*.

\(^{43}\) 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 ἔν, ἐν, and ὄταν 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).

\(^{44}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 192*. Again the error was noted by Plooij, *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; 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. 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 ὁταν 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 καὶ to the next καὶ, it should be considered “unattested” and not “missing,” as is assumed by Harnack.

### 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. 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. There,

---

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

46 In Matt 5:11 *vos* precedes different verbs in a b c (maledicere), g¹ (odio habere), and h (perseguor). Tertullian’s dedecorare in *Scorp.* 9.2 is unattested in the OL manuscripts.

47 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.

48 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).

49 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 NA²⁷), k adds fratres eorum, and sy replaces τοὺς πρὸ 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 (οὗτως 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 γὰρ mit D a ff² I Ambros. gefehlt hat?” could be answered in the affirmative. On the other hand, a simple omission by Tertullian cannot be ruled out. The inclusion of et in Scorp. 9.2, 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.

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 οὖν οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι, ὅτι πεινῶσετε, οὖν οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε. Three issues need to be discussed. First, Harnack did not comment on the absence of ὑμῖν after both occurrences of οὖν, but it is tenuous to assert its absence in Marcion’s text. 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 κλαυοῦσετε at the end of Tertullian’s adaptation. Neither of them noticed, however, that as Tertullian continues his argument he connects the Gospel

---

50 Harnack, Marcion, 192*. A few additional witnesses to the omission are provided in IGNTP. Tsutsui agrees that the conjunction was absent in Marcion’s text, but also notes that its omission was not due to Marcion (“Evangelium,” 83).
51 Attested elsewhere for Luke 6:23 only in the OL manuscripts b, f, and q.
52 Harnack, Marcion¹, 173*. In the second edition Harnack placed ὑμῖν in parentheses after αὐτῶν because of the testimony of Epiphanius (Marcion, 192*).
53 Harnack, Marcion, 192*.
54 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.
55 Harnack, Marcion, 192* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 83. According to IGNTP the phrase is missing in X, 158, 179, 213, and l299.
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.\(^{56}\) 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.


4.16.1 – *Sed vobis dico, inquit, qui auditis … Diligite inimicos vestros, et benedicate eos qui vos oderant, et orate pro eis qui vos calumniatur,… Si enim qui inimici sunt et oderunt et maledicent et calumniatur fratres appellandi sunt,\(^{57}\) utique et benedici odientes et orari pro calumniatoribus iussit qui eos fratres deputari praecepet. \(| 4.16.6 – \ldots et non modo non remaledicendi sed etiam benedicendi,... | \) 4.27.1 \ldots vetat remaledicere, multo magis utique maledicere,... | An. 35.2 – \ldots diligite enim inimicos vestros, inquit, et orate pro maledicentibus vos ... | Pat. 6.5 [sic, 6.6] – \ldots Diligite inimicos vestros et maledicentibus benedicite et orate pro persecutoribus vestris ut filii sitis patris vestri caelestis.*\(^{58}\)

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 ‘Αλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω, τοῖς ἀκούοσιν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (v. 27) and καὶ προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς (v. 28).\(^{59}\) NA\(^{27}\) and the Textus Receptus (TR) read identically here apart from the absence of καὶ before προσεύχεσθε.\(^{60}\) Tertullian’s lack of consistency regarding

---

\(^{56}\) Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 199 rightly notes the reference.

\(^{57}\) The reference to calling our enemies brothers is from Tertullian’s citation of Isa 66:5 immediately prior to this sentence.

\(^{58}\) 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.

\(^{59}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 192*-93*.

\(^{60}\) 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;”61 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.62 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

61 Harnack, Marcion, 193*.
62 There are also various forms in Tertullian’s allusions to this text listed in n. 58.
Tertullian himself. At the very least, the confidence with which Harnack offered the reading εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ύμᾶς 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.

### 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 repercutiendi 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.

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 πάρεσε 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 offerrelpraebere in 4.16.2, 6.

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 ἵματιον then χιτῶν, whereas Tertullian appears to attest the Matthean order χιτῶν then ἵματιον. According to IGNTP, in the manuscript tradition of Luke this

---

63 See Braun’s note in *Contre Marcion IV*, 201n2.

64 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.

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

66 Though obvertere 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.

67 For comments on the grammatical construction in 4.16.2 see Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 202n2.
reversed order is attested in 1542*, b, ff², g¹, l, r¹, 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 κωλύσῃς. 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,... 14.27.1 – … 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 ...

Tertullian appears to attest Luke 6:30a in its Lukan form (παντὶ αἰτοῦντι σὲ δἰδοῦ), though the Latin is unable to indicate whether the definite article, attested in numerous Greek manuscripts before αἰτοῦντι, was present in Marcion’s text. In addition, the Majority Text, along with several other manuscripts including A, D, and several OL manuscripts, reads δὲ τῷ after παντὶ. 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 δὸς here, and there is no good reason to doubt that Tertullian’s future imperative is rendering δἰδοῦ. 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.

68 See also the comments of Braun, ibid.
69 An additional allusion to Luke 6:30a occurs in 4.16.10.
70 In his reconstructed text Harnack wrote (τῷ?) (Marcion, 193*).
71 The term “Majority Text” is here used in the sense employed by NA²⁷ in its explanation of the Gothic “M” as a siglum in the apparatus (see the introduction to NA²⁷, 14*, 55*).
72 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 κοθήως ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι θέλετε παρὰ τῶν ὑθράπων, σὺ τῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιείτε συτοῖς. 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. 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. 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. 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.

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 παρά, though ἀνθρώπου could have appeared with or without the article in Marcion’s text. Once

---

73 Harnack, Marcion, 193*-94*.
74 The apparatus of Tischendorf and von Soden list no attestation for κοθήως appearing in the Matthean text.
75 Harnack, Marcion, 193* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 84.
76 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.
77 Note also that Tertullian uses an indicative instead of the Matthean subjunctive in Scorp. 10.3.
again, that Tertullian attests the expected *hominès* in *Scorp.* 10.3 would tend to confirm Tertullian’s attesting a different Greek text for Marcion than that of Luke.\(^78\)

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 remites et remittetur tibi si tenax inuriae 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 ἀπολύθη σεσθε [sic].\(^79\) 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.\(^80\) 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.\(^81\) The third element concerning forgiveness is elsewhere always offered with a third person verb and

---

\(^78\) Matthew and Luke are verbatim in ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ άνθρωποι. 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.*

\(^79\) Harnack, *Marcion,* 194\(^a\).*

\(^80\) 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.

\(^81\) 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


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.82 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 οὕτως*).83 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,...* 14.4.5 – *... cum et si discipulus Marcion, non tamen super magistrum ...* 14.17.12 – *Sed non est discipulus super magistrum.* 1 An. 55.2 – *... servi super dominum et discipuli super magistrum,...* 1 Praescr. 34.5 – *... ipse [Valentinus] faceret discipulos super magistrum.* 1 Scorp. 9.6 – *... non est discipulus super magistrum ... nec servus super dominum suum,...* 1 Val. 33.1 – *Exitterunt enim de schola ipsius [Valentinus] discipuli super magistrum,...* 84

---

82 Both Harnack and Tsutsui indicate that there is only an allusion to the text (*Marcion*, 194* and “Evangelium,” 85).

83 Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 222n5.

84 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 ἐστὶν μοθήτης ὑπὲρ τῶν διδάσκαλον.\(^{85}\) 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.\(^{86}\) 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.”\(^{87}\) 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;\(^{88}\) 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,... 12.4.2 – Agnoscat hinc primum fructum optimum, utique optimae arboris, Marcion. 12.24.3 – ... et quia et Marcion defendit arborem bonam malos quoque fructus non licere producere. 14.17.12 – Proinde et arbor bona non proferat malum fructum, quia nec veritas haeresim, nec mala bonum, quia nec haeresis veritatem:... 14.21.4 – ... quia arbor bona malos non ferat fructus nec mala bonos, et nemo de spinis metat ficus et de tribulis uvas. 14.21.5 – Non dabit enim arbor mala bonos fructus,... et bona malos dabit,... 14 HERM. 13.1 – Certe nec bona arbor fructus malos edit,... nec mala arbor bonos,...

---

\(^{85}\) The absence of σὺτού at the end of the phrase, with P\(^{75}\), 8, B, D, and many other manuscripts is likely. Some manuscripts include σὺτού after the first element, and in Matt 10:24 it is nearly uniformly present after the second (cf. Scorp. 9.6).

\(^{86}\) Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 85. Braun, Chronica Tertullianeae, 491 agrees. Harnack’s text is found in Marcion, 194*.

\(^{87}\) This preferred usage by Tertullian is also mentioned by Braun, Contre Marcion I, 166n6 [sic n1].

\(^{88}\) 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.\textsuperscript{89} 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 καρποὺς. Third, concerning the verb in the verse, Harnack observed “nicht ποιεῖν, sondern προενέγκειν und προενέγκαι im Text, der Tert. und Adamantius vorlag.”\textsuperscript{90} 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.\textsuperscript{91}

3.1.21 Luke 7:2, 9

4.18.1 – Proinde extollenda fide centurionis incredibile, si is professus est talem se fidem nec in Israele invenisse ad quem non pertinebat fides Israel<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 Israele umquam fuisse. Ceterum dicens talem fidem debuisse inveniri in Israele,… | Idol. 19.3 … si etiam centurio crediderat,… | Val. 28.1 … ubi adventum Soteris [the Demiurge] acceptit, 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 τοιούτην πίστιν οὐδὲ

\textsuperscript{89} 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).

\textsuperscript{90} 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 ἐγένεκειν/ἐγέγκαι and προενέγκειν/προενέγκαι. Harnack pointed out this fact in his apparatus, but not in the reconstruction of Marcion’s text from which this citation is taken.

\textsuperscript{91} Possible, though unproveable, is that Tertullian is familiar with the variant reading ἐγένεκειν 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.
εν τῷ Ἰσραήλ εὕρον, with elements repeated in the subsequent discussion. Harnack stated that Tertullian definitely read talem (τοιούτῳ) in Marcion’s text as Tertullian repeated it three times.92 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 r1 read talem.93 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 οὐδεποτε, a reading also found in D, “denn bei einer Wiederholung schreibt er [Tertullian]: „talem fidel nec in Israhele umquam fuisse“.94 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.95 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.


4.18.4 – … scandalizatur Iohannes auditis virtutibus Christi,…96 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 agnoscedum se nuntiaverit Iohanni. 4.18.7 – … interrogationis illius: Tu es, qui venis, an alium expectamus? 4.18.8 – … et qui sit maior tanto prophetæ, qui non fuerit scandalizatus in Christum, quod tunc Iohannem minuit. 4.18.9 – … cum ipsum quod caeleste in Iohanne fuerat, spiritus [et] prophetiae, post totius Dominus in dominum translationem usque adeo defecerit ut quem praedicaverat, quem advenientem designaverat, postmodum, an ipse esset, miserit sciscitatum. 4.18.10 – Carn. Chr. 4.4 – … carnem ab omni vexatione restituit, leprosam emaculat, caecam reluminat, paralyticam redintegrat, daemoniacam expiat, mortuam resuscitat,…

92 Harnack, Marcion, 196*.
93 IGNTP states that the reading is also attested in sy9.
94 Harnack, Marcion, 196*.
95 Braun rightly notes that Tertullian’s argument here rests on the precise sense of the verb εὕρον (Contre Marcion IV, 229n4).
96 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, ἥ ἀλλον προσδοκῶμεν for Marcion’s text. 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: ὁς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ 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 περισσότερον. 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 praeparēt viam tuam,... |

The only variant in the manuscript tradition of this phrase is the Matthean ἔτερων instead of ἀλλον. 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.

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

Moreschini’s text reads praeparēt with B, 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 “praeparēt (=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 praeperabit viam tuam ante te;…¹⁰⁰

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;¹⁰¹ 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 ἐμπροσθέν 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 r¹.¹⁰²

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 aeque creatoris, et qui sit maior tanto prophetia,… | Bapt. 12.5 – … Nemo dicens maior inter natos feminarum Iohanne baptizatore.

Harnack reconstructed this verse μείζων πάντων τῶν γεννητῶν γυναικῶν προφητῆς Ἰωάννης ἐστίν· ὃ (δὲ) μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (οὐ τοῦ θεοῦ?) μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.¹⁰³ Tsutsui comments “Die Wiederherstellung (und

¹⁰⁰ Possible additional allusions to Luke 7:27/Matt 11:10/Mark 1:2 occur in Bapt. 6.1, 10.6.
¹⁰¹ Harnack placed the Greek pronoun in parentheses in his reconstructed text (cf. Marcion, 197*). The pronoun is omitted in numerous witnesses including P²⁷⁵, N, B, D, L, and W.
¹⁰² See also Harnack, Marcion, 196*.
¹⁰³ 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).
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. 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 ἀποφήτης to have been present in Marcion’s text, even if it is the reading of the Majority Text and several other witnesses. 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. 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 κρυπτὸν φανερὸν γενήσεται. 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.
3.1.27 Luke 8:18

2.2.6 – ... ideoque non habendo fidem etiam quod videbatur habere ademptum est illi,... 14.19.3 – Et ideo per Christum adicer: Videte quomodo auditis ... etiam dicendo: Videte, quomodo auditis,... 14.19.4 – Hoc probat etiam subiacens sensus: Ei qui habet dabitur, ab eo autem qui non habet etiam quod habere se putat auferetur ei.110 | 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 8:18 without οὖν. 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.111 If the particle was absent, Harnack’s view, supported by the reading of a handful of manuscripts,112 is more likely, since Tsutsui’s is dependent on his unlikely contention that Marcion relocated v. 18.113 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.114 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.115 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

---

110 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).


112 IGNTP lists 343, 716, 1229, several OL manuscripts, sy², sy⁶, sy⁸, bo, and the Persian Diatessaron as attesting the omission.

113 See n. 110.


115 According to IGNTP only the Persian Diatessaron, geo, and aeth omit γάρ. In addition, it is not clear whether γάρ would have preceded or followed οὖν. According to IGNTP, the former is the reading of Μ, B, L, Ζ, 0202, and 157.
in Fug. 11.2. As the manuscript tradition is nearly uniform here, σὺτῶ with } was almost certainly present after δοθήσεται.\footnote{116}

For 8:18c Harnack reconstructed οὖς δ’ ἄν μη ἔχῃ, καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ’ σὺτῶ.\footnote{117} 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 \textit{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 ἐκ or the preposition and pronoun here in Marcion’s text.\footnote{118} In addition, though Tertullian writes \textit{videtur habere} in Fug. 11.2, his \textit{habere se putat} does not necessitate a word order change in Marcion’s text, a change that Harnack also did not make.\footnote{119} Finally, despite the attestation of ἔχει (cf. Matt 13:12/Mark 4:25) in later manuscripts, Harnack was right to view Tertullian’s \textit{habet} as likely rendering the subjunctive.\footnote{120}

\section*{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 adnuntiaret,\ldots\footnote{121} | Carn. Chr. 7.2 – Primo quidem numquam quisquam adnuntiasset illi matrem et fratres eius foris stantes, qui non

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{116}{Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 198* places σὺτῶ in this position but in parentheses.}
\footnote{117}{Ibid.}
\footnote{118}{Harnack provides no rationale for including ἐκ but leaving out ἀπ’ σὐτῶ at the beginning of the phrase. Tertullian places \textit{ei} at the end of the phrase, and though ultimately not provable, it could be that Tertullian wrote \textit{ab eo autem} from memory at the beginning of the phrase and then saw ἀπ’ σὺτῶ at the conclusion of the verse leading to a redundant \textit{ei} (\textit{auferetur ei} is the reading of \textit{e} in Matt 13:12). According to IGNTP there is one OL manuscript, l, and two manuscripts of sa that attest \textit{autem}. καὶ οὖς is attested in the remainder of the manuscript tradition. Worth noting are the readings of \textit{e}, \textit{auferetur ab eo, quod videtur habere}, along with \textit{D} (also \textit{d}), ἀρθήσεται ἀπ’ σὺτῶ καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν. Tertullian may have been familiar with a similar reading.}
\footnote{119}{Even the altered word order in the readings of \textit{D}, \textit{d}, and \textit{e} cited in the previous note retain the otherwise uniformly attested order of these two words.}
\footnote{120}{Every OL manuscript (except \textit{a}, which reads \textit{habuerit}) here reads \textit{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.}
\footnote{121}{Additional allusions to Luke 8:20 occur in 3.11.3; 4.19.10; and 4.36.9.}
\end{footnotes}
certus esset et habere illum matrem et fratres et ipsos esse, quos tunc nuntiabat, vel retro cognitos vel tunc ibidem compertos,…\textsuperscript{122}

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 \textit{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 \textit{foris} before the verb \textit{stare} in both of these references shows that that was not necessarily the word order in Marcion’s text. Nevertheless, \textit{ἐξοικηκασιν} 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 \textit{illi} before the verb \textit{adnuntiare} in 4.19.7, but after the verb in \textit{Carn. Chr. 7.2} reinforces the necessity for caution in attempting to determine Greek order from Tertullian’s testimony at this point.\textsuperscript{123}

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

\textbf{3.1.29 Luke 8:21}

4.19.6 – \textit{Ipse, [all who deny the birth of the Lord] inquiunt, contestatur se non esse natum dicendo: Quae mihi mater,\textsuperscript{125} et qui mihi fratres? 14.19.10 – … superest

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{122} Additional allusions to (contextually) Matt 12:47 occur in \textit{Carn. Chr. 7.3}, 5, 7–8.
\textsuperscript{123} The indication by IGNTP in its apparatus that Marcion attests the order \textit{θέλοντες ἰδεῖν σε} at the close of the verse, apparently dependent on Tertullian’s word order \textit{quaerentes videre eum}, should be questioned.
\textsuperscript{124} Thus, in addition to the problematic word order in IGNTP (see n. 123), it should not be assumed that \textit{θέλοντες} is the attested reading. Though Harnack placed \textit{ἐστιν ἐκασιν} \textit{ἐξοικηκασιν} \textit{ἰδεῖν σε} \textit{θέλοντες} in parentheses, it is curious that he did not mention that Tertullian’s testimony provides no direct warrant for \textit{θέλοντες}.
\textsuperscript{125} Moreschini’s text reads \textit{mater} with \textit{β} rejecting the certainly erroneous reading \textit{pater} found in \textit{M}. 
discipere sensum non simpliciter pronuntiantis: Quae mihi mater aut fratres?

4.19.11 – Atque adeo cum praemisset: Quis mihi mater et qui mihi fratres?

subiungens: Nisi qui audiant verba mea et faciunt ea ... 14.26.13 – ... 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 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. 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. It is worth noting Tertullian’s varying inclusion of mihi in his citations. In addition, that Marcion’s text read τοὺς λόγους μου and not the canonical τον λόγον του θεου 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

_126_ Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read quae.

_127_ Only one manuscript, codex Trecensis, includes mihi. Every other manuscript and editor simply reads qui fratres, which likely is correct.

_128_ 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).

_129_ In Carn. Chr. 7.1 Tertullian, after the question as cited above, continues audiat igitur et Apelles quid iam responsum sit a nobis Marciioni eo libello quo ad evangelium ipsius provocavimus, considerandum 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, “Singular 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*. 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 τοὺς λόγους μου ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες αὐτοὺς.

3.1.30 Luke 9:22

4.21.7 – *quia oportet 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, inquitis, contemnere 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 “despine” 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 inveniret, perdet illam qui vero perdiderit mei causa, inveniet illam.*

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. For Luke 9:24 Tertullian does not attest the presence of γόρ at the beginning of the verse. Harnack

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

131 Harnack, *Marcion*, 198*.


133 Matt 16:25 reads slightly differently from both the Lukan and the other Matthean occurrence, with σώζω as the first verb and τυρίζω as the second.
placed the conjunction in parentheses;\textsuperscript{134} however, Tsutsui argues that Marcion deleted it and uses its absence to argue that Marcion also deleted Luke 9:23.\textsuperscript{135} 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 ὁτὸς 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 \textit{et qui} as κḋ  ὃς, 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 \textit{et qui} cannot be his rendering of ὁ ὃς ὃς. Furthermore, though Tertullian reads \textit{perdiderit eam propter me} where Luke has ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν σὺτου ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ, Harnack perhaps incorrectly reconstructed ἀπολέσῃ σὺτήν ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ.\textsuperscript{136} Though this reading may be reflected in e, reading \textit{illam} instead of \textit{eam}, it is interesting that in the allusion back to the verse in 4.21.10 Tertullian has \textit{qui animam suam propter deum perdit} and in \textit{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 σὺτου. 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 \textit{propter deum} in 4.21.10 makes it more likely that \textit{propter me} in 4.21.9 has arisen out of Marcion’s text.

\textsuperscript{134} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 201*.
\textsuperscript{135} Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 92.
\textsuperscript{136} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 201*. 
3.1.32 Luke 9:26

4.21.10 – Qui confusus, inquit, me<it>137 fuerit, et ego confundar eius,138… 14.21.12 – [Marcion’s Christ] Non poterat itaque dixisse: Qui mei139 fuerit. 1 Carn. Chr. 5.3 – Qui mei, inquit, confusus fuerit, confundar et ego eius. 1 Fug. 7.1 – Qui mei confusus fuerit, et ego confundar eius coram patre meo. 1 Idol. 13.6 – Qui autem confusus super me fuerit penes homines, et ego confundar super illo, inquit, penes patrem meum, qui est in caelis. 1 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.”140 Once again, it is very difficult to determine whether γάρ was missing in Marcion’s text at the outset of the verse.141 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).142

Second, for the first half of 9:26a, apart from the absent conjunction, Tertullian appears closely to follow Marcion’s text, attesting ὃς ὁ ἐπαισχυνθῇ 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 καγώ ἐπαισχυνθῆσομαι σὺν.143 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

137 Mei is the reading in Ursinus’s note, Rigalti, Oehler, Kroymann, and Evans. Me is the reading in Ḟ, Gelenius, and Pamelius.
138 Pamelius’s edition reads eum.
139 Pamelius’s edition reads me confuses.
140 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.
141 IGNTP indicates that its absence is elsewhere only attested in one manuscript of bo.
142 Harnack, Marcion, 201* and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 92.
143 Harnack, Marcion, 201*.
just as likely that the order was that of Matt 10:33 (ἀρνηθομαι κἀγὼ σὺν ὑμῖν), 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 τότεν 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, 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. 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. 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.” Tsutsui may be right;
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 Filli 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 ἐὰν τὸ ὑπό; 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 agnoscebilia servaverat; ubi etiam Moyes 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 ἐξαστράτωσε.148 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*

---

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 ... agnoscent ...
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 stabant et faciem ad faciem—cum illo, inquit, non extra illum,— in gloria[μ] ipsius, sedum in conspectu. 1 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? 1 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 ...
1 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. 1 Res. 55.10 – Dominus quoque in secessu montis etiam vestimenta luce mutaverat, sed liamenta Petro agnoscebilia servaverat; 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.”

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). Harnack contended that Marcion’s Gospel read καὶ ἴδον δύο ἄνδρες συνέστησαν σὺτῳ in v. 30, and that the initial references by Tertullian were due to an erroneous

---

149 References to “Moses and Elijah,” in this order, also occur in Praescr. 22.6 and Res. 55.10.

150 Tertullian also refers to Moses speaking with Jesus in Prax. 14.7.
recollection of his own text of Luke. 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. 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 ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ), and sed stantem would refer to v. 32 where Peter and the other two disciples ἔδω πρὸ τῆς δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄδρας 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 voluisset 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

---

151 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).

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

153 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 “unaehmbar” for and therefore omitted by Marcion (*Marcion, 203*).
audite. | Prax. 23.3 – … Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene sensi, audite illum;…  

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: οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. 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 νεφελῆς wahrscheinlicher) and then observed in the apparatus, “Dem „de caelo“ Tert.s ist nicht zu trauen, da er hier referiert.” Similarly, Tsutsui notes Tertullian’s allusion and indicates that caelo is an unlikely reading by placing it in brackets. 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.


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.

154 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.

155 Williams states that Tertullian read hic est filius meus dilectus, 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[ī] for Luke against Tertullian’s dilectus, which corresponds to ἐκλεγμένος, ‘chosen,’ in the majority text of Luke” (“Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel, 486, 481n13). Apart from the Majority Text of Luke not reading ἐκλεγμένος, Williams has unfortunately followed a misprint of 4.22.10 in CCSL. In his M.A. thesis Williams noticed that CCSL here offers dilectus 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 dilectus 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.

156 Harnack, Marcion, 202*-3*.

14.23.10 – Illi autem causato patris sepulturam cum respondet: Sine mortui sepeliant mortuos suos, tu autem vade et adnuntia regnum dei,… 14.23.11 – Cum vero et tertium illum prius suis valedicere parantem prohibet retro respectare,… 1 Bapt. 12.9 – … patris exequias despexit;… 1 Idol. 12.3 – … cum etiam sepelire patrem tardum fuit fidei. 1 Mon. 7.8 – Nam et illum adulescentem 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 ἀκολουθήσας σοι ὠποῦ ἀν ἀπέρχη (v. 57).158 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 ἀφεῖ τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς νεκροὺς ἑσυτών, σὺ δὲ ἀπέλθε καὶ διάγγελε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.159 Most of the verse is unproblematic; however, it is not clear that Marcion’s text did not read the much more common τοὺς ἑσυτῶν νεκροὺς and ἀπέλθων. 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.160 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 οἴκον μου] (v. 61) and the prohibition of βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (v. 62).

158 Marcion’s text possibly could have read εἶν.
159 Harnack, Marcion, 204*.
160 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> 161 pacem ei dicere,... 162 Or. 26.2 – Aut quomodo secundum praeceptum pax huic domui dices,...

Harnack reconstructed this verse εἰς ἣν (δὲ) ἀν εἰσέλθητε ὦικίαν ... (λέγετε) εἰρήνη (τῷ οἶκῳ τοῦτῳ). 163 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 δὲ, 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 εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν with several early witnesses, including P75, 8, and B, instead of οἰκίαν εἰσέρχησθε. 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 εἰρήνη σὺτῇ or σὺτῳ. 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. 164

3.1.39 Luke 10:19

4.24.9 – Quis nunc dabit potestatem calcandi super colubros et scorpios? 165 Or. 4.7.13 – tunc et scorpios et serpentes sanctis suis [the Creator God’s] subdidit,... 165

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

---

161 Praescribat is indicated as supplied by Braun (Contre Marcion IV, 306).
162 Ursinus’s note and Kroymann’s edition read dicerent.
163 Harnack, Marcion, 205*.
164 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.
165 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.
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


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 θης 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 P45 and the 10th century minuscule 27*.169 Gregory, following Klijn, rightly notes “although the omission of καὶ θῆς γῆς can be explained as the result of a particular Marcionite tendency, nevertheless this is not a

---

166 Tertullian’s Latin cannot reveal whether τῶν was present before ὅφτων as attested in P45, D, and a few other witnesses.
167 Moreschini’s text reads revelaveris with R2 and R3, rejecting revelaverit in M, γ, and R1.
169 Harnack, Marcion, 206*. Blackman, Marcion, 46 also saw a tendentious omission. Of course, Harnack did not have access to P45 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 P45. Williams simply writes “In X, 21 together with the Chester Beatty papyrus, P45, he [Marcion] omitted καὶ θῆς γῆς” (Alterations, 14).
necessary explanation.” 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. 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.

Fourth, the absence of *πατέρ* 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. Tsutsui rightly asks what tendency necessitated the deletion of *πατέρ*, and his question is particularly poignant because Harnack himself, based on the allusion in 4.25.3, believed that *πατέρ* was present in Marcion’s text in the final clause of Luke

---


171 *Gratias ago* (ὐχαριστῶ), 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 ὑχαριστῶ” (“Matthew 11:25 // Luke 10:21,” 9). In support of this view Klijn cites Plooij, 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 ἐξαμολογοῦμαι” (Further Study, 82). It should be noted that Plooij’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 ὑχαριστῶ καὶ was “der Deutlichkeit wegen hinzugesetzt,” presumably by Marcion (*Marcion*, 206*).

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

173 Ibid.

Therefore, the possibility must be entertained that if the word was absent it was not due to an excision by Marcion.

Fifth, Tsutsui notes that in Tertullian’s citation God is the subject of the “revealing” but not of the “hiding.” Harnack, who reconstructed the text as ὁ θεός ἄτινα ἠρωτήθη σοφοῖς καὶ σωματίσεις υπεφέρον ἐπεκάλυψεν, contended that this wording was a tendentious alteration. Tsutsui agrees, noting “Hier liegt wohl ein merkwürdiger Querschnitt der Gottes- bzw. der Erlösungslehre Marcions vor.” Braun, however, states that the statement ea quae … parvulis “paraît avoir été remodelée par le citateur [Tertullian].” Indeed, Harnack’s attempt to support this formulation and its passive voice by invoking Tertullian’s discussion of the passage is not persuasive. 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. 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. Interestingly, Tertullian then states Sed in destructionem, inquis, uti traduceret eas (4.25.6). Of course, one cannot be certain
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 Filii. | 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]184 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
notum nisi Filio adfirmat.185

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.186
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.187

184 Pamelius, Rigalti, Kroymann, and Evans viewed the elements in brackets as unoriginal
and arising from a copyist’s interpolation.

185 An additional allusion to Luke 10:22 occurs in 4.25.11.

186 Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 322n2. See also Zahn, Geschichte, 2:470.

187 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 aldaar worden weergegeven, want in den marcionitischen Bijbel
staat juist als in onze Bijbel’: οὐ δὲ ἔγνω τον πατέρα ἐμέ ὀ υἱὸς” (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 πατρός for Marcion’s text. 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, 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 καὶ at the outset is almost certainly a simple omission by Tertullian. Second, though Harnack reconstructed οὐδεις γινώσκει (ἐγνώ?), 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. Third, the inversion of “father” and “son” in Marcion’s text so that it read τις ἦστιν ὁ πατήρ ἐι μή ὁ υἱός καὶ τις ἦστιν ὁ υἱὸς ἐι μή ὁ πατήρ, an inversion also attested in numerous other manuscripts and church fathers, may be confirmed by Tertullian citing the Matthean/Lukan order in Praescrip. 21.2.

Finally, Harnack reconstructed Luke 10:22c καὶ ὁ ἐὰν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ. 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 Praescrip. 21.2 as well. The subjunctive ἀποκαλύψῃ is attested in several church fathers for Luke 10:22/Matt 11:27, and may have been

---

188 This is also Harnack’s reconstruction (Marcion, 206*).
189 IGNTP also lists certain Vulgate manuscripts, sy*, the Persian Diatessaron, and Eusebius as omitting the possessive pronoun.
190 Harnack placed the conjunction in parentheses (Marcion, 206*).
191 Ibid.
192 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).
193 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.
194 Harnack, Marcion, 206*.
195 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.\(^{196}\)

### 3.1.42 Luke 10:25

4.19.7 – ... *Ecce legis doctor adsurregexit 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:*...  | 4 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.\(^{197}\) Second, Harnack contended that, with D, Marcion’s text did not read διδάσκαλε at the outset of the question.\(^{198}\) 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 αἰώνιον, 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.\(^{199}\)

### 3.1.43 Luke 10:27

4.25.15 – ... *ut doctor de ea vita videatur consuluisse quae in lege promittitur a creator longaeva [aeterna], et dominus ideo illi secundum legem responsum dedisse: Diliges dominum 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

\(^{196}\) Nearly all witnesses read ἀποκαλύφθαι in Luke 10:22/Matt 11:27, though the OL manuscript a reads *revelavit.*

\(^{197}\) Harnack reconstructed νομικός (τις ἐκπειράζων αὐτῶν), but there is no good reason for suggesting the omission of ἠνάστη or the absence of καὶ ἰδοὺ at the outset of the verse.

\(^{198}\) Harnack, *Marcion,* 207*. d and the Arabic Diatessaron also attest the absence of the vocative.

\(^{199}\) 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] 15.8.9 – 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,…

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. Harnack combined the omission of αἰώνιον 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).” 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].” 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 text.

---

200 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.

201 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 Dn 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).

202 Harnack, Marcion, 207*. Zahn’s comments are found in Geschichte, 2:470–71.

203 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 ὀλῇ τῇ διανοιᾷ σου. 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*  

205 Iohannes discipulos suos docuit. | Or. 1.3

– *Docuerat et Iohannes discipulos suos adorare;… Ideo nec extat, in quae verba docuerit Iohannes adorare,…*  

206

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 ἐνσι. It is interesting that Harnack reconstructed the first two clearly attested elements of the verse as ἐν τῷ ποτῳ τινὶ προσευχόμενον and (ἐπίευ) τίς τῶν μαθητῶν (πρὸς οὐτόν), in neither case inverting the Greek word order according to Tertullian’s Latin. Given the extremely weak or nonexistent manuscript evidence for

---

204 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*).

205 R and Gelenius read *sicut* and *sicut et* was restored by Pamelius.

206 An additional reference to Christ teaching the disciples how to pray occurs in 4.36.2.

207 Placed by Harnack in parentheses (*Marcion*, 207*).
Tertullian’s order, Harnack was probably correct in these decisions, however, under the influence of Tertullian placing docuit at the end of the clause, Harnack placed ἐδιδαξέων at the very end of the verse, noting that this position is otherwise unattested. 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 IGNTP, 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 καθός καὶ or simply καθός, 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. 210

208 According to IGNTP, the order τινι τωσεσ is attested in several OL manuscripts and the 13th century minuscule 2766 and the order των μαθητών τις is otherwise unattested.

209 Harnack reconstructed the remainder of Luke 11:1 κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμῶς προσέχεσθαι, καθός καὶ ἑωράσως τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτοῦ ἐδιδαξέων (Marcion, 207*).

210 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?,” NedIT 44 (1990): 277–78.
Nevertheless, some insight can be gained from Tertullian’s questions. 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 P75, Σ, 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. 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, led Harnack to reconstruct Marcion’s text as (ἐλθάτω) το ἁγιον πνεῦμα (σου ἐφ’ ἡμῶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμῶς). Though some have followed Harnack in viewing this reading as that of Marcion, the four witnesses are 700, 162, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus. For the readings and discussion see Joel 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 primitive (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.


213 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, Delobel is right in noting that there are several reasons for questioning this reconstruction. 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. 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).” 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 στοιχεῖον τῆς σοφίας [ἐφήμισ] καὶ καθοριστῶ τῆς ἁπάντης 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,” SKFAW [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 epexegetical to the petition “Your kingdom come” and that therefore “Eine Veränderung anzunehmen, ist unnöthig” (Harnack, Adolf Harnack: Marcion: die Dortpater 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 [4th 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.1.),” 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.

Delobel references several commentators accepting this view (“Extra-Cannonic 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 prudentely stick to the elements which are actually present in Tertullian’s text” (“Lord’s Prayer,” 297–98n15; cf. idem, “Extra-Cannonic Sayings,” 111n12[cont.]).


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-Cannonic Sayings,” 110).

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.²¹⁹ The unfortunate reality, as Chase had already observed, is that “Tertullian gives no evidence as to the precise wording of the clause.”²²⁰

The opening to the third question contains a reference to both βασιλεία and the verb ἐρχομαι; therefore, Harnack reconstructed ἔλθατω ἡ βασιλεία σου.²²¹ 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 cottidianum? | Or. 6.2 – … panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie … petendo panem quotidianum … | Or. 6.4 – Merito autem adiecit: da nobis hodie,… ²²²

This petition is also attested by Origen. Tertullian’s question reflects ἂρτος ἐπισύσιος 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

²¹⁹ 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 ἁγιοθήτω 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 postulem: «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).

²²⁰ 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] formulirt 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.

²²¹ 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 ἐλθέτω as found in Σ and several other manuscripts, instead of ἔλθητος.

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._  

\{{\textit{Or. 7.1}}\} – *Docet itaque petamus dimitti nobis debita nostra._  
\{{\textit{Or. 7.2}}\} – *… quod remittere nos quoque profitemur debitoribus nostris._  
\{{\textit{Or. 8.1–3}}\} – *Ne nos inducas in temptationem, id est ne nos patiarius induci, ab eo utique qui temptat. Ceterum absit ut Dominus temptare videatur, quasi aut ignoret fidem cuiusque aut deicere.*  

_\{{\textit{Or. 8.6}}\} – Eo respondit clausula, interpretans quid sit: ne nos deducas in temptationem; hoc est enim: sed devehe nos a malo._  

\{{\textit{Pud. 2.10}}\} – *Debitoribus denique dimissuros nos in oratione profitemur,…*

The question alluding to Luke 11:4a refers to ἁμαρτία and the verb ἰημι. The other references by Tertullian to this petition in _Or._ 7.1, 2 and _Pud._ 2.10 all reflect the Matthean wording (*debitum* rendering ἰημι), 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 ἰημι τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἶμων), is generally acceptable, even if it would be slightly more accurate to also enclose ἶμων within parentheses or to omit the unattested elements entirely.\(^{223}\) 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 ἰημι ἰημι παντὶ ἰημι ἰημι. Nevertheless, the second half of the phrase is unattested and further speculation is unadvisable.

Tertullian’s final question concerning the Lord’s Prayer attests πειρασμός and a passive form of the verb ἐσφέρω. In addition, only in this final petition does Tertullian use the pronoun _nos._ Harnack believed that Marcion had tendentiously

\(^{223}\) Harnack, _Marcion_, 207*.
altered the passage to read (καὶ) μὴ ἀφεῖς ἡμᾶς εἰσενεχθῆναι εἰς πειρασμόν.\(^{224}\) This reading has often been cited for Marcion’s text,\(^{225}\) but Schmid has recently questioned this view.\(^{226}\) 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.\(^{227}\) 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.\(^{228}\) 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.\(^{229}\)

\(^{224}\) 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).


\(^{226}\) 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.

\(^{227}\) Ibid., 143.

\(^{228}\) 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 patriis induci ab eo’; in the *de Fuga* it is ‘ne nos induceris … 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 Plooij, *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], 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.

\(^{229}\) Schmid, “How Can We Access?,” 144.
3.1.48 Luke 11:5

4.26.8 – Sic et praemissa similitudo nocturnum panis petitorem amicum facit, non alienum, et ad amicum pulsanten, non ad ignotum. ad eum pulsat ad quem ius illi erat, cuius ianuam norat, quem habere planes sciebat. 14.26.9 – sero pulsatur. 1 Or. 6.3 – Sed et nocturnes ille pulsator panem pulsabat. 1 Praescr. 11.5 – Panem vicinus non habebat et ideo pulsabat: ubi apertum est ei et accepit, pulsare cessavit. 1 Praescr. 12.3 – … etiam pulsator ille vicini ianuam tundebat. …

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


230 Moreschini’s text reads petit with R3 (paralleling the perfect tense of quaesivit and pulsavit), rejecting petit in M, γ, R1, and R2.

231 Additional allusions to Luke 11:9/Matt 7:7 occur throughout De praescriptione haereticorum: petite et accipietis (8.11), quaerete et invenietis (8.2, 4, 15; 9.1, 6; 10.7, 9; 43.2), and pulsate et aperietur 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.\(^{232}\) 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 οἶτείτε, ζητείτε, and κρούετε.\(^{233}\) The situation is different, however, for the second verb in each element. Only invenire (attesting εὑρίσκω) 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 εὑρήσετε or εὑρήσεται.\(^{234}\) That the counterpart to κρούεΤε was ἄνοιξεται\(^{235}\) also appears established, not only because the manuscript tradition here attests no lemma other than ἄνοιξις, but also because admirere in 4.26.6 is rather obviously Tertullian’s own word.\(^{236}\) The counterpart to οἶτείτε 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 IGNTP 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.\(^{237}\)

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 ortygometram, non serpentem pro pisce nec scorpium pro ovo…. Ita et spiritum sanctum is dabit … | Or. 6.3 – … Numquid filio panem poscenti lapidem tradit?

\(^{232}\) See Harnack, *Marcion*, 208*.

\(^{233}\) 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.”

\(^{234}\) Numerous witnesses, including  and D, read the latter.

\(^{235}\) The form could also be ἄνοιξεται as in D and numerous other witnesses.

\(^{236}\) Aperire is used in all of Tertullian’s other citations and allusions.

\(^{237}\) 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\(^{d}\) and sy\(^{e}\) 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, 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 δῶσει πνεῦμα ᾠγίου.

3.1.51 Luke 11:15

4.26.11 – ... in Belzebule dictus eicere daemonia:...  14.28.2 – ... 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 ... 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). 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 ἀρχων τῶν δαιμονίων in both references perhaps reveals that the descriptor is not important for him.

3.1.52 Luke 11:21-22

4.26.12 – Merito igitur adplicuit ad parabolam fortis illius armati, quem validior alius oppressit,…  15.6.7 – Etiam parabola fortis illius armati, quem alius validior oppressit et vasa eius occupavit,…

---

238 It should be noted, however, that the Matthean reading also appears in numerous manuscripts of Luke.

239 In the interaction with Luke 11:14–22, the manuscripts and editions of Tertullian offer variant spellings of Beelzebul. Moreschini 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.

240 On the spelling of Beelzebul, see n. 239.

241 The reading in Matt 9:34 is much closer to Luke 11:15.

242 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 *illus* 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 ἴσχυρός καθωπλισμένος (v. 21) and ἴσχυρότερος … νικήσει [νικήσει is attested in several manuscripts, but is less likely] (v. 22).243

### 3.1.53 Luke 11:27–28


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 κολία ἡ βαστάσασα σὲ καὶ μαστοί ὦς ἐθήλασσας).244

Harnack believed Tertullian’s testimony to reveal two specific readings in v. 28: (1) ἀκούωντες after τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ instead of before it and (2) ποιοῦντες instead of φυλάσσοντες.245 The first reading is suspect because in *Carn. Chr. 7.13*

---

243 Though Harnack, *Marcion*, 209* cited Tertullian’s allusions to these verses he provided no reconstruction of them.

244 Harnack offered the same reconstruction, though placing ὦς ἐθήλασσας 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.

245 Harnack, *Marcion*, 209*. Plooij, *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.  

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 οὗ δοθῆσται. 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 abstru<d>endam, 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 constituui 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. 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

---

246 In *Carn.* Chr. 7.13 Tertullian makes no reference to the second element.  
247 Harnack, *Marcion*, 209*. It is not entirely clear why Harnack included the unattested ὑπὸ τοῦ μόδιου in his reconstruction, but not the attested ἐπί 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 intellegetis [Isa 7:9]—, neque alios admittebant:… 4.28.2 – … qua 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.248 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.249 Finally, sineret in 4.28.2 may well have arisen from the parallel in Matt 23:13.

248 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]).

249 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 dinosceretur,...\textsuperscript{250} | Paen. 6.10 – Nihil occultum quod non revelabitur:... | Virg. 14.3 – ... Nihil occultum quod non revelabitur,...

Harnack reconstructed this verse οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον, ὁ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ οὐδὲν κρυπτόν, ὁ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.\textsuperscript{251} This reconstruction follows the text of NA\textsuperscript{27} with two exceptions. First, ἐστίν after συγκεκαλυμμένον has been omitted.\textsuperscript{252} 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 ἐστίν appears in the text, and yet Tertullian does not offer it in either of his other two citations.\textsuperscript{253} 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.\textsuperscript{254}

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

\textsuperscript{250} Moreschini’s text reads dinosceretur with Rhenanus’s editions, rejecting dinosceretur in M and Υ.

\textsuperscript{251} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 211*.

\textsuperscript{252} IGNTP lists a few manuscripts that attest ἐστίν before συγκεκαλυμμένον. In addition, a variant spelling συγκεκαλυμμένον is attested in P\textsuperscript{75}, D, W, Θ, and 2766, whereas κεκαλυμμένον is attested in P\textsuperscript{46}, Θ, C*, and 1241. For this reason the precise rendering of opertum is uncertain.

\textsuperscript{253} Though Harnack believed the textual tradition to unanimously include ἐστίν in Luke, IGNTP lists two minuscules, one lectionary, and Hilary as omitting it, along with Tertullian and Marcion. In any case, the evidence is scant.

\textsuperscript{254} According to IGNTP, numerous OL manuscripts, and manuscripts of other ancient versions, attest οὐδὲ instead of καί. 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 \textit{et nihil} to be listed as evidence for the same Greek reading.
presence of κηρυχοθήσαται, 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 ἔλαλησατε) than offered in the general audire in Praescr. 26.2.255


4.28.3 – Deinde conversus ad discipulos: Dico autem, inquit, vobis amicis, nolite terreri 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 habeat256 mittendi in gehennam—creatorem utique significans—; ita<que>257 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 praecepit eum potius timendum, qui et corpus et animam occidat in gehennam,… non qui corpus occidunt, animae autem nihil nocere possint,… | Scorp. 9.6 – … non eos timendos, qui solum corpus occidunt, 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 relatus est cum corpore et anima occidendus in gehenna?258

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 ύμῖν τοῖς φίλοις (Luke

255 Plooij, Further Study, 82 argued that mussitarent was rendering a different text than that found in any general tradition and that the in apertum reflects the same reading behind the Liége Diatessaron’s oppenbare. 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.

256 Moreschini’s text reads the subjunctive habeat against the indicative habet in X, Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.

257 R₂ and R₃ read itaque, whereas R₁, M, γ, and Latinius’s note read ita.

258 Additional allusions to Luke 12:4–5 occur in 4.28.5 and An. 13.3.
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. Tsutsui, however, rightly responds “ob ‘μου’ hier steht oder fehlt, die Anrede verändert sich inhaltlich nicht.” 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 η φοβηθήτε από τῶν ὑμῶν μόνον ἀποκτένευν δυνάμενων καὶ μετά τοῦτα μηδεμίῳ εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐχόντων ἐξουσίαν. 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. 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. It is possible,

259 Harnack’s placement of ὑμῖν in parentheses with a question mark is due to Epiphanius’s testimony (Marcion, 211*).
260 Ibid. This comment was an addition to the second edition. In Marcion¹, 193* Harnack did not question the presence of μου.
261 Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 102. According to IGNTP, μου is omitted in X, 131, 213, and 1242*.
262 Harnack, Marcion, 211*.
263 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.
264 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 φοβηθῆτε. Most of the remainder of the verse does not present significant challenges, though it is worth noting that Tertullian attests the order ἐξοσιάζων ἔχοντα and could be attesting βαλεῖν, found in P⁴⁵, W, and a few other witnesses, instead of ἔμβαλεῖν. 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 desequentibus sumere: Dico enim vobis, omnis qui confitebitur <in> me²⁶⁵ coram hominibus, confitebor in illo coram deo…. Et omnis qui negavit me coram hominibus, denegabitur coram deo,… | Cor. 11.5 – … Jesus negaturus ommem 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 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

²⁶⁵ R₃ reads in me, whereas R₁, R₂, M, and γ read me.
fuerit coram hominibus in caelis, et ego in illo confitebor coram patre meo, qui in caelis est.\textsuperscript{266} 

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 δὲ with γὰρ because he had omitted vv. 6–7.\textsuperscript{267} 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.\textsuperscript{268} 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 μὲ und ἐν σωτῷ ist beabsichtigt” cannot be accepted.\textsuperscript{269} Second, Harnack reconstructed πῶς ὡς ὁμολογησει, which certainly is possible.\textsuperscript{270} 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.\textsuperscript{271} 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.\textsuperscript{272} Apart from the fact that there is no other manuscript evidence for ἐνώπιον

---


\textsuperscript{267} Harnack, Marcion, 212*. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 103 makes the same point.

\textsuperscript{268} Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 359n4.

\textsuperscript{269} Harnack, Marcion, 212*.

\textsuperscript{270} A, B*, D, Γ, Δ, and numerous minuscules read the future active indicative of Matt 10:32 instead of the Lukan aorist active subjunctive.

\textsuperscript{271} Harnack, Marcion, 212*.

\textsuperscript{272} 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 ἐμπροσθεν.273 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 ὀμολογήσω does not actually reflect Marcion’s text, but Tertullian’s proclivities.274 Finally, Tertullian does not attest τῶν ἀγγέλων at the end of v. 8.275 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 ὁ ἡρνήσατο με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.276 First, Harnack noted that καὶ instead of δέ, and πᾶς ὁ ἡρνήσατο instead of ὁ ἀρνησάμενος are otherwise unattested. Even if *et* attests καὶ 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.277 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.

---

273 Tischendorf, von Soden, and *NA*27 attest no manuscript variation for the preposition in Matt 10:32.

274 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 ὀμολογήσας κἀγὼ.

275 Tischendorf, von Soden, and *NA*27 indicate that *K* also omits these words; however, IGNTP indicates that τῶν ἀγγέλων was present and wrongly states that τοῦ θεοῦ was omitted by the corrector.

276 Harnack, *Marcion, 212*.

277 In addition, it is worth noting that the entire OL manuscript tradition offers qui … *negaverit* (*abnegaverit* in *r*) 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 \textit{coram} is rendering ε\nu\omega\pi\iota\nu or έ\mu\pi\rho\omega\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu in Luke 12:8 also occurs in 12:9.\footnote{Both prepositions are attested in both occurrences in the Greek manuscript tradition.}

\textbf{3.1.61 Luke 12:10}

4.28.6 – … \textit{Qui dixerit in filium hominis, remittetur illi, qui autem}\footnote{Some disagreement exists among the manuscripts and editors of Tertullian as Rigalti, Oehler, Kroymann, and Evans read \textit{qui autem} but θ, Gelenius, and Pamelius read \textit{autem qui}.} \textit{dixerit in spiritum sanctum, non remittetur ei.} \textit{| 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,\footnote{Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 212*.} 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 \textit{in futuro aev\iota} in Tertullian’s work against Marcion, which Tertullian highlighted in \textit{Pud. 13.19}.\footnote{According to IGNTP this Matthean element is found in D, c, d, e, 827 and some Ethiopic manuscripts.} 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 (καί) ὅς ἄν εἰπη εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἄνθρωπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὅς δ’ ἄν εἰπη εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιον, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.\footnote{Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 212*–13*.} 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 \textit{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, \textit{dixerit} is likely a future perfect indicative, which Harnack understood as rendering a Greek aorist subjunctive (εἰπη). IGNTP, however,
interprets the OL manuscripts in which it appears as rendering a Greek future. Further complicating the issue is that Matt 12:32 twice reads ὅς εἶπεν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἔριον, and D, in the first occurrence in Luke 12:10, reads ὅς ἡμεῖς ἐπίθεον. 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 ἐπὶ τοῦ, 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 τῷ πνεύμα τῷ ἁγίῳ instead of τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύμα, though Tertullian’s own proclivity of altering the word order must also be taken into account. Finally, though συντρω 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.


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.

---

283 IGNTP lists only Marcion, Athanasius, and 170 as attesting ἐπὶ τοῦ. It should be noted, however, that the IGNTP apparatus for this verse is problematic. It views a, c, d, r', and e (all reading dixerit) as attesting ἐπὶ at the beginning of the verse and for the second occurrence sees b, ff', i, q, r', and e (again all reading dixerit) as attesting ἔρουντι (instead of τῷ ἁλοσφημήσοντι). IGNTP lists these OL manuscripts, in the latter instance, as attesting ἔρουντι λόγου, 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 παραβολὴν and [τινὸς implied] πλούσιον. 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. Even if this suggestion is correct, the precise wording remains elusive. Based on the citation of v. 20 Harnack reconstructed εἴπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός· ἀφρων, ταῦτῃ τῇ νυκτί τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν (ἀπὸ σοῦ)· ἀ δὲ ἥτοιμασάς, τίνος ἡσταί; Tertullian provides a nearly verbatim rendering of the Greek text, here identical in the Majority Text and NA, though a few points warrant mention. First, the omission of δέ is almost certainly due to Tertullian. Second, his use of a future (reposcent) once again is attributable to his citation habit and therefore does not necessitate a future in Marcion’s text. 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, τίνος 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, ... | 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 corrurum 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,

---

284 In v. 19 the rich man addresses his own soul telling it ἔχεις πολλὰ ἄγαθα κείμενα εἰς ἐπὶ πολλὰ· ἀναπαύσῃ, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου. It would also make sense contextually for Tertullian to be referring to this statement right before citing God’s response.

285 Harnack, Marcion, 213*.

286 Thus, IGNTP questionably lists Marcion along with gat and Irenaeus as reading ἀπαιτήσουσιν.
Though this observation is correct, some insight into Maricon’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). Second, Tertullian’s allusion to the words σπείροσιν and θερίζουσιν is unproblematic. 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 θεός τρέφει σῶτούς. 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, 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 floscolo 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


288 Only a few witnesses, though they include D and a handful of OL manuscripts, attest the Matthean τὸ πέτειν ὑπὸ οὐρανοῦ in Luke 12:24.

289 The negation of the action by Tertullian (non … *nec*) does not definitively reveal whether the Greek read οὐ … ὁδεῖ (with P45, P55, A, B, W, and most other manuscripts) or οὐτὲ … οὐτὲ (with Θ, D, L, Q, 579, 892, and e).

reading in Marcion’s Gospel is confirmed by these verbs also appearing in D, d, Clement of Alexandria, sy, and syc. Harnack believed that Marcion’s text read οὐχ ὑφαίνει οὔτε ἥθει, though the fact that these other witnesses attest οὔτε ἥθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει may mean that the slightly different phrasing, possibly under the influence of 12:24 and ήθει 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.”

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 (ἐὰν δὲ ἔν 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.

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 ὀλίγοπιστοὶ 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.

---

292 Harnack, Marcion, 214*.
293 Ibid.
294 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. Third, the absence of *dei* in *Or. 6.1*, possibly under the influence of Matt 6:33, increases the likelihood of the reading βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ in Marcion’s text. 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.* 14.29.16 – *... 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. Even though D, b, d, and syκ 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. Also, Harnack offered καὶ τὸ δίκαιον οὐκ ἀφ᾽ ἐσωτήρν τίκνετε for Marcion’s text, noting “die Wortstellung sonst: ἀφ᾽ ἐσωτήρν τίκνετε τὸ δίκαιον.” Tertullian, however, always places the reference to that which is “just” before the

---

295 Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:476 and Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, 2:427 also viewed *enim* as part of Tertullian’s argument. The Moreschini/Braun text has *enim* in italics, indicating that they consider it part of the citation (*Contre Marcion IV*, 370–71).

296 NA27 places τοῦ θεοῦ in brackets in Matt 6:33.

297 This reading is also attested by P45, A, D4, many OL manuscripts, along with numerous other manuscripts (see NA27).


299 Thus, Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:477 correctly noted that it is unclear whether τί δέ was present or absent.

300 Harnack, *Marcion*, 217*. 
verb (cf. 4.29.16 and Cor. 4.5). Thus, Harnack’s inversion of the elements in the allusion to Marcion’s text is questionable.


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 artheros.*

Part of Luke 12:58 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian’s testimony to v. 58 attests κρίτης and the words βολεῖ εἰς φυλακήν. For v. 59 Tertullian attests οὐ μὴ ἔξελθῃ ἐκεῖθεν ἔως καί and the Matthean τοῦ 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); however, Tertullian’s proclivity to Matthew’s reading may once again be the reason for the phrasing here (cf. An. 35.1).

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.* | 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 κλαυθμός καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὁδόντων. 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

---

301 According to IGNTP Hillary is the only other witness for a change of order to τὸ δίκαιον κρίνετε.

302 D also reads the irregular form of the subjunctive (ἀποδοῖς).

303 This is another instance where Harnack did not follow Tertullian’s word order as he reconstructed τοῦ ἔσχατον κοδράντην ἀποδῶς (Marcion, 217*).

304 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. The remainder of the verse is not multiply cited, and Tertullian’s adaptation reflects the reading ὄψεσθε τοὺς δικαίους εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ κρατουμένους ἐξε. There are several readings here worth discussing. First, ὄψεσθε is the reading of B*, D, and numerous other manuscripts. Second, τοὺς δικαίους instead of Ἄβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας is a unique reading. Third, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν 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 a², c, ff², 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?”] … qui scilicet [et] humanitatis 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. 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. Tertullian’s allusion to 14:14b reflects the universally attested ἐν τῇ ἁναστάσει. 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

---

305 Every occurrence of the phrase ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυχμὸς 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.

306 R₂ and R₃ read humanitatis, whereas R₁, M, and γ read et humanitatis.

307 Harnack, Marcion, 218*.

308 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 inventit qui quaesivit, is exultavit qui inventit. 4.32.2 – utriusque parabolae … Atque adeo exultare illius est de paenitentia peccatoris, id est de perditi recuperatione,… \Pud. 9.4 – Et duo utique filii illuc spectabunt, quo et drachma et ovis \Pud. 9.20 – … ovem et drachmam …

In 4.32 Tertullian alludes to the two parables found in Luke 15:3–10. 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 συγχάρω (vv. 6, 9). In addition there is a reference to the idea of χαρά … ἐπὶ … άμαρτωλῷ 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. 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 amiciarum … Et ego, inquit, dico vobis, facite vobis amicos de mamonae iniustitiae,… \Fug. 13.2 – Facite autem vobis amicos de mamonae: quomodo intellegendum sit,… \Pat. 7.10 – Quomodo amicos de mamonae 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 ἔγω λέγω ύμίν, ποιήσατε ύμίν φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἄδικίας. 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

---

309 On the structure and argument of 4.32 see the comments in Braun, \Contre Marcion IV, 398–99n3.

310 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.

311 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 ύμίν, 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. In addition to the question regarding the position of the second pronoun, Harnack himself observed that this ύμίν is “nicht sicher.” Given that Tertullian writes vobis in Fug. 13.2 and nobis in Pat. 7.10 it seems more likely that Tertullian is rendering ἐσυντοίς with datives whose person is being governed by the main verb.

3.1.72 Luke 16:13


This verse is also attested in Adam. According to 4.33.1, the opening of the verse had some negation of the idea δύνασται δυσί 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)

312 IGNTP lists D, M, several minuscules, several OL manuscripts, numerous versions, and Hilary as attesting this order.

313 NA follows P, 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.

314 Harnack, Marcion, 220.

315 Additionally, all OL witnesses read facite vobis here and IGNTP lists 1215 and 1295 as the only Greek manuscripts attesting ύμίν instead of ἐσυντοίς (230, 348, 477, 1216, and 1579 apparently have both pronouns).

316 Moreschini’s text reads quia with Rhenanus’ editions, rejecting the reading qui in M and Y.

317 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 οὐκέτας 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 ἥνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἔτερον ἀγαπήσει was omitted by chance.318 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 ἔνος γὰρ (καταφρονήσει) καὶ τοῦ ἔτερου ἀνθέξεται· οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δούλεύτων καὶ μαμωνᾷ, though again wondering if ἡ was really missing and whether Marcion had a word other than καταφρονήσει.319

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,”320 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.321 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 Iohannem 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 … |322

318 Harnack, Marcion, 220*.
319 Ibid.
320 Ibid.
321 Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 401n3.
322 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.\(^{323}\) Harnack reconstructed ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφήται ἔως Ἰωάννου, though whether Marcion’s text read ἔως or μέχρι cannot definitively be determined from Tertullian’s Latin alone.\(^{324}\) 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.\(^{325}\) 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.\(^{326}\)

3.1.74 Luke 16:22

3.24.1 – … apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium. | 14.34.10 – … 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 πτωχὸς and to ἐἰς τὸν κόλπον

---


\(^{324}\) 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 ἔως occurs where aur, b, d, f, ff, h, l, and q render it usque ad and a, c, ff, and g render it usque in (k reads quomodo in).

\(^{325}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 220*, IGNTP states that Marcion, along with a, b, c, d, ff, gat, i, l, r, Ambrosiaster, and Rufinus attest ἐξ ὁποιαν. Though quo could be understood in this way, the meaning in context seems to make Harnack’s ἐξ οὗ preferable.

\(^{326}\) 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 κηρύσσει/εὐαγγελίζεται (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.
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,… | 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.329 Noteworthy, however, is the presence of illicit, 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,…

---

327 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.

328 Moreschini’s text follows the order illos audiant attested in M and Kroymann’s edition, rejecting the reading audiant illos in β and the other editors. This latter reading may have been influenced by the word order in the canonical text.

329 Harnack, Marcion, 222*. 
Tertullian’s allusion to Luke 17:4 in 4.35.3 attests ... ἐὰν ἐπτάκις ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ and ὀφθάλμις. 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 descript, Pharisaenum 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, iustificator pharisaeo procacissimo discersit.

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. 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.

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. | Or. 14.36.7 – ... Vende, inquit, quae habes ... Et da, inquit, egenis ... Et veni, inquit, sequere me. | Idol. 12.2 – ... atquin omnia vendenda sunt et egentibus dividenda. An allusion to Luke 18:22 also occurs in 4.36.6.

---

330 Harnack’s reconstruction ... (ἐὰν) ἐπτάκις ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ, ὀφθάλμις ... once again could cause confusion by implying that the phrase appeared in this manner in Luke 17:4.

331 Harnack, Marcion, 225*.

332 For example, Harnack reconstructed the opening of v. 10 as ὀφθάλμωσιν δύο. However, D, every OL manuscript except e, and several of the versions attest the order δύο ὀφθάλμωσιν. Tertullian’s testimony cannot reveal which reading was in Marcion’s text.

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. Once again, the opening words are not multiply attested in Tertullian, and it would be tenuous to assume the absence of εἰς 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 (δίσφοδωμι) rather than a Matthean one. The closing elements of the verse are also not multiply attested, though it may preliminarily be noted that Tertullian attests εὖ φορανοῦ, the reading of W, Θ, Ψ, 078, f1, f13, 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,* 4.36. *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

---

334 Harnack wrote ἐν σοι λείπει κτλ. From the apparatus it is apparent that Harnack primarily had the text of *Adam*, in view (*Marcion*, 226*).

335 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 δισφοδωμι appears in the Synoptic Gospels.

336 Mei, possibly on account of a scribal error, is omitted in *M*. 
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Tertullian renders the generally attested text ἵσσο, υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με. In 4.37.1, however, Tertullian renders a word order closer to Matt 20:30 ἐλέησόν με, ἵσσο, υἱὲ Δαυίδ.337 This observation increases the likelihood that the former citation is controlled by Marcion’s reading. In addition, the presence of ἵσσο, 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 filius David.

3.1.80 Luke 18:42

4.36.10 – … Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit. | 4.36.12 – … Fides tua te salvum fecit. | Bap. 12.8 – Fides tua te, aiebat, salvum fecit … | Praescr. 14.3 – Fides, inquit, tua te salvum fecit,… 338

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 σοι 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.339

3.1.81 Luke 19:10

4.37.2 – Cum vero dicit: Venit enim filius hominis salvum facere quod periit,… 340 | Pud. 9.12 – Venerat Dominus utique, ut quod perierat salvum faceret,… | Res. 9.4 – … Ego, inquit, veni, ut quod periiit salvum faciam;… | Res. 34.1 – In primis cum ad hoc venisse se dicit, ut quod periiit salvum faciat,… 341

337 In Matt 20:30 there are two blind men crying out and the text states ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς [κύριε,] υἱὸς Δαυίδ. According to IGNTP a Catenae in evangelia Lucae et Ioannis, Augustine, Origen, and Rufinus attest the reading ἵσσο, ἐλέησόν με, υἱὲ Δαυίδ, in Luke 18:38.


339 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.

340 Moreschini’s text reads periiit, and simply notes the reading perit, presumably created by a copy error, in M.

Tertullian’s citation of this verse attests ἔλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός for Marcion’s text, which is also Harnack’s reconstruction. The only problematic element involves the omission of ζητήσας καὶ before σώσαι. 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. 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, ζητήσας is also missing. 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 baptisma Iohannis unde esset. Et cur quasi nesciens interrogabat? Sciebat non responsuros sibi Pharisaeos…. Puta illos renuntiasse humanum Iohannis baptismas:…. 14.38.2 – Sed de caelis fuit baptismis Iohannis. l Bapt. 10.1 – Baptismus a Iohanne denuntiatus iam tunc habuit quaestionem ab ipso quidem domino propositam ad pharisaeos caelestisne is baptismus esset an vero terrenus,…

For Luke 20:4 Harnack reconstructed τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ ἱωάννου. Though the second τὸ is attested in Θ, 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 ἔξω υἱῶν and ἔξω υἱῶν, 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 ἔξω υἱῶν given the same use of the plural in Bapt.

---

342 Harnack, Marcion, 227*.
344 According to the NA27 apparatus these manuscripts include D, L, W, Θ, 078vid., the Majority Text, nearly all OL manuscripts, syc, p, b, and boφ. In Luke 19:10 IGNTP lists 1187, 2757, and Ambrose as omitting the phrase.
345 Harnack, Marcion, 228*. 
Finally, *Bapt.* 10.1 reveals the same curious reference found in 4.38.1 that the Pharisees asked this question (v. 1). Therefore, it is unlikely that Marcion’s text read an otherwise unattested ὠ Φαρισαῖοι, as posited by Harnack, and rather more likely that the reference to *Pharisaeos* is due to Tertullian.

### 3.1.83 Luke 20:25


Harnack reconstructed this verse ἀπόδοτε τὰ Κάσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ. 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.

346 Though the parallels in Matt 21:25/Mark 11:30 also read the singular ἵ ὀυρανοῦ, 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).”

347 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.”

348 Harnack, *Marcion*, 228*.


350 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.

351 In the Majority Text τοῖς follows ἀπόδοτε whereas in NA 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)\textsuperscript{352} cur non et deus meus veram substantiam hominum angelis accommodarit unde sumptam? \textit{14.38.5} – … quos vero dignatus sit deus illius aevi possessione et resurrectione a mortuis neque nubere neque nubi, quia nec morituri iam sint, cum similes angelorum sint dei.\textsuperscript{353} resurrectionis filii facti.\textsuperscript{354} \textit{14.38.7} – Nacti enim scripturae textum ita in legendo decucurrerunt: Quos autem dignatus est deus illius aevi, <ut illius aevi> deo adiungant;\textsuperscript{355} quo alium deum faciant illius aevi, cum sic legi oportet: Quos autem dignatus est deus, ut Recta hic distinctione post deum ad sequentia pertineat illius aevi, id est: Quos dignatus sit deus illius aevi possessione et resurrectione. \textit{14.38.8} – filii huius aevi nubunt et nubuntur … quos deus illius aevi, alter scilicet, dignatus sit resurrectione, … \textit{14.39.11} – … quia nec morientur in illo, nec nubent, sed erunt sicut angeli. \textit{15.10.14} – … erimus enim sicut angeli. \textit{1 Mon. 10.5} – Si autem in illo aevi neque nubent neque nubentur, sed erunt aequales angelis, … \textit{1 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, … \textit{1 Res. 62.1} – Sed huic disceptationi finem dominica pronuntiatio imponet: Erunt, inquit, tanquam angeli, si non nubendo, quia nec moriendo, … \textit{1 Res. 62.4} –

\textsuperscript{352} Moreschini rejects the addition of \textit{dei} after \textit{angeli} attested only in \textit{X}.

\textsuperscript{353} The main text and apparatus in the SC edition are problematic, and apparently erroneous, on two accounts. The text reads … \textit{quia nec morituri iam sint, cum similes angelorum sunt dei,} … and the apparatus provides data for the variant reading \textit{fiant} for \textit{sint}. The problem, however, is that the variant occurs not at \textit{morituri iam sint} (the only occurrence of \textit{sint} in the SC text), but at \textit{sint dei}, which for some reason, and apparently without manuscript attestation, here reads \textit{sunt dei}. For the correct text and variant see the apparatus in Moreschini’s text found in his \textit{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 \textit{sint} [actually before \textit{dei}] is found in M, \textit{γ}, Rigalti, and Kroymann and \textit{fiant} [again before \textit{dei}] in R, Gelenius, Pamelius, Oehler, and Evans.

\textsuperscript{354} Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read \textit{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.”

\textsuperscript{355} There are several text critical issues here. \textit{illius aevi} is read twice in R\textsubscript{1} and all editors attest \textit{illius aevi} twice, but it is attested only once in M, \textit{γ}, R\textsubscript{1}, and R\textsubscript{2}. \textit{adiungant} is the reading of M and Kroymann, whereas \textit{γ}, R\textsubscript{1}, and R\textsubscript{2} attest \textit{adiungat}. Rhenanus, followed by the other editors, amended the text to \textit{adiungunt} in his third edition. Kroymann added \textit{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 \textit{ut} entre les deux \textit{illius aevi} … Le parallélisme \textit{ita in legendo} … \textit{ut} signifie … ut garantit que telle était la structure de la phrase à l’origine” (\textit{Contre Marcion IV}, 470n3).
Denique non dixit: Erunt angeli, ne homines negaret, sed tanquam angeli, ut homines conservaret:... 356

Tsutsui refers to v. 35a as “eine der unklarsten Stellen im Evangelium Marcions,”357 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 οὐς δὲ κατηχήσωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰώνος ἑκείνου τυχεῖν (καὶ;) τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν. 358 Braun and Tsutsui both note the key difficulty surrounding how possessione is to be understood in the sentence. 359 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. 360 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 δὲ 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 θεὸς to be an external subject. 361 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

356 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.

357 Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 120.

358 Harnack, Marcion, 229*.

359 Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 471n5 and Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 120.

360 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 possessione 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, possessione et resurrectione do strongly give the appearance of being two things of which some are considered worthy (see also nn. 362 and 363).

361 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.*

In Greek one could posit οὕς [δὲ] κατηθιζόμενον ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τῆς κληρονομίας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, 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. 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.

Harnack reconstructed Luke 20:36 as οὔτε γὰρ ἀπόθανεν ἔτι μέλλουσιν, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσίν ἦς καὶ οἱ εἰσίν, vormarcionitischer Defekt τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως οἱ (γεγονότες;). 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. 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 εἰσίν for

---

362 Interpreting dignari with an accusative object (quos) and two ablative of respect (possessione and resurrectione) along with an external subject (deus). The genitive phrase (illius aevi) is then taken either with deus or possessione.

363 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/κληρονομήσαι. 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, sy6, and sy5, the Arabic Diatessaron, and several other witnesses; however, Tertullian’s use of possessione seems to indicate that more than simply τοῦ ζῶνος ἐκείνου preceded καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως in Marcion’s text.

364 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.

365 ἐκαμίζω, ἐκκαμίζομαι, γαμίζω, and γαμίσκω are all attested in the Greek manuscript tradition.


367 D. Plooij 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 υἱὸι ἔσον was not present in Marcion’s text due to a pre-Marcion scribal error caused by homoteleuton.368 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 ὃντες.


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 ἐπηρωτήσαν αὐτῶν οἱ μαθηταί, explicitly stating that Marcion’s text read the Matthean οἱ μαθηταί with D, d, and geo.369 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 21.370 In addition, Harnack omits δὲ 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.

368 Harnack, Marcion, 229*. The phrase is also not in D, several OL manuscripts, and syς.
369 Harnack, Marcion, 230*.
370 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

Harnack reconstructed Luke 21:8 πολλοὶ ἔλευσονται ἐπὶ τῶ ὄνοματί (μου), λέγοντες· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός....

Several observations are in order. First, once again, given Tertullian’s habitual omission of conjunctions, it is not clear that γάρ after πολλοὶ was absent in Marcion’s text. 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 Ν, 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 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός, which is the reading of the parallel Matt 24:5. Harnack believed that Marcion’s text had been influenced by the text of Matthew, which is indeed possible. 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


371 Harnack, Marcion, 230*.

372 IGNTP lists only one manuscript of bo attesting the omission of γάρ. IGNTP goes on to state that Marcion’s text attested ἔλευσονται ψευδοπροφητεύει. It is a complete mystery to me on what basis this claim is made.

373 ὅτι is also not present in Matt 24:5.

374 Braun indicates his agreement with Harnack’s interpretation (Contre Marcion IV, 475n5). IGNTP lists several manuscripts, including 157, most of the OL manuscripts, sy, 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.\textsuperscript{375}

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.\textsuperscript{376} 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 ἐπὶ ἔθνος,\textsuperscript{377} and for v. 11 λοιμοί καὶ λιμοί σεισμοὶ τε, φόβητρα τε καὶ σημεῖα τὰ π’ οὐρανοῦ.\textsuperscript{378} Harnack rightly noted that the order λοιμοί καὶ λιμοί is attested by B, several OL manuscripts, and sy\textsuperscript{c}; 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.\textsuperscript{379} 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.


4.39.9 – … signa iam ultimi finis enarrat, solis et lunae siderumque prodigia, et in terra\textsuperscript{380} angustias nationum obstupescentium 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

\textsuperscript{375} An additional allusion to Luke 21:9 occurs in 4.39.17.

\textsuperscript{376} Harnack, Marcion, 230*.

\textsuperscript{377} Braun notes the use of super for contra based on the influence of ἐπὶ (Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 477n2). The OL manuscripts for Luke 21:10 offer contra (d, ff\textsuperscript{2}, i, q, r\textsuperscript{1}), adversus (f), and super (a, c, e). Even greater variation is found in the parallels in Matt 24:7 and Mark 13:8.

\textsuperscript{378} Harnack, Marcion, 230*.

\textsuperscript{379} 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.

\textsuperscript{380} Moreschini’s text follows the reading in terra of Gelenius and the other editors, rejecting inter in 8 and interim as inferred in R\textsubscript{2}. 161
nationum, cum stupore sonitus maris et motus refrigescensium 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 ος Ἡχους
θαλάσσης κυμαινουσης (Ἡχους θαλάσσης και σάλου in Luke) at the end of v. 25
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. 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 refrigescere, 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.


4.39.10 – Post haec quid dominus? Et tunc videbunt filium hominis venientem de
caelis cum plurima virtute. Cum autem haec fient, ergetis vos, et levabitis capita,
quoniam adpropinquabit 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.

381 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 κοκων (attested in
one lectionary witness, 1524), for example.
382 Ibid.
383 Moreschini rejects the reading adpropinquavit of Pamelian, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.
Tertullian attests Luke 21:27 as reconstructed by Harnack: καὶ τότε ὃψυται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς.\footnote{Harnack, Marcion, 231*.}

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.”\footnote{Ibid.}

Tsutsui connects the wording to that of the first appearance of Marcion’s Jesus in Luke 4:31.\footnote{Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 122.} 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.”\footnote{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.”}

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.\footnote{According to IGNTP no other witness attests this omission.}

At the same time, however, a simple omission by Tertullian is possible.\footnote{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.}

Several readings also merit attention in Luke 21:28. Harnack reconstructed τούτων δὲ γινομένων ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἔπαρσατε τὰς κεφαλὰς, διότι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.\footnote{Harnack, Marcion, 231*.} First, though Tertullian may simply be offering a loose translation of the Lukan opening ἐρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι,\footnote{Several OL manuscripts attest the reading τούτων δὲ γίνεσθαι ἐρχομένων, 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.} once again, 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
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 ὃμιλον after κεφαλός becomes slightly more likely for Marcion’s text because Tertullian includes it in Res. 22.6. Finally, though all the manuscripts of Tertullian’s works attest adpropinquabit, numerous editors of Tertullian’s works have posited adpropinquavit. Harnack stated “appropinquabit schwerlich richtig,” without any further explanation. Even though ἢγγικεν is attested in some manuscripts, it may be that this is another case where Tertullian is rendering the Greek verb in the present tense (ἐγείρει) with a Latin future, and therefore there is no need to posit an error in the manuscript tradition of Tertullian’s works.

3.1.90 Luke 21:31

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.” 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

392 The possessive pronoun is also omitted in D, d, and in one manuscript of the Georgian Version.

393 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.”

394 Harnack, Marcion, 231 *.

395 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).

396 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; 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 ἐγγὺς ἐστιν and thus more likely to arise from a text, the former is never here attested in any OL witnesses. 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*[^399] — *sic enim dominus eorum destinavit—, dum verbum eius maneit in aevum—sic enim et Esaias pronuntiavit.*

1. Herm. 34.1 – …

*caelum et terra praeteribunt, inquit;…*

This verse is confusingly reconstructed by Harnack ἦ (δῆ?) γῆ καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς παρελύσονται, ὁ δὲ λόγος μου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.[^400] 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.[^401] 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

[^397]: IGNTP lists numerous manuscripts with this harmonization including the OL manuscripts c, gat, and r along with Cyprian and other church fathers.

[^398]: See the data for this verse in the chart in Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess?,” (forthcoming).

[^399]: Moreschini’s text reads *caelum et terra* with M and Kroymann, rejecting *terra et caelum* read in β and the other editors.


[^401]: 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 παρελύσονται. 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.  

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.*  

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 παρῇ, which corresponds to Luke except for the absence of τοῦτο before τὸ πάσχα. 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*

---

402 Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 493n3 rightly notes that Tertullian made the same type of reference to Isa 40:8 in 4.33.9.  

403 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).  

404 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.\textsuperscript{405}

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.\textsuperscript{406} 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 ἐσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ, which is also the reconstruction of Harnack.\textsuperscript{407} Numerous manuscripts, including P\textsuperscript{75}, \textsuperscript{8}, A, B, D, and many OL manuscripts attest δὲ 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.


\textsuperscript{406} Harnack, Marcion, 233\textsuperscript{*}. IGNTP notes that Cyril in Contra Nestorium reads τοῖς μαθηταῖς and f reads τοῖς μαθηταῖς συντοῖ.

\textsuperscript{407} Harnack, Marcion, 234\textsuperscript{*}. ἔξ δεξιῶν in Harnack’s reconstruction is a typographical error.
3.1.95 Luke 23:44-45


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 ὤρα ἐκτιη. 4.42.5 also attests ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ for v. 45, though the precise conjunction and placement of it is not certain.408 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.409 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


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

408 Harnack reconstructed the opening of the verse as ἐσχίσθη [καί], though, as this reading is not attested in any manuscript and ἐσχίσθη δὲ is found in P75, 8, and several other manuscripts, it seems more likely to posit δὲ as the conjunction. The Majority Text does read καί, but it has it before ἐσχίσθη.

409 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 ὑπονόησεν.


4.43.6 – *cum haesitantibus eis ne phantasma esset, immo phantasma credentibus:* Quōd turbati estis? et quid cogitationes subeunt in corda vestra? Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ipse ego 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,...* Cur adicit: Et scitote quia ego sum,... Carn. Chr. 5.9 – *... fuit itaque phantasma etiam post resurrectionem, cum manus et pedes suos discipulis inspicientes 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 φαντασμός 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 τι τετραγμένοι ἔστε καὶ [διὰ] τι διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐἰς 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

---

410 This is also the reconstruction of Harnack, *Marcion,* 236*.

411 Moreschini does not add *inquit* after *estis* as do Pamellius, Rigalti, Oehler, Kroymann, and Evans.

412 Moreschini’s text reads *ipse ego* with M and Kroymann, and not the order *ego ipse* of B and the other editors.

413 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: \textit{quia ipse ego sum} or the variant \textit{quia ego ipse sum} (4.43.6); \textit{scitote quia ego sum} (4.43.8); and \textit{quod ego sum} (\textit{Carn. Chr.} 5.9).\textsuperscript{414} Greater insight into Marcion’s wording at this point requires the incorporation of the evidence from Epiphanius. Third, though Tertullian does not attest \textit{ψηλαφησαστε με καὶ ἰδέτε} for Marcion’s text, Tertullian also omits reference to this element in \textit{Carn. Chr.} 5.9. Finally, in both 4.43.6 and 7, Tertullian only makes reference to a spirit having bones, without referring to \textit{σάρξ} as well. Yet, once again, in the citation of v. 39 in \textit{Carn. Chr.} 5.9 Tertullian also only mentions the bones, indicating that it may be a simple omission on Tertullian’s part.

\textbf{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.

\textsuperscript{414} Tsutsui argues that \textit{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 “

\textit{κοὶ γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμί}”), 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, \textit{et scitote quia ego sum} appears to be Tertullian’s rephrasing of \textit{quia ipse ego sum}, not an addition at the end of v. 39 (see also Zahn, \textit{Geschichte}, 2:494 who recognized that \textit{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 \textit{ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι σάρξ} along with \textit{ψηλαφησαστε με καὶ ἰδέτε} (“Le chapitre 24 de Luc et l’origine de la tradition textuelle du \textit{Codex de Bèze} (D.05 du NT),” \textit{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

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 ἑτεὶ πεντακοιδεκάτῳ and Τίβεριον, with Τίβεριον Κοίσαρος attested in the allusion in 1.15.1.


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.
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. 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 πολλοί λεπροί ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ ἐν [ταῖς] ἡμέραις Ἑλισαιοῦ τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη ἐκ Ἕλενα 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: Νοζαρέθ (v. 16, Harnack reproduced most of the reading in D in parentheses); unus proverbium (probably the ἰατρεία τεσσαυτόν in v. 23); ἐξεβάλον αὐτόν and ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἔως τῆς ὀφρύος τοῦ ὑροῦ (v. 29); and διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο (v. 30).

---

2 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 évangelique d’avoir mis en premier un episode 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 (Le 4,16-30 en version abrégée aurait précédé Le 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.

3 D reads ἔλθων δὲ εἰς Νοζαρέθ ὅπου ἦν κατὰ τὸ εἰώθος ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνώσαι. Harris, positing that ὅ ἦν τεθραμμένος and κατὰ τὸ εἰώθος αὐτῶν 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 [5th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901], 119). Harnack contended “in D ist hier ein Teil des Textes M.s erhalten” (Marcion, 186*).

4 Lukas more forcefully states that these words are “certainly” those to which Tertullian refers (Rhetorik, 232).

5 For Harnack’s discussion see Marcion, 185*–86*.
4.1.3 Luke 4:31

4.7.1 – [Marcion] proponit eum⁶ descendisse in civitatem Galilaeae Capharnaum, utique de caelo creatoris,…. 4.7.2 – Nunc autem et reliquum ordinem descensionis expostulo, tenens descendisse illum. Viderit enim, sicuti ‘apparuisse’ posuit 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 Galilaem. 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.⁷ Tertullian’s testimony in 4.7.1 attests κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ πόλιν.⁸ κατήλθεν is attested numerous times, though interestingly Tertullian indicates that appareuisse (ἐφάνη) was elsewhere used to describe Jesus’ appearance. Harnack is probably correct when he posits that this term was used in the Antitheses.⁹ 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?).¹⁰ 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.”¹¹ Therefore, the de caelo

---

⁶ Moreschini’s text reads eum with all manuscripts and most editors, though Gelenius and Pamela read deum.


⁸ 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 Χριστὸς (cf. 1.15.6; 1.19.2).

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 77 and Harnack, Marcion, 183*.

¹¹ 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. Finally, in 4.7.5, 6, 7 Tertullian seems to reflect a text closer to that of Mark 1:21 (ἐῳσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἔδιδασκαν) than Luke 4:31 (.Logf διδάσκον αὐτοῦς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν); 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. 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, meas est. 4.8.5 – Ceterum et a daemoniis liberare curatio est valitudinis. Itaque spiritus nequam … cum testimonio excedebant vociferantes: Tu es filius dei. Cuius dei,… Sed proinde increpabantur et iubebantur tacere. Proinde enim Christus ab hominibus, non ab spiritibus inmundis, veletab 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. Yet, Tertullian makes reference to τὸς χειρὸς ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθερὰπευεν αὐτοῦς. That Tertullian drew his allusion from Marcion’s text may

12 See Tertullian’s argument in 3.23.7, referenced in 4.7.1.
13 Several additional references to the rebuke by Jesus occur in 4.7.14–15.
14 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.”
15 Numerous manuscripts read ἐπιτιθεὶς 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 κράζωντα· Σὺ εἰ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐπιτιμῶν ὁκ έἷς αὐτὰ λαλεῖν as a reconstruction for 4:41. His contention that ὁτι before σὺ was absent with “zahlreichen Lateinern” cannot be accepted with certainty as the entire phrase καὶ λέγοντα ὁτι is unattested by Tertullian. The final phrase of 4:41 is simply unattested, and therefore Zahn’s view that it was absent is questionable. 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


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. In 4.8.10 there is a reference to οἱ ὁχλοὶ … κατείχον αὐτῶν, which is largely unproblematic. Tertullian’s citation of Luke 4:43 in 4.8.10 presents a few challenges. Harnack reconstructed Δεὶ με καὶ ταῖς ἀλαίς (ἐτέραις?) πόλειν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. First, Harnack wrongly stated that δεἰ με is never clause initial, as this is precisely the position in

---

16 Harnack, *Marcion*, 187*. It is worth noting that Harnack reconstructed the plural *excedebant* with a singular. Several manuscripts attest the plural (including Ν, C, Θ, ψ, 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 g), P75, Ν, 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.

17 Harnack, *Marcion*, 187*. According to IGNTP, καὶ λέγοντα is almost uniformly attested in the manuscript tradition, and is present in all OL witnesses.


19 Harnack, *Marcion*, 187*. IGNTP states that the latter reading is attested by several witnesses including most OL manuscripts.

20 Harnack offered only the latter, apparently overlooking the reference to the crowd (*turbis*).


22 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.\(^{23}\) Second, though the reference to 
\textit{euaggeliosasqai} τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ is straightforward,\(^{24}\) deciphering 
\textit{et aliis civitatibus} is a bit more difficult. καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν is read almost uniformly in the manuscript tradition and is rendered 
\textit{et aliis civitatibus} in every OL manuscript reflecting this Greek text. D reads καὶ εἰς τῶς ἄλλας πόλεις, which corresponds to the reading 
\textit{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 ἐτέραις, or he is loosely rendering the reading of D, d, and e. If δεῖ μὲ was indeed clause initial then the latter may be more likely, though a definite conclusion is not possible.

\subsection*{4.1.7 Luke 5:2, 9–10}

4.9.1 – \textit{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 weniges bekannt.”\(^{25}\) 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).\(^{26}\) For Jesus’ words in v. 10 Tertullian attests, as Harnack reconstructed, μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ζωγρᾶν.\(^{27}\) 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

\(^{23}\) According to IGNTP δεῖ μὲ is attested by the remaining OL witnesses and numerous versions and church fathers before 
\textit{euaggeliosasqai}, and is attested after the verb in B, W, and 892.

\(^{24}\) 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.

\(^{25}\) Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 187*.

\(^{26}\) Harnack did not reconstruct ὁ ἄλλης in v. 2 and viewed Ἔμμα 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, ἐπὶ πέντε πρὸς τὸν Ἔμμα is also not reconstructed by Harnack, though Amphoux is probably correct to see \textit{dicens Petro} as a reference to this phrase (“Les premières éditions de Luc I. Le texte de Luc 5.” \textit{ETL} 67 [1991]: 322).

\(^{27}\) Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 188*. 
alternately to exclude, include, or add conjunctions, it may not have been present in Marcion’s text.  

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 ἀνήρ λεπρός with D (vir leprosus in d) in v. 12. Since Tertullian only refers to the cleansing leprosi, however, the Greek could just as easily have been ἀνήρ πληρής λέπρος. 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. The exact reading of Marcion’s text remains unknown. For v. 13, 4.9.4 attests ἴπσατο, 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 ἀπέλθε (though vade could also be rendering the imperatival sense of ἀπέλθων) δεῖξον τῷ ιερεί καὶ προσένεγκον τὸ δώρον ὃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, ἵνα ἦ ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον. The Matthean reading (καὶ … Μωϋσῆς in Matt 8:4), ἵνα ἦ, and ὑμῖν are all worth noting.

---

28 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 NA27) 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).
29 Harnack, Marcion, 188*.
30 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).
31 It is not clear why IGNTP states that Marcion apud Tertullian attests ἵνα ἦ εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν.
32 According to IGNTP these last elements, though in different orders, are attested in D, numerous OL manuscripts, and Ambrose. sy attests ἵνα ἦ 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,33 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 absolvit—, ut scandalo isto discuso 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.34 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.35 4.10.13 attests ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας,36 and 4.10.1 ἐγείρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου.37

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 ethnocis et publicanos, quos adlegebat,...

In the discussion of Luke 5:27–32, apart from the multiply cited v. 31, 4.11.1 has a reference to the τέλων 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 ethnocis in

33 Evans here adds in brackets “into the text of your gospel” (Adversus Marcionem, 2:299).
34 Tertullian’s simple reference to a paralyticus (cf. also 4.12.15) instead of to an ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἦν παραλείμμαθος (Luke 5:18) confirms the point made above concerning leprosus.
35 Tertullian explicitly states that this is the first occurrence of “Son of Man” in the Gospel (4.10.14).
36 IGNTP indicates that Athanasius also reads ἔχει ἐξουσίαν.
37 This is the reading of D, d, and ε⁴. Ψ 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. Its use may be due to Tertullian’s sarcastic statement that Marcion nusquam legerat lumen et spem et spectationem nationum praedicari Christum (4.11.1).


4.11.4 – Unde autem et Iohannes venit in medium? Subito Christus, subito et Iohannes. 14.11.5 – ... si non etiam ipsum inter ceteros tinxisset, nemo discipulos Christi manducantes et bibentes ad formam discipulorum Iohannis adsidus ieiunantium et orantium provocasset,... 14.11.6 – At nunc humiliter reddens rationem quod non possent ieiunare filii sponsi quamdiu cum eis esset sponsus, postea vero ieiunaturos 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. In 4.11.5, v. 33 is attested, which Harnack reconstructed οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰωάννου πυκνὰ νηστεύουσιν καὶ δεήσεις προιόνται. (Christi Jünger) ἔσθιον καὶ πίνουσιν. 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 νυμφώνος, ἐὰν ὅσον μετ’ αὐτῶν ἔστιν ὁ νύμφιος. ὅταν ἀπορθή ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νύμφιος ... νηστεύσουσιν. 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. Harnack, however, apparently did not consider the possibility that Tertullian created the closer

---

38 καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν is omitted in C*, D, 265, and d.
39 See also Harnack, Marcion, 187*.
40 Ibid., 189*.
41 Ibid.
42 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. 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 destrueret deberet. 4.12.5 – Esurierant discipuli ea die; spicas decerptas manibus efflixerant, cibum operati ferias ruperant…. accusant Pharisaei,… 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 solactium cibi indulsit—, 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. For v. 1, Tertullian alludes to ἐν σοββάτῳ (4.12.1) and then to the actions of the disciples (4.12.5). Harnack reconstructed v. 1b ἐπείνασαν οἱ μαθηταί, ἔτιλλον τοὺς στάχυς ψώχωντες τοῖς χερσίν (εἰργάσασθι βρῶσιν?). This reconstruction is problematic for several reasons. 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. Second, since ἐπείνασαν was not in Marcion’s text the word order proposed by Harnack becomes unnecessary. The uniquely Lukan reference to ψώχωντες τοῖς χερσίν may indicate that Tertullian is paying some attention to

43 Though Matthew reads πενθεῖν in the question, D, W, 1424, and many of the versions read νηστεύειν.

44 For discussion concerning its position in these verses see chapter 3, n. 30.

45 Harnack, Marcion, 190*.

46 See also the disagreement with Harnack’s reconstruction by Tsutsui (“Evangelium,” 80–81).

47 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.\(^{48}\) Finally, Harnack, in his apparatus, stated that εἰργάσαντο βρῶσιν 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.\(^{49}\) 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.\(^{50}\) 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 εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ and τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως in v. 4.\(^{51}\) 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.\(^{52}\) 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


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 ξηρᾶ (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.\(^{53}\) Tertullian’s reference, however, both omits

---

\(^{48}\) Note also the simple omission of καὶ Ἰησοῦν by Tertullian.

\(^{49}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 190*.

\(^{50}\) The idea of “food” again appears in the general reference in 4.12.14.

\(^{51}\) 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*, 171*); however, in the second edition he apparently erroneously, according to IGNTP, wrote “mit Codd. Afric.” (*Marcion*, 190*).


\(^{53}\) Harnack, who normally tended to reconstruct as many words as possible, here was content to write “παρετηροῦτο … Φαρισαῖοι (das Folgende wesentlich identisch)” (*Marcion*, 190*).
elements in and compresses the content of the verse.\textsuperscript{54} This observation is particularly relevant when considering Tertullian’s citation of v. 9 in 4.12.11, from which Harnack reconstructed (ἐπερωτάω) εἰς ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν (τῷ σαββάτῳ?) ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἥ μῆ; ψυχὴν σώσαι ἥ ἀπολέσαι;\textsuperscript{55} Given the observation just made about v. 7, it would appear that Harnack’s question, concerning the reading μῆ instead of κακοποιῆσαι, “ob Tert. nicht willkürlich verkürzt hat?” should be answered in the affirmative.\textsuperscript{56} In addition, it is unclear whether Marcion read εἰς, though Harnack rightly notes that it is also unclear whether Marcion had “Sabbath” in the singular or plural (cf. Matt 12:12).\textsuperscript{57}

\textbf{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 ὀρὸς προσεύξασθαι … διαυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ πατρός (τοῦ θεοῦ?).\textsuperscript{58} 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.”\textsuperscript{59} 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 ἔξελθείν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ὄρος.\textsuperscript{60} That τοῦ πατρός is wording created by Tertullian is revealed by the fact that he does not mention simply “the

\textsuperscript{54} For example, there is no mention of οἱ γράμματεῖς, and Tertullian expresses the idea of ἱνα εὐροσιν κατηγορεῖν with ut accusarent.

\textsuperscript{55} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 190*.

\textsuperscript{56} Given the loose nature of the allusion it is unnecessary to posit, with IGNTP, an otherwise unattested λόγος (from Tertullian’s \textit{liberare}) for Marcion’s text.

\textsuperscript{57} The same uncertainty concerning the latter point was expressed by Zahn, \textit{Geschichte}, 2:460.

\textsuperscript{58} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 191*.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{60} IGNTP 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).  

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. In v. 14, Tertullian refers to Jesus changing Simon’s name (4.13.6), which once again points to the Lukan Σίμωνα ὄνομασεν Πέτρου. Although Tertullian does not refer to v. 16 (attested by Epiphanius) in *Marc. 4*, he does refer to *Iudam traditorem* in 2.28.2. 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 Epiphanius. The textual evidence for Luke 6:17b, alluded to by Tertullian in 4.13.7, is quite complicated and Harnack’s reconstruction, πλήθος (πολὺ) ἀπὸ τῆς (παραλίου?) Τύρου καὶ ἄλλων τε χωρῶν (πόλεων?) καὶ τῆς περαιός ἔληλυθότων, is unconvincing. The allusion does contain a reference to πλήθος 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

---


62 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*).

63 Mark 3:16 also refers to the agency of Jesus (ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρου), though according to IGNTP this reading does not appear in the Lukan manuscript tradition. Matt 10:2 simply states Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος.

64 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 *Praeser. 3.11*.

immediately subsequently.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, \textit{ex aliis regionibus} could be referring to the other locales mentioned in the verse. Harnack, along with Braun, also saw the reference to \textit{etiam transmarine} reflecting the textual variant \textit{και τῆς περαιώς (et trans fretum)} found after \textit{Ἰηρουσαλημ} in \textit{X}, \textit{W}, and several OL manuscripts.\textsuperscript{67} Though this view is possible, it is also possible that Tertullian uses the term to create a link with those who are described \textit{veniunt ab aequiline et mari} in the citation of Isa 49:12 (4.13.7).

\subsection*{4.1.16 Luke 6:24}

4.15.3 – \textit{Ecce enim demutat in maledictionem,... Vae enim dicit.} 4.15.9 – \textit{Sed accidentia vitia divitiis illa in evangelio quoque ‘vae’ divitibus adscribunt: Quoniam, inquit, recepistis advocationem vestram,...} \textsuperscript{68}

Luke 6:24 is also attested by Eznik. Tertullian’s citation of the verse in 4.15.9 attests \textit{οὐαὶ τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ύμῶν.}\textsuperscript{69} It is worth noting concerning the two “omissions” that Harnack cautioned “Ob πλήν und ύμῖν gefehlt haben bleibt ungewiß.”\textsuperscript{70} As is often the case, the conjunction may well have been omitted by Tertullian.\textsuperscript{71} Also, since ύμῖν 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.

\subsection*{4.1.17 Luke 6:26}

4.15.14 – \textit{Vae, cum vobis benedixerint homines! Secundum haec faciebant et pseudoprophetis patres illorum.}

Harnack reconstructed Luke 6:26 \textit{οὐαὶ ὅταν ύμᾶς καλῶς εἰπώσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι κατὰ ταῦτα ἐποίουν καὶ τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.}\textsuperscript{72} Several elements, however, should be questioned. First, the omission of

\textsuperscript{66} The citation begins \textit{et ecce allophyli et Tyrus et populus Aethiopum} (4.13.7).
\textsuperscript{68} Additional allusions to Luke 6:24 occur in 4.15.6–8, 10–11.
\textsuperscript{69} This is also the reconstruction of Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 192*. The manuscript tradition for this verse is relatively uniform.
\textsuperscript{71} According to IGNTP πλήν is only omitted in Λ, 716, 1187*, and the Persian Diatessaron.
\textsuperscript{72} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 192*. 
Luke 6:34

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’ ὁν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν, ποία χάρις ἐστίν ὕμιν. 77 That Marcion’s text read ἀπολαβεῖν may be confirmed not only by the fact that it is read in many manuscripts, 78 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). 78 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 ὕμιν is attested at the end of the phrase in D and numerous OL manuscripts, 79 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

---

73 Manuscripts omitting ὕμιν include P75, ℳ, A, B, and numerous others.
74 See NA27 for the various orders in which ὕμιν καλῶς ἐπιστεύει is found in the manuscript tradition.
75 The omission of γὰρ is also found in D, 1319, several lectionaries, most OL manuscripts, and the Persian Diatessaron. The addition of καὶ is found in b, f, q, and in Irenaeus.
76 Harnack, Marcion, 194. 9.
77 NA27 reads λαβεῖν on the strength of the testimony from P75vid. ℳ, B, L, W, and a few other witnesses.
78 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.
79 Though D and d also omit ἐστίν making their reading different in respects other than simply word order.
pronoun is read in b, q, and r, 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. Yet, Harnack did not mention that η reads *fili Aliissimi Dei.* It is not probable, however, that either υἱοὶ ὑψίστου θεοῦ or υἱοὶ θεοῦ was the reading of Marcion’s text. 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. 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.” Therefore, with his thoughts on the “sons” element Tertullian may have unconsciously written the more common *fili dei.* Tertullian continues the citation in 4.17.6 attesting the nearly uniform reading ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστὸς ἔστιν ἐπὶ τούς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.

4.1.20 Luke 6:36
4.17.8 – *Estote, inquit, misericordes, sicut pater vester... Aut si alius nunc misericordiam praeceptit, quia et ipse misericors sit,...*

---

80 Harnack, *Marcion,* 194*.
81 Zahn, *Geschichte,* 2:462 overstated the case when he called Tertullian’s citation “genau.”
82 It is worth noting that Marcion’s text read υἱοὶ ο ἐστε ( Câm.) 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 *filiis Dei* from Matt 5:9 in *Pat.* 11.8 and *Pud.* 2.2.
83 See Wright, *Alterations,* 128 for a similar view.
84 Thus, contra Zahn, *Geschichte,* 2:452, there may indeed be an “erdenklichen Grund” for the possibility that Tertullian has provided an inexact citation.
85 *Vester* is omitted by β and Gelenius, but attested by M and retained by all the other editors.
Harnack reconstructed this verse γίνεσθε οἰκτήρμονες, καθώς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὥκτειρεν ὑμᾶς (οἰκτήρμων ἔστιν?). 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.” 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 καθώς 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. 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.

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 υμῖν. μέτρον καλόν, πεπιεσμένον καὶ ύπερεκχυσθώμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον υμῶν. τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ὃ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρήσεται υμῖν. Apart from πεπιεσμένον καὶ ύπερεκχυσθώμενον, most of 6:38a, b is unproblematic. IGNTP lists numerous variants for the problematic phrase. Though the reading attested by Tertullian (πεπιεσμένον καὶ ύπερεκχυσθώμενον) is found in a few manuscripts, the omission

86 Harnack, Marcion, 194*.
87 Ibid.
88 See IGNTP for the data.
89 IGNTP lists Marcion as the only witness omitting υμῶν. 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.
90 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.
91 This is also Harnack’s reconstruction (Marcion, 194*).
92 IGNTP lists 71*, 828*, l48, gat, and a few witnesses to geo.
of σεσαλευμένου 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 (τῷ συντῷ ὦ 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.93

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.94

4.1.24 Luke 6:46

4.17.13 – Si ita est, quis videbitur dixisse: Quid voca<ti>s,95 domine, domine?
4.17.14 – Quis item adiecisse potuisset: Et non facitis quae dico?

93 Harnack simply noted “Anspielung” and offered no reconstruction (Marcion, 194*).
94 Once again, Harnack simply noted “Anspielung” and offered no reconstruction (ibid., 195*).
95 Vocatis is read by Pamelius, Rigalti, and Kroymann whereas θ and the other editors read vocas.
Harnack reconstructed Luke 6:46 τί με (unsicher) καλείτε (καλείς?) κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὖ ποιεῖτε (ποιείς?) ὁ λέγω. 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“. The omission of the pronoun με could well be due to Tertullian, and though several manuscripts also omit δὲ 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.

4.1.25 Luke 7:12, 14–16

4.18.2 – Resuscitavit et mortuum filium viduae…. ut omnes illic creatori gloriam retulerint, dicentes: Magnus prophetes prodiit in nobis, et respexit deus populum suum.

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 ἔδοξαζον τὸν θεὸν … μέγας προφήτης προῆλθεν εν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. 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 prodict revealed Marcion having changed his text to read προῆλθεν instead of ἡγέρθη, thus avoiding a passive form. The OL manuscripts, however,

---

96 Harnack, Marcion, 195*.
97 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, Marcion¹, 177*).
98 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 καλείς, and only Clementina reads ποιείς.
100 Harnack, Marcion, 196*.
101 Ibid. Harnack provided only ἡγέρθη as the Lukan reading and did not mention ἐγέρσται, 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 ἐπισκέπτωμαι behind the perhaps only slightly less unusual respicere. Thus, Harnack’s argument appears less than persuasive, though it still remains unclear whether Marcion’s text read ἤγέρθη or ἤγηγερτο. Finally, the omission of ὅτι after καὶ 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 (Ἡρῴατο λέγειν) περὶ Ἰωάννου τί ἐξεληλύθατε θεᾶσσαθι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον; Concerning this reconstruction, first, the majority reading is ἐξεληλύθατε, but P75, N, B, D, L, W and numerous other manuscripts read ἐξηλθατε. 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 τὴν ἔρημον following instead of preceding the infinitive. That Tertullian is responsible for the word order cannot be excluded.


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 … merverit veniam,… [the woman] per paenitentiam ex fide iustificatam ab eo [Jesus] audit: 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 γυνῇ described as ἀμαρτωλὸς (v. 37), what she

102 In the Gospels, ἐπισκέπτωμαι 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 ff1, ff2, and q in Matt 25:43 and prospicere in e in Luke 1:68.

103 Harnack, Marcion, 197°.
104 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 δάκρυσι ἐβρεξε, ταῖς θριξὶν ἐξέμασσεν, and τῷ μύρῳ ἠλείφεν.

4.1.28 Luke 8:2-3

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, αἵτινες καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν. 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.

First, though καὶ 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.

104 IGNTP lists Marcion apud Tertullian as attesting the reading σε σέσωκέν, 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 σέσωκέν to Marcion and the OL witnesses in Luke 7:50, 8:48, and 17:19, but lists no variants in Luke 18:42.

105 Harnack, Marcion, 197*.

106 Ibid.
Second, the reading αὑτῶ 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 αὑτῶ instead of αὑτοῖς fits naturally into Tertullian’s argument.

Third, suis should probably be read as rendering αὑτοῖς and not αὑτῶν. 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. It is worth noting that IGNTP does not consider the OL manuscripts to be attesting αὑτῶν.

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 γυνῆ, 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 ὄτα ἀκουέτω. Harnack, who also reconstructed the text in this manner, rightly noted that this is not the Lukan, but rather the Matthean reading. 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,…

---

107 d reads de substantia sua. Also, it is not entirely clear whether de is rendering ἀπὸ or ἐκ, though the former is more likely.

108 Harnack stated it was a “bei Luk. völlig unbezeugt e Fassung” (Marcion, 198*). IGNTP states that 2643 also omits ἀκουέτω.
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* 109 et mari imperat?… sed ignorant substantiae auctorem suum, quae famulis quoque eius obaudire consueverant. l 4.20.2 – … praedicatio marinae istius expeditionis … l 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 with a reference to v. 25b, which Harnack reconstructed τίς (ὁρα) οὕτος ἐστιν, ὃς τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ,110 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.111 In addition, though ὃς and the omission of καὶ 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 θαλάσσῃ found in the Synoptic parallels (cf. Matt 8:27/Mark 4:41) is also noteworthy.112 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.113 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.114

---

109 Moreschini rejects the reading *et ventis* found in R₃, Gelenius, Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.


111 Ibid., 198*.

112 Concerning word order, it is also worth noting that Matt and Mark speak of οἱ ἀνέμοι (Mark: ὁ ἀνέμος) καὶ ἡ θαλάσσα obeying Jesus.

113 Harnack incorrectly stated that this reading is unattested in Luke (*Marcion*, 198*).

114 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 ὁ ὕμειον) 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.


4.20.4 – … 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 ὁ νηρός and him having δαιμόνια (v. 27), followed by a reference to the demon calling himself λέγειυν (v. 30). V. 28 is attested in 4.20.5, and Harnack reconstructed Ἰησοῦς ὦτα τοῦ θεοῦ (wahrscheinlich fehlte τοῦ υψιστοῦ) μη με βοσσινίσης. Harnack argued “τοῦ υψιστοῦ fehlte wahrscheinlich, weil Tert. sonst nicht so fragen konnte [in 4.20.5].” 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 υψιστοῦ, and Tertullian may simply have omitted it. In 4.20.6 reference is made to παρεκάλουν and the request not to send the demons εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον (v. 31).

---

115 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.

116 Harnack, Marcion, 199*.

117 Ibid. The same point was made by Zahn, Geschichte, 2:452.

118 Tsutsui states that the words may have been omitted, but remains uncommitted to Marcionite redactional activity (“Evangelium,” 89).

119 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.”

Braun rightly notes the problem with this view, responding “Ce n’est pas sûr et peut fort bien renvoyer à επέτρεψεν συτοίς (permissit illis) du v. 32. L’adverbe denique indique clairement que le récit est abrégé.”

4.1.33 Luke 8:43–46, 48

4.20.8 – … tangitur a femina, quae sanguine fluibat, 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. 4.20.9 – … dixit: Fides tua te salvam fecit. 4.20.13 – Nec illud omittam, quod, dum tangitur vestimentum eius,…

In this account, vv. 44–46 are also attested by Epiphanius. 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 ἡψατο (Mark 5:31) followed by a reference to the Markan όι μαθηται, implying their comment that Jesus is surrounded by a crowd. In reply, Tertullian attests Jesus’ words ἡψατο μού τίς and … γὰρ ἐγνών δύσαμιν

---

120 Harnack, Marcion, 199*.
121 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 impetraverunt (Evangelium,” 89), but this seems to include too much in Tertullian’s brief reference.
122 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.
123 Tertullian also refers to the woman touching Jesus in 4.20.10, 11.
124 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.
125 This is the form when the disciples restate Jesus’s question. In Mark 5:30 Jesus says τίς μου ἡψατο τοις μαθηταιν.
126 See n. 122.
In 4.20.9 Jesus’ words η πίστις σου σέσωκεν σε (v. 48) are attested. At the conclusion of the discussion Tertullian, in order to demonstrate that Jesus had a body, makes a further reference to v. 44 (Ὑψάτο … 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; yet, many manuscripts read Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ (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 ἀπεστείλεν … κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 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 δέξωνται [ὑμᾶς] and τὸν κοινοτόν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν [ὑμῶν] ἀποτινάξατε εἰς μαρτύριον. Though the precise readings of

---

127 Once again Harnack rightly noted “die Wortstellung bei Tert. hier und in v. 48 ist ohne Bedeutung” (Marcion, 200*).

128 For the word order see n. 104.

129 Harnack, Marcion, 199*.

130 IGNTP states τοῦ θεοῦ τῆν 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.

131 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.\(^{132}\)

### 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 suscitat us alium deum post resurrectionem praedicaret.*

In Tertullian’s adaptation of Luke 9:7–8, there are references to Ἡρώδης and ὑπὸ τινῶν [ὀτι] Ἰωάννης [ηγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν] (v. 7), as well as to ὑπὸ τινῶν … Ἡλίας and ἄλλων προφήτης ἐς 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 “*omnia* ist auffallend (Luk. τινῶν)”;\(^{133}\) however, he appears to have misunderstood Tertullian’s statement. Tertullian does attest the τινῶν (αλλί) in v. 7, and *opinion omnium* is a reference to the sum of what the different groups were saying. In v. 8 Harnack reconstructed ἐς τίς τῶν ἀρχαίων προφήτων (oder προφήτης τῶν ἀρχαίων).\(^{134}\) 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 ἐς τίς, though, with numerous manuscripts, τίς 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 ἔν ἐρήμῳ (v. 12), ἄρτοι … καὶ ἱχθύες (v. 13), πεντακισχίλιοι ἀνδρείς


\(^{133}\) Harnack, *Marcion*, 200*.

\(^{134}\) Ibid.
(v. 14), and that there was an overabundance of food (τὸ περισσεῦσαν in v. 17). 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, ... silentium indicens.... ille autem praecepit ne cui hoc dicerent,...

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. 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 P75, A, B, and D, it is likely for Marcion’s text, though the Latin cannot rule out the reading εἶπεῖν in the TR.


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 δισχῶριζεσθαι ... ὁ

---

135 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.).

136 The reply Tu es Christus is repeated in 4.22.6 and 4.34.15.

137 Additional references to the silence enjoined occur in 4.21.7–8.

138 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).

139 Moreschini’s text reads hic nos with M and Kroymann, though β and the other editors read nos hic.

Πέτρος ... καλὸν ἔστιν ὁδὲ ἡμᾶς εἶναι καὶ ποιήσωμεν ὁδὲ σκηνᾶς τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ Ἔσωεὶ [sic] μίαν καὶ Ἡλία [sic] μίαν, μὴ εἰδῶς ὁ λέγει. First, Harnack stated that the order ὁδὲ ἡμᾶς is “sonst fast unbezeugt,” though IGNTP lists no other witnesses. 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 ὁδὲ is otherwise unattested, when in fact it is attested by D*, d, l, r¹, and numerous versions. Third, Harnack apparently made an error in his reconstruction, because in the apparatus he stated that Marcion read τρεῖς σκηνὰς 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 ff² attest this particular combination of μίαν before σοὶ and then following Moses and Elijah. It is possible that Marcion’s text read this way, though Tertullian’s influence is also possible.

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.


4.23.1 – Stet Christus Marcionis et exclamet: O genitura incredula, quousque ero apud vos? Quousque sustinebo vos? ¹⁴⁴ 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. Nevertheless, the citations could render

¹⁴¹ Harnack, Marcion, 202*.
¹⁴² Ibid., 203*.
¹⁴³ 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).
¹⁴⁴ The second question is omitted by γ, R₁, and R₂.
¹⁴⁵ 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 ω γενεα απιστος ... εως ποτε εσομαι προς υμας; εως ποτε ανεξομαι υμων. The unattested και διεστραμμενη may be a simple omission by Tertullian. Also, the repeated quousque/quamdiu appears to attest εως ποτε appearing twice, as in numerous other manuscripts.


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 μειζων and παιδιον appear to be attested, this brief reference provides no basis upon which to reconstruct any longer readings in Marcion’s text.


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. Harnack stated that here Tertullian is interacting with another of Marcion’s antitheses. Braun, however, responds that the comparison could have arisen out of the statement ως και 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. Even

---

146 Mark 9:19 has only one adjective describing the generation (omega γενεα απιστος).
147 The long list of manuscripts attesting this reading in IGNTP reveals that Harnack’s comment “εως ποτε secundum mit wenigen Zeugen” is a significant understatement (Marcion, 203*).
149 Harnack, Marcion, 204*.
150 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.151 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.”152

4.1.42 Luke 10:1, 4, 7–11


In this pericope, v. 5 is multiply cited. Tertullian attests two elements of v. 1: ἀνέδειξεν [or ἀπέδειξεν] … ἐτέρως ἐβδομήκοντα (4.24.1) and ἀπέστειλεν … εἰς … πόλιν (4.24.2).156 As is well known, the manuscript tradition is divided between

---

151 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.

152 Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 94.

153 Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans read per viam. According to IGNTP the Greek text uniformly attests κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν. The OL attests per viam, circa viam, and in viam.

154 Moreschini rejects the reading dignus est in Pamelius, Rigalti, Oehler, and Evans.

155 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; R3, B, and Gelenius read et adhaerentiam; Pamelius, based on the conjecture of R3, 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.

156 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 ραβδον (?) μή ύποδήματα ... μηδένα κατά τὴν όδόν ἀσπάσαμηθε.\textsuperscript{157} 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).\textsuperscript{158} Since IGNTP indicates that no manuscript and only Didymus the Blind and Epiphanius attest ραβδον 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 ἀξιὸς ... ὁ ἔργατὴς τοῦ μισθοῦ σὺτοῦ 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.\textsuperscript{159} 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 δέχωμαι (v. 8).\textsuperscript{160} Finally, in 4.24.7 Tertullian offers a reference to v. 10 (μή δέχωμαι ύμᾶς) followed by a citation and adaptation of elements in v. 11. Tertullian quotes πλὴν ... γινώσκετε [ὅτι] ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and concludes with a reference to τὸν κοινωτὸν [ὁ ποιμασόμεθα].\textsuperscript{161} The reference to excuti and in testificationem are again taken by Tertullian from the mission of the 12 (Luke 9:5).\textsuperscript{162}

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 δεδομένοι 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, \textit{Contre Marcion IV}, 304n1, 305n3.

\textsuperscript{157} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 205*.


\textsuperscript{159} Once again, the lack of an ellipsis in Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 205* could be misleading.

\textsuperscript{160} Harnack thought that Marcion’s text, along with a handful of manuscripts, omitted ἐφ’ ύμᾶς in v. 9 (ibid.). Its absence, however, could also be a simple omission by Tertullian.

\textsuperscript{161} It is unclear why Harnack reconstructed the otherwise unattested γινώσκεσθε (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{162} For ἐξ ὑμῶν see Harnack’s comments in the apparatus (ibid.). See also Braun, \textit{Contre Marcion IV}, 309n3.
4.1.43 Luke 10:16

4.24.8 – … Qui vos spernet, me spernet. 163

It is interesting that although Harnack quotes the reading *spernet* he was content to reconstruct Luke 10:16 with the Greek present tense: ó ἀδετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀδετεῖ. 164 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 ἀδετῶν is attested by P45 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 οί ὁφθαλμοί οί βλέποντες ἀ βλέπετε λέγο γάρ ὑμῖν, ὦτι προφέται σφίκ ἰδαυ [sic], ἀ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε. 165 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 πολλοὶ is elsewhere attested only in 1241, though κοί βασιλεῖς is also omitted in D and several OL manuscripts. 166 The placement of ἀ 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. 167

4.1.45 Luke 11:7–8


---

163 Moreschini’s text reads *spernet* (bis) with M and Kroymann, whereas β and the other editors read *spernit* (bis).

164 Harnack, *Marcion*, 205*.

165 Ibid., 206*.


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. In v. 8, the allusion similarly reveals the main ideas of the verse even if the precise wording of the Greek cannot be reconstructed.

4.1.46 Luke 11:14, 18–20


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). 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 ἐκβάλλουσιν, The omission of δὲ 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 δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν δακτυλῳ [sic] θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἀρά ἐφθασέν εἰς ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, and only noted the otherwise unattested reading εἰς ὑμᾶς. It is not certain, however, that in vos is not

---

168 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.

169 Harnack attempted to reconstruct the verse, and his reconstruction is plausible, though based largely on inference (Marcion, 208*).

170 On the spelling of Beelzebul here in both the Latin and Greek see chapter 3, nn. 239 and 240.

171 Moreschini’s text reads adpropinquavit with R₂ and R₃, rejecting adpropinquabit read by M, γ, and R₁. 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 ἐφθασέν.

172 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 συτὸ ἦν was present in Marcion’s text or not (set in brackets in NA²⁷).

173 Harnack, Marcion, 209*.

174 Ibid.
rendering the nearly uniformly attested εἰς ὑμᾶς.\textsuperscript{175} Tsutsui disagreed with Harnack’s reconstructing ἐφθασεν, contending that \textit{adpropinquavit} rendered ἔγγυτεν.\textsuperscript{176} Tsutsui rightly notes that only \textit{d}, which also reads \textit{adpropinquavit}, might support this reading. In addition, though not mentioned by Tsutsui, Tertullian elsewhere in \textit{Adversus Marcionem} uses \textit{adpropinquare} to render the verb ἔγγυτζω or the phrase ἔγγυς ἕστιν.\textsuperscript{177} At the same time, however, the OL manuscripts do reveal some variation in their renderings of v. 20,\textsuperscript{178} 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.\textsuperscript{179} Finally, ἐγώ in v. 20 is also worth noting, as it may have been in Marcion’s text since it is attested by \textit{D} and numerous other manuscripts, several versions, and multiple church fathers.\textsuperscript{180} At the same time, an unconscious influence on Tertullian by Matt 12:27 cannot be ruled out.


4.27.1 – ... et ‘vae’ ingerit Pharisaeis et doctoribus legis. | 4.27.2 – Ideo et tunc \textit{Pharisaeus qui illum vocarat ad prandium retractabat penes se cur non prius tinctus esset quam recubuisset,... Iesus autem etiam interpretatus est ei legem, dicens illos [the Pharisees] calicis et catini exteriora emundare, interiora autem ipsorum plena esse rapina et iniquitate,... exterioara, inquit, calicis lavatis, id est carnem, interiora autem vestra non emundastis,\textsuperscript{181} 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

\textsuperscript{175} Every OL manuscript except \textit{c}, reads \textit{in vos}, which IGNTP does not interpret as evidence for the reading εἰς ὑμᾶς.

\textsuperscript{176} Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 100.


\textsuperscript{178} The OL manuscripts attest the verbs \textit{praevenerire} (b, f, q, r\textsuperscript{1}), \textit{provenire} (f\textsuperscript{2}, i), \textit{pervenire} (aur, c, l), \textit{anticipare} (a\textsuperscript{2}), and \textit{adpropinquare} (d).

\textsuperscript{179} A similar possibility was suggested for Luke 11:33 in chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{180} P\textsuperscript{7}, \textit{S}, B, D, f\textsuperscript{3}, and several other witnesses have ἐγώ before ἐκβάλλων.

\textsuperscript{181} Moreschini’s text reads \textit{emundatis} with \textit{M}, \textit{F}, and Kroymann, rejecting the reading \textit{emundatis} in \textit{M}, \textit{R}, and the other editors as well as \textit{mundatis} in \textit{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 saluationum 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 οὕσι 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.¹⁸² Notably, Tertullian’s reference to v. 38 attests Marcion’s text as having read similarly to D and d concerning the Pharisee: ἠρέσετο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑσυτῶ λέγειν διά τι οὐ πρῶτον ἔβαπτίσθη.¹⁸³ The precise wording and word order, however, are not entirely certain as most other OL manuscripts attest ἠρέσετο ἐν ἑσυτῶ διακρινόμενος.¹⁸⁴ Tertullian concludes the thought with a reference back to the “reclining” of v. 37.¹⁸⁵

Tertullian continues in 4.27.2 with an adaptation and then a citation of Jesus’ reply to the Pharisee (v. 39).¹⁸⁶ Tertullian’s testimony is curious here in that in the space of a few lines he offers divergent wordings for the verse.¹⁸⁷ In the adaptation Tertullian appears to attest the reading [οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος τὸ ἔξωθεν καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἐσωθεν ύμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγής καὶ

¹⁸² Tertullian’s use of the pluperfect (vocarat) cannot reveal whether a historical present was in Marcion’s text or not.

¹⁸³ The phrase ἠρέσετο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑσυτῶ is also attested in 343, 716, 1229, and a.

¹⁸⁴ 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. sy⁸ attests a similar reading.

¹⁸⁵ Harnack inquired “Las M. πρὸ τοῦ ἀναπεσεῖν ὕψος πρὸ τοῦ ὀρίστου [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.

¹⁸⁶ 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.).

¹⁸⁷ 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.
A few lines later, however, Tertullian quotes a rather more truncated text to τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποιηρίου καθαρίζετε (οὐ 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 ποιηρὸς τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν. 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.

In 4.27.3 Tertullian quotes v. 41 in a slightly curious form. Only one manuscript attests anything similar to quae habetis, and it is possible that Tertullian is unconsciously being influenced by the similarly themed Luke 18:22 (οὐσα ἔχεις) or Matt 19:21 (τὰ ὑπάρχοντα). In any case, Tertullian does attest the words δότε and ἔλεημοσύνην in v. 41a, as well as πάντα καθαρὰ ἔσται ὑμῖν in v. 41b. The latter could have been the reading in Marcion’s text as it is also found in D; 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

---

188 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).

189 Once again exteriora is in a different place in Tertullian’s Latin (see n. 188). Several texts, including P and D invert the order of ἔξωθεν and ἐσωθεν. Though the opening word of v. 30 is unattested, Harnack noted “Fehlte ἐφρονεὶς bei M? Schwerlich” (Marcion, 210*).

190 Another slightly different reference to v. 39 occurs in 4.27.6 where Tertullian simply refers back to munditiæ catinorum.

191 The OL manuscript f reads ex his que habetis.


193 Harnack only provided a reconstruction of the latter element (Marcion, 210*).

194 The reading ἔστιν ὑμῖν is attested by numerous OL manuscripts and church fathers, and ὑμῖν ἔστοι is attested in many manuscripts, including P.
καὶ τὴν ἁγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ. τὴν κλησιν is otherwise unattested; 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. 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 οὐδὲ against the νομικοί. The adaptation attests the loading with φορτία δυσβάστακτα, 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. Tertullian has adapted v. 47, though his testimony seems to point to οὐδὲ … ὑπὸ οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν.

195 IGNTP wrongly states that Marcion omitted καὶ … θεοῦ.


198 Braun notes that *importabilis* occurs only in ecclesiastical Latin and strengthens the translation of δυσβάστακτος (*Contre Marcion IV*, 351n1).

199 Harnack only reconstructed οὐδὲ τῶ 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.

200 Though the reading τὰ μνημεῖα attested by Epiphanius must be taken into account, this reading, according to IGNTP, is elsewhere only attested in P1056 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 
pατέρων ὑμῶν.201

### 4.1.49 Luke 12:1

4.28.1 – *Cavete, inquit discipulis, a fermento Pharisaorum, quod est hypocrisis,…*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 12:1 … (.urlopen λέγειν) πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς: 
[πρῶτον?] προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἣτις ἐστὶν 
ὑπόκρισις.202 In the apparatus Harnack indicated that he was inclined to see 
πρῶτον as missing, and he highlights the omission of ἔσωτοῖς 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 σὺντοῦ 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 P45, OUNCE, 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 prohibit ad interrogationem cogitare de 
responsione. Sanctus enim, inquit, spiritus docebit vos ipsa hora quid eloqui 
debeat is.*

201 Harnack reconstructed v. 48 (.openConnection) μάρτυρες ἐστε μὴ συνευδοκεῖν (Marcion, 211*). It is 
not clear why he chose to render testabantur with μάρτυρες ἐστε (this is the reading of NA27 
following OUCH, 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.

202 Ibid.
In 4.28.8 Tertullian alludes to Luke 12:11 and then cites v. 12. Harnack reconstructed the words προσφέρωσιν ἐπὶ τάς ἄρχας 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 ύμας, τάς συναγωγάς, or τάς ἔξουσίας was omitted would be unwarranted.

Based on the citation of v.12 Harnack reconstructed τὸ γὰρ ἄγιον πνεῦμα διδαξεῖ ύμας ἐν σάτη τῇ ἁρμᾷ, τί δὲι εἰπεῖν ύμας. Tertullian’s word order sanctus enim spiritus is different from nearly the entire extant OL tradition and the Vulgate, which read spiritus enim sanctus. According to IGNTP the entire Greek manuscript tradition attests ἄγιον πνεῦμα, and it is likely that Tertullian’s word order is following the word order of Marcion’s text. 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 δὲι εἰπεῖν ύμας. First, ff², gat, and Heracleon attest τί instead of ὁ, 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 ύμας is “nicht sicher” and “sonst unbezeugt.” 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 … εἰπεῖ τῷ ὁδηγῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ’ ἐμοῦ τήν κληρονομίαν. Though the precise wording is not

---

203 Ibid., 213*.
204 Only a reads sanctus enim spiritus.
205 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.
206 Harnack, Marcion, 213*.
207 Harnack reconstructed very similarly though excluding εἰπεῖ and μου (ibid.).
clear, the minimal manuscript variation makes this reading rather likely. 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 κριτήν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς. 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 κριτήν ever preceding κατέστησεν. κριτήν is the reading of several manuscripts, including P75, Θ, B, D, and L, though it is possible that iudicem is rendering the reading δικαστήν. Finally, it is also possible that with D, 28, a, b, d, and the Persian Diatessaron, ἡ μεριστήν was omitted in Marcion’s text. As has often been the case, however, a simple omission by Tertullian cannot be ruled out completely.

### 4.1.52 Luke 12:22–23

4.29.1 – Quis nollet curam nos agere animae de victu et corpori de vesitu … qui et substantiam ipsius animae accommodavit potiorem esca, et materiam ipsius corporis figuravit potiorem tunica,…

Harnack places his reconstruction of these verses in parentheses and reconstructed the text verbatim to the reading in NA27 (starting with μη μεριμνάτε in v. 22), except for the omission of γόρ in v. 23. 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

---

208 Several minuscules and lectionaries read τῇ κληρονομίᾳ μετ’ ἐμοῦ.
209 Harnack, Marcion, 213*.
210 The NA27 apparatus recognizes this point noting “κριτήν νῦν δικαστήν ΜclionT.”
211 Harnack believed that Marcion’s text did omit the phrase (Marcion, 213*).
212 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).
213 Harnack, Marcion, 213*. γόρ is present in many manuscripts, including P75, Θ, B, and D, but absent in numerous others, including P75, A, K, Q, and W.
and the body being more than ἐνδύμα, seems to have influenced Tertullian’s phrasing. Similarly, the allusion to v. 23 implies the presence of the ψυχή/τροφή and σῶμα/ἐνδύμα 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 quae runt,… 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 ταύτα γὰρ τα ἑβνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν (or ἐπιζητεῖ/ζητεῖ). Though according to IGNTP πάντα after γάρ is omitted in b, ff², i, l q, r¹ 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. 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 χρηστε 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 ardentes 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 δοῦλοι and the κύριος mentioned in v. 37. He then alludes to the phrases αἱ ὀφθηκες περιεξωσμέναι and οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι (v. 35) followed by

---

214 Thus, for v. 22 it is not clear whether ὑμῶν was present with either ψυχή or σώματι, or both. In addition, no insight into the form of the verbs ἔσθηκα and ἐνδύω, assuming they were present, can be gained.

215 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.

216 D, e, a, c, d, and l attest οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν. b, f, ff², i, q, and r¹ attest οἶδεν δὲ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν.
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.” Nevertheless, for the parable in vv. 39–40, Harnack reconstructed v. 39 … ἐὰν οὐδὲν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἔχεται, οὐκ ἂν ὀφθήκεν διωρυχῇναι τὸν ὀικὸν αὐτοῦ. No manuscript attests οἶκον 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 ἔχεται, found in most manuscripts, but not in P, N, D, and several versions. As this reading appears to have arisen through the influence of the parallel Matt 24:43, 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 οὐ οἶος

---

217 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*).

218 Additional allusions to these verses occur in 4.29.10–11.

219 Moreschini’s text reads caedentem with M, R2, and R3, rejecting cedentem in γ and R1.

220 Harnack, Marcion, 215*.

221 Ibid.

222 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 ἐτοιμαί, οτι ἢ ὁρᾶ ὡς 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. Harnack commented in his apparatus “Wortstellung belanglos,” 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. 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), and that the steward who treats his fellow slaves well will be rewarded, which Harnack reconstructed ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν καταστήσει αὐτῶν (v. 44). Despite Tertullian’s paraphrase (omnia 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. 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.


224 Ibid.

225 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.

226 No extant text omits the pronoun entirely, with αὐτοῦ strongly attested and αὑτῷ attested by P⁵⁵, 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 ἢ οὐ προσδοκᾷ καὶ ἐν ὀρᾷ ἢ οὐ γινώσκει; yet, the compact nature of Tertullian’s testimony does not allow the exact wording to be reconstructed. More significantly, Harnack reconstructed the final element of the verse ἀποκρίσει αὐτόν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων υπῆρξε, appealing to Marcion’s theological views as the basis for positing the otherwise unattested readings ἀποκρίσει and τεθήκεται. Though the use of segregō 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.

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 (διορίσει πολλάς [v. 47], διορίσεται 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.


227 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.

228 Harnack, Marcion. 215*.

229 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).

Tertullian cites the first half of Luke 12:49, rendering πῦρ ἡλθον βολεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν.\(^{231}\) 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 (δίσμερισμόν) and accuses Marcion of having altered the former to the latter.\(^{232}\) Harnack reconstructed v. 51 δοκείτε ὅτι ἡλθον εἰρήνην βολεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν; σὺχί, λέγω ύμῖν, ὄλλα δίσμερισμόν (ἀποχώρισιν?).\(^{233}\) 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.\(^{234}\) 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 ἡλθον βολεῖν εἰρήνην. Therefore, the order here may be due to Tertullian. Third, it is not clear that venisse me is rendering ἡλθον and not παρεγενόμην.\(^{235}\) Fourth, according to IGNTP βολεῖν instead of δούναι is attested in several OL manuscripts, sy\(^{a}\), sy\(^{b}\), 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 ἐπὶ plus the accusative was in Marcion’s text. Fifth, Marcion’s text could have read ὄλλα instead of ὄλλα ἦ with P\(^{45}\), D, and several other manuscripts, but again, all OL manuscripts read sed, which IGNTP does not take as evidence for the reading ὄλλα. Finally, though raising the questions “Hat aber M. δισμερισμόν gelesen? Las er nicht ἀποχώρισιν oder ähnlich?,”

---

\(^{231}\) Harnack offered the preposition ἐπὶ instead of εἰς. This reading is possible, though the latter preposition appearing in P\(^{45}\), 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 ἡ φωνή.

\(^{232}\) 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.

\(^{233}\) Ibid.

\(^{234}\) According to IGNTP ὅτι is only omitted in 1210.

\(^{235}\) 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 ἡλθον.
Harnack provided no rationale for Marcion’s text reading anything other than διαμερισμοῦ.  

Tertullian’s testimony to v. 53 is largely unproblematic and Harnack reconstructed διαμερισθήσεται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατέρα, καὶ μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητέρα, καὶ πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.  

A few observations include, first, that Tertullian attests the TR reading διαμερισθήσεται, even though many witnesses, including P45, P75, B, D, and the OL manuscripts read διαμερισθήσεται. Second, Harnack stated that the second and fourth καὶ are otherwise unattested, though IGNTP indicates that there is some evidence for their presence. 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.  

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 υἱοῦ καὶ τῆς γυνής δοκιμάζετε, τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τούτων οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν. 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 presentation.
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 P45, P75, Σ, D, numerous other manuscripts, and many versions. Finally, since D, along with several OL, sy, 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 καὶρὸν (P75, B, and 892 read τὸν καὶρὸν δὲ), and Harnack’s reconstruction of the verbs is speculative. It could be that probantes is rendering an otherwise unattested δοκιμάζετε, and dinoscentes reflecting οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, though it also could be that Tertullian’s parallel construction reflects a parallel construction of οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν in Marcion’s text.


4.30.1 – Quaestionem rursus de curatione sabbati<s> facta quomodo discussit? Unusquisque vestrum sabbatis non solvit<sup>244</sup> asinum aut bovem suum a praesepi et ducit ad potum?

Harnack viewed the opening question in 4.30.1 as attesting ἐν τοῖς σὰββασιν 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

---

242 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*).

243 As already noted οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν is universally attested in the first phrase, and it is the reading of P75. 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.

244 Moereschini follows the emendation of Kroymann (sabbati<s>) as M, γ, R1, and R2 read sabbati, and R3, along with the other editors, reads sabbato. Braun calls the correction by Kroymann “pleinement justifiée” (Contra Marcion IV, 381n6).

245 Moereschini reads solvit with R3, apparently viewing solvet in M, γ, R1, and R2 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 ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν τοῖς σαββάσι [sic] (τ. σαββάστω?) οὐ λύει τὸν ὄνον αὐτοῦ ἤ τὸν βοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει;246 The otherwise unattested plural sabbatis probably should be attributed to Tertullian.247 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 ἤ τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ; whereas, 69 reads as Harnack reconstructed.248 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.249 Finally, ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει may very well be correct as ἀπάγει τῷ ὀδατί (rendering ducit ad potum) is not attested in any Greek manuscript, and, according to IGNTP, is only witnessed in l, r, 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.250

Tertullian cites Luke 13:19a in 4.30.1 and Harnack reconstructed ὁμοία ἔστιν κόκκω σινάπεως, ὁν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐσπειρεν εἰς κήπον ἐσουτοῦ (ἐν τ. ἐσουτοῦ κήπῳ?).251 Though IGNTP views regnum dei as part of Marcion’s text,252 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

246 Harnack, Marcion, 217*.
247 According to IGNTP Irenaeus attests τῇ ἦμέρᾳ 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).
248 Harnack, however, was unaware of the testimony of this manuscript as he believed that the order attested by Tertullian was unattested elsewhere (Marcion, 217*).
249 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 praepe domini sui. The terms do not occur together anywhere else in the NT.
250 Allusions to elements in Luke 13:19 also occur in 4.30.2.
251 Harnack, Marcion', 199*. The reconstruction in Marcion, 217* is identical except that the final element simply reads εἰς κήπον, where it appears that ἐσουτοῦ was erroneously omitted.
252 The same position is taken by Zahn, Geschichte, 2:477.
testimony unproblematic. The same cannot be said for *seminavit in horto suo*. Harnack noted “ἐσπειρέως 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 συντο ὑμῶν. 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 ζῷμη (v. 21) can be reconstructed.253


4.30.4 – *Cum surrexerit, inquit, pater familiae;… Et cluserit ostium:… quibus pulsantibus respondebit: Nescio unde sitis, et rursus enumerantibus quod coram illo ererint et biberint et in plateis eorum docuerit, adicet: Recedite a me omnes operarii iniquitatis;…*

Tertullian cites several elements from Luke 13:25, which Harnack reconstructed ἐὰν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἶκος ἐσπέριμάς καὶ ἀποκλείῃ τὴν θύραν … κρούειν … ἀποκρῖθης (ἐρεῖ) σῶκ οἴδα πόθεν ἐστε [sic].254 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

---

253 Harnack also offered no further reconstructed elements (*Marcion, 217*).

254 Ibid., 217*-18*. 
does not interpret the evidence from these Latin witnesses as rendering a Greek text different from the almost uniformly attested ἀφ’ οὖν ἄν. Insisting that cum renders ἦν over-reads the Latin. Second, Harnack viewed ὑμᾶς after οἶδα as absent from Marcion’s text. 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, 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 ἐπίστη τω� πλατείας ἄμων 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 ἔργαται ἄνωμίς/ἀδικίας. Concerning the final word, Harnack reconstructed Marcion’s text with the former. He rightly noted that ἄνωμίς (cf. Matt 7:23 and Ps 6:9) is attested by a few witnesses, including D. Braun, however, states, “Le text de Luc, conservé par Marcion, se sert de l’expression «ouvriers d’iniquité» (ἔργαται ἀδικίας).” Part of the problem is that iniquitas could render either term. Even if Harnack is right, and the general pattern of Tertullian’s Latin leans in that direction, it still may not have

---

255 Ibid., 218*. ἀφ’ οὖν ἄν occurs only here in the NT. According to IGNTP the first two words (ἀφ’ οὐ) are almost universally attested, though several manuscripts then read ἦν, instead of ἄν.

256 Harnack stated the omission was otherwise unattested (Marcion, 218*); however, c and possibly r also omit it.

257 It is absent in D, several OL manuscripts, and a few other witnesses.

258 Operarii could be either vocative or nominative and therefore cannot distinguish between οἱ ἔργαται and ἔργαται. The latter, which is the reading of many manuscripts including P75, N, B, and D is more likely.

259 Harnack, Marcion, 218*.

260 Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 386n1.


262 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 inusititia (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 ἄνωμία, 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 ἁριστὸν η ἁπτομαι and the verb φέωνει.


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 praepelt etiam de viis et sepibus colligi,… spem … de qua illos gustaturos negat dominus,…

Tertullian attests numerous elements in the parable found in Luke 14:16–24, and its Lukian 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 ἀνθρωπὸς τις ἐποίει ἁπτομαν καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοῦς. It is possible, however, that fecit is rendering ἐποίησε, which NA indicates is the reading of the Majority Text and of A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, and f. In addition, though Harnack believed Marcion’s text did not read ἁπτομαν μέγα, the absence of μέγα could be a simple omission by Tertullian. 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 ἱπξαντο}

263 An additional allusion to this parable occurs in 4.31.7.

264 Harnack, Marcion, 218*

265 ἐποίησε is the reading of P, Σ, and B.

266 According to IGNTP μέγα is absent in X, 213, 1080, e, sy, one manuscript of bo, and arm.
παραιτείσθαι ... ἀγρὸν ἡγόρασα (v. 18), [ζεύγη] βοών ἡγόρασα (v. 19), and γυναίκα ἕγημα (v. 20).²⁶⁷

From Tertullian’s testimony in 4.31.6, for v. 21, Harnack reconstructed ἀποθειέλειν ... τότε ἐπαρθεῖς²⁶⁸ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ... εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ρύμος τῆς πόλεως ....²⁶⁹ 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* (ὄργεῖς), the entire extant manuscript tradition here reads ὀργισθείς. Zahn is probably right when he argued it to be unlikely that Tertullian would have translated ὀργισθείς with motus, and it is probable that Marcion’s text read another Greek verb,²⁷⁰ however, precisely what that verb was remains obscure. Finally, Tertullian attests only a few unproblematic elements from vv. 22–24: ἥτι τόπος ἐστίν (v. 22), εἰς τὰς ὀδοὺς καὶ φραγμοῦς (v. 23), and οὐδεὶς ... γεύσεται (v. 24).

4.1.64 Luke 16:2, 4–7

4.33.1 – ...secundum servi illius exemplum qui ab actu summotus dominicos debitores diminuitis 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.

---

²⁶⁷ D, sy*, syc, and the Persian Diatessaron read γυναίκα ἔλαβον.

²⁶⁸ Though Harnack wrote ἐπαρθεῖς in his text, in the apparatus he noted “ἐπαρθεῖς oder κινηθεῖς oder ähnlich” (Marcion, 219*). κινηθεῖς was the reading suggested by Zahn, Geschichte, 2:478.

²⁶⁹ Harnack, Marcion, 219*. Based on 4.31.6 ἐξέλθε should also be included in the reconstruction.

²⁷⁰ Harris attempted to argue that motus was rendering ὀργισθείς 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 ὀργισθείς with ὀρμηθείς, 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.
In 4.33.4 Tertullian cites the two questions found in Luke 16:11–12. Harnack reconstructed v. 11 εἰ ἐν τῷ ἁδίκῳ μαμώνα πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἁληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει; 271 Most of the verse is unproblematic, though the omission of the conjunction οὐ, also absent in a few other manuscripts and versions, could very well have been due to Tertullian. 272 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 μαμώνα ἁδίκῳ is virtually unattested in the manuscript tradition and the second citation, including the otherwise unattested verius, seems altered by Tertullian’s own hand. 273

Concerning v. 12, Harnack reconstructed εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐχ εὑρέθητε, τὸ εἷμον τίς δεώσει ὑμῖν. 274 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 εὑρέθητε, 275 also attested in sya, syb, and the Arabic Diatessaron. Third, ε, i, and l, along with manuscript 157 read ἐ ilma, and it is possible that Tertullian’s meum is reflecting the reading in Marcion’s text. 276 Finally, though numerous manuscripts and witnesses, including Θ and D, read δεώσει ὑμῖν, the fact that Tertullian often alters the position of pronouns

271 Harnack, Marcion, 219*.
272 IGNTP lists Marcion as a witness for the omission.
273 Braun comments “A si proche distance T. ne reprend pas le fragment de verset sous sa forme exacte (verum > verius)” (Contre Marcion IV, 405n5).
274 Harnack, Marcion, 219*.
275 The same point is made by Zahn, Geschichte, 2:479.
276 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 ἐ ilma 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.


4.33.2 – *Cui famulatam videns Pharisaearum cupiditatem ... Inridebant denique Pharisaei pecuniae cupidi,*...  14.33.6 – *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 φιλὸργυμοι and ἐξεμικτήριζον, neither of which provides any difficulties. In 4.33.6 Tertullian alludes to the nearly uniformly attested ύμεις ἐστὲ οἱ δικαιούντες ἐαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων in v. 15 and then quotes γινώσκει δὲ ὁ θεὸς τὰς καρδιὰς 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 ψηλὸν ἔστιν παρὰ ἄνθρωποις βδέλυγμα ἐστίν τῷ θεῷ. 277 Given that the word order ψηλὸν παρὰ ἄνθρωποις is weakly attested, with παρὰ instead of ἐν virtually unattested; 278 the absence of ἐνώπιον before “God” is unattested; and ἔστιν is placed either before ἐνώπιον or omitted altogether; 279 it is possible that Tertullian has here been influenced by the wording of Luke 18:27 (τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἄνθρωποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἔστιν). 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 prophetæ, quam unus, apex verborum domini.*

Harnack reconstructed Luke 16:17 εὐκοπῶτερον (δὲ ἔστιν) τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τῶν λόγων μου μίαν κεραίαν (πεσάν), again apparently assuming that the otherwise unattested word order is due to Tertullian. 280

277 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).

278 579 and three church fathers read παρὰ.

279 The former is the case for several manuscripts including most OL witnesses and the omission is attested in numerous manuscripts, including P75, A, B, and D.

280 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.\textsuperscript{281} Wright, however, notices that Tertullian follows this reference with Verbum, enim inquit Esaias, dei nostri manet in aeum (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.\textsuperscript{282} 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 προσεῖν, which Harnack considered uncertain,\textsuperscript{283} 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.\textsuperscript{284} Thus, Marcion’s precise wording cannot be established with certainty.

\textbf{4.1.68 Luke 16:18}

4.34.1 – Sed Christus divortium prohibit dicens: Qui dimiserit uxorem suam et aliam duxerit, adulterium committet; qui dimissam a viro duxerit, aeque adulter est:… | 4.34.4 – Qui dimiserit, inquit, uxorem, et aliam duxerit, adulterium commissit, et qui a marito dimissam duxerit, aeque adulter est.\textsuperscript{285} | 4.34.9 – … inlicitorum matrimoniorum et adulterii figuras iaculatus est in Herodem, adulterum pronuntians etiam qui dimissam a viro duxerit,…\textsuperscript{286}

Tertullian makes several references to Luke 16:18, two of which are quotations. Harnack privileged the first citation and reconstructed ὁ ὀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἐτέραν\textsuperscript{287} μοιχεύει, καὶ ὁ ὀπολευμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς

\textsuperscript{281} Ibid. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 111 and Braun, \textit{Contre Marcion IV}, 410n2 share Harnack’s view.

\textsuperscript{282} Wright, \textit{Alterations}, 133. The potential influence of Isa 40:8 was also considered with regard to Luke 21:33, discussed in chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{283} See Harnack’s comment in the apparatus (\textit{Marcion}, 220*).

\textsuperscript{284} 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.

\textsuperscript{285} Moreschini’s text reads adulter est with M, X, and R₃, rejecting adulter in R₁ and R₂ and est in F.

\textsuperscript{286} An additional allusion to Luke 16:18 occurs in 5.7.6.

\textsuperscript{287} IGNTP interprets \textit{aliam} in several OL manuscripts as rendering ἄλλην instead of ἔτέραν. This interpretation, however, seems unnecessary.
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. In addition, Tertullian’s use of finite verbs was rightly not retained by Harnack, as Tertullian is using them to render the Greek participles. 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 ἐστιν, 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. 14.34.11–12 – ... sive tormenti sive refrigerii apud inferos ... Respondebimus et <ad> haec [Marcion’s interpretation], ipsa scriptura revincente oculos eius, qui ad inferos discernerit 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 ἁδῷ, ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, [ὑπάρχων] ἐν βασάνοις, ['Αβραὰμ] ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, and ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ [αὐτοῦ]. In v. 26 the allusion in 4.34.11,

288 Harnack, Marcion, 220*.
289 πᾶς before ὁ ἀποκλειμένης is not present in B, D, L, 69, all OL manuscripts, and various other versions.
290 According to IGNTP the participles are uniformly attested in the manuscript tradition.
291 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 infernum 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.
292 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 μέγας. 293

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 molino294 saxo ad collum delicato 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 οὐχὶ and τὰ σκάνδαλα for v. 1, but the precise reading, and the Greek behind auctori scandalorum, cannot be determined.295 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 ἐμαρτάνω 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 συνέφερεν αὐτῷ, έἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ἦ έἰ μυλικὸς λίθος περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ περιέκειτο καὶ ἔρριπτο εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἦ ἵνα ἔνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων σκανδάλισῃ.296 First, though the attestation of συνέφερεν in d (συμφέρει in D and e) makes it possible that Marcion’s text read as Harnack reconstructed, the influence of Matt 18:6 (συμφέρει) 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.297 Third, Harnack noted that έἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη comes from Matt 26:24.298

293 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.
295 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.”
296 Harnack, Marcion, 222*-23*.
297 According to IGNTP, in addition to συνέφερεν, discussed above, περιέκειτο and ἔρριπτο are attested by D, a, d, r, e, and Basil of Caesarea. For these verbs Luke reads a present followed by a perfect.
298 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.  

Finally, Harnack is inclined to follow Tertullian’s word order, though the otherwise unattested μυλικὸς λίθος, περιέχειτο following the περί prepositional phrase, and σκανδαλίσῃ 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 curatone decem leprosorum, quos tantummodo ire iussos ut se ostenderent sacerdotibus, in itinere purgavit, sine tactu iam et sine verbo, tacita potestate et sola voluntate.  

Sed et quod in manifesto fuit legis praecepit: Ita, ostendite vos sacerdotibus.  

4.35.9 – In Samariae regionibus res agebatur, unde erat et unus interim ex leprosis.  

4.35.11 – Unde et unum illum solutum 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.  

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 ὁνδρές is to be understood, and if so, where it occurred in the phrase is not clear. Tertullian makes several references, including one


300 In 4.35.6, 10 Tertullian again makes reference to these “ten.”  

301 An additional allusion to Luke 17:14 occurs in 4.35.10. In 4.35.8 Tertullian makes the confusing statement Sed cur pristine leproso nihil tale praecept? 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.

302 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 est 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 ἵππως. Zahn rightly criticized the views of Hahn, Evangelium Marcions, 189 (insertion after v. 14) and Volckmar, 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 πορεύεntes ἐπιδείξατε ἐαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεύσιν ... ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν ... ἐκαθαρίσθησαν.303

For the verses attested only by Tertullian, in 4.35.9 he alludes to Σαμαρείας in v. 11 and [σὺτος ἡ] Σαμαρίτης in v. 16. In 4.35.11 Tertullian attests εἰς ... ἐξ αὐτῶν in v. 15;304 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: ἥ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.305

4.1.72 Luke 17:20–21

4.35.12 – Sed nec Pharisaei 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 ἐπερωτήθεις δὲ υπὸ 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.306 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.307 Harnack reconstructed οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· ἰδοὺ ὁμέν, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ·

303 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 δείκνυμι, which is why, without bringing Epiphanius’s testimony into the discussion, I here write ἐπιδείκνυμι.

304 Harnack apparently used the reference to giving glory to God (v. 18) to also reconstruct δοξάζων τῶν θεῶν 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.

305 For the word order see n. 104. Harnack apparently believed that miratus also reflected an element in Marcion’s text and therefore wrote (καὶ) ἄσωμασι τοῦτον (εἰ πεν σωτῷ) 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.

306 Harnack, Marcion, 224* reconstructed the verse the same way.

307 Ibid. and Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 441n4.
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.”

Tsutsui recognizes that the future is prevalent in the manuscript tradition with only l and s reading dicunt. 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. 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 does not include the second ἰδοὺ, noting however that ἦ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ is the reading of A, D, (W), Ψ, f 13, the Majority Text, OL, and sy·p·h. Finally, though numerous late witnesses omit ἦ before this second ἰδοὺ, 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 (αὐτόν?) πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆμαι… There are several difficulties with following Harnack’s suggested reading. First, though δεῖ after πρῶτον is omitted by a handful of manuscripts, it may here be a

---

308 Harnack, Marcion, 224*.
310 e reads dicens, and according to IGNTP all other witnesses attest the future.
311 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.
312 Harnack, Marcion, 224*. In Marcion1, 206* Harnack wrote “Ob ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τουτῆς 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 Ἡσ 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 τῶν υἱῶν ἄνθρωπου 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. 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 ἡμέρασι Νῦν (v. 26) and [ἐν] ταῖς ἡμέρασι Λῶτ (v. 28); however, nothing else from these verses can be reconstructed. For Luke 17:32, Tertullian’s question references the unproblematic μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λῶτ.

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. 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. 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 βοώντων πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός is only one of several problems. The otherwise unattested omission of δὲ has all the hallmarks of a simple omission by Tertullian. In

314 Tertullian’s admonet meminisse, however, could be rendering μνημονεύεται found in Ν, A, N, R, W, and several other manuscripts.
315 Harnack, Marcion, 224*.
316 For example, Harnack reconstructed προσεύχομαι 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.
317 Harnack, Marcion, 224*–25*.
addition, though the TR and most OL manuscripts attest ποιήσει, P²⁵, ¹⁸, B, D, and many other manuscripts read ποιήσῃ. 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? de praeceptis creatoris an ea sciret, id est faceret, expostulavit, ad contestandum praeceptoris creatoris vitam acquiri sempiternam. Cunque ille principaliora quaeque adfirmasset observasse se ab adulescentia:… 4.36.5 – Rescidite Christus priora praecepta non occidendi, non adulterandi, non furandi, non falsum testandi, diligendi patrem et matrem,… ati gloriosissimus ille observator praeceptorum pecuniam multo cariorem 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 διδόσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κλήρονομήσω. In 4.36.3 his citation of v. 19 attests [οὐδεὶς] ἀγαθὸς εἶ μὴ ἐίς ὁ θεός. Even apart from the evidence of the other sources, since Tertullian concludes his previous discussion with a reference to deus optimus et ultra 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 τοῖς ἐντολοῖς οἴδας (4.36.4, 7) and μὴ φονεύῃς, μὴ μοιχεύῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα (4.36.5), though Tertullian’s gerundives could also render the Matthean οὗ plus future tense of the verbs. In addition, the order μὴ φονεύῃς, μὴ μοιχεύῃς 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 [ταύτα πάντα] ἐφύλαξα/ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητος.

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?” 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. 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.

4.1.76 Luke 18:35, 37, 39, 43

4.36.9 – *Cum igitur praetereuntem illum caecus audisset,… Sed antecedentes increpabant caecum, uti taceret.* 14.36.12 – … *exterio re quoque visione donavit,…* 14.37.1 – … *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 προσάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ.322 οἱ δὲ is attested by D, e, d, r₁, 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

321 Braun, *Contre Marcion IV*, 448 also recognizes the allusion to v. 23.
322 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’, 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 ... αὐτόν ἔδωκεν τῷ θεῷ. According to IGNTP, the order αὐτόν 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 Ζακχεὺς (v. 2), 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 εἰ τινὸς τι ἐσυκοφάντησα, τετραπλοῦ ἀποδίδωμι. 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. Also, the order τετραπλοῦ 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 οἶκῳ. The order τούτῳ τῷ οἶκῳ is again attested by a few witnesses, including ff 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.


4.37.4 – Servorum quoque parabola, qui secundum rationem feneratae pecuniae dominicae diiudicantur,... etiam ex parte severitatis non tantum onerantem, verum

323 Harnack, Marcion, 227* erroneously indicated that the name appears in v. 1.
324 Ibid.
325 In Μ, D, and several other witnesses it precedes the verb, though elsewhere it follows.
326 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).
327 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.\textsuperscript{328}

Harnack rightly noted that there are only brief allusions to elements in the parable of the ten minas.\textsuperscript{329} In 4.37.4 there appear to be allusions to παρασκολύμν (v. 11) and δούλους ... ἐδώκεν 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 ἔχωντος) καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρβήσεται.\textsuperscript{330} A few witnesses, including Θ, 69, and sy, attest ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν; however, Tertullian may have been influenced by Luke 8:18 in his wording here.\textsuperscript{331} 4.37.4 concludes with an adaptation of σώτηρός ... ἄιρων/ἄιρω ὁ οὐκ ἔθηκα καὶ θερίζων/θερίζω ὁ οὐκ ἔστειρα (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.\textsuperscript{332}

\textbf{4.1.79 Luke 20: 5–6, 7–8}

4.38.1 – Puta illos renuntiasse humanum Ioannis baptisma: statim lapidibus elisi fuissent. | 4.38.2 – Sed de caelis fuit baptisma Iohannis. Et quare, inquit Christus, non credidistis et?... 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

\textsuperscript{328} An allusion back to this parable, and v. 13 in particular, occurs in 4.39.11.

\textsuperscript{329} Harnack, Marcion, 227*.

\textsuperscript{330} Ibid., 228*. If the reading honorantem is correct (see n. 327), the reference to “honor” could have v. 26a in view.

\textsuperscript{331} See the discussion of this verse in chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{332} 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/Creatur 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. In addition, the reference indicates that the Lukan καταληθάσει ἰμάς 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 συρραγῶν. The unlikelihood of the plural was already discussed in the previous chapter as it related to v. 4. His reconstruction of the quoted element of v. 5, διατή σὺ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ, is essentially unproblematic; yet, the absence of σῦν after δια τί could be a simple omission by Tertullian. 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 ἔγω λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.

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.


4.38.4 – Sadducaei, 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

---

333 Harnack, *Marcion*, 228* reconstructed ἰξ, which is attested in nearly all manuscripts; however, D, along with a, c, d, ff, and e, read ἀπό.

334 See the comments in the section on Luke 20:1, 4 and chapter 3, n. 346.

335 Harnack, *Marcion*, 228*.

336 Many manuscripts, including Θ and B, omit the conjunction, though it is attested in A, D, and numerous OL manuscripts.

337 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 κατί.
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 [τινς τῶν] Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες/λέγοντες ἀναστασιν [μὴ εἶναι] (v. 27). Second, ex lege probably arises due to Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν in v. 28. Third, there is a clear reference to ἔπτα ἀδελφοί and [λαβῶν] γυναῖκα (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 σὺτῶν γίνεται γυνὴ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει. 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 ἀποκριθεὶς found in several witnesses and the citation attests οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ταῦτα σαίώνος γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται. Curiously, Harnack did not follow Tertullian’s word order, reconstructing τοῦ σαίώνος τοῦ τοῦ. 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 τίνος τῶν γραμματέων ἐἴπαν διδασκάλε, καλῶς ἐἴπας.
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 ύμιν) δοκεῖ (περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; (τίνος) υἱός (ἐστιν; λέγουσιν σώτῆ) Δαυίδ [sic].

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. 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 ἔτιναι Δαυίδ 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. 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 Δαυίδ κύριον σώτον καλεῖ. 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 martyrium utique et in salutem. | 4.39.6 – Et hic igitur ipse cogitari vetat quid responderi oporteat apud tribunalia,... Et sapientiam ipsam, cui nemo resistet,... |
4.39.7 – Quid enim sapientius et incontradicibilius\textsuperscript{348}… Nec mirum si is cohibuit praecognitionem… 4.39.8 – A proximis quoque persecutiones et nominis, ex odio utique, blasphemiam praedicatum… 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 τοῦτων and διωξοῦσιν, along with “sufferings,” for v. 12.\textsuperscript{349} Significantly more problematic is the reference to v. 13, reconstructed by Harnack (ἀποβήσεται ύμῖν) εἰς μαρτύριον καὶ σωτηρίαν.\textsuperscript{350} Harnack recognized that καὶ σωτηρίαν is unattested elsewhere and contended that therefore it was an addition by Marcion.\textsuperscript{351} 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.”\textsuperscript{352}

In 4.39.6, 7 the allusions to v. 14 attest μὴ προμελετᾶν\textsuperscript{353} ἀπολογηθῆναι and those to v. 15 attest σοφίαν, ὅ ὡς δυνήσονται ἀντιστήναι οὐδὲν ἂν ἀντειπεῖν [πάντες].\textsuperscript{354} 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

\textsuperscript{348} Braun, \textit{Contre Marcion IV}, 480n3 observes that incontradicibilius, restored by Rigalti, is a neologism resulting from the biblical text where ἀντειπεῖν = contradicere follows ἀντιστήναι = resistere.

\textsuperscript{349} The reference to apud tribunalia in 4.39.6 could be referring to being brought ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἡγεμονίᾳ at the end of v. 12.

\textsuperscript{350} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 230*.\textsuperscript{351} Ibid. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 121 agrees, and the same view was held by Zahn, \textit{Geschichte}, 2:488.

\textsuperscript{352} Braun, \textit{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 \textit{et salvos eos faciet dominus illo die velut oves} (4.39.4).

\textsuperscript{353} Braun, \textit{Contre Marcion IV}, 481n5 notes that the hapax praecogitatio (4.39.7) once again arises from the biblical text.

\textsuperscript{354} Harnack, \textit{Marcion}, 230* overlooked \textit{cui nemo resistet} (4.39.6) and therefore only reconstructed (ἐγὼ δὲ υμῖν . .) σοφίαν. Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 121 included this allusion, but Braun, \textit{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 ἑσυτοῦς.355 Concerning this reading, though δὲ 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.356 In addition, it is difficult to determine whether salvos facietis vosmetipsos corresponds to a supposed σώσετε ἑσυτοῦς in Marcion’s text. Harnack raises the possible influence of Matt 24:13 for the reading,357 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,…358

The allusion to Luke 21:20 attests κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἰερουσαλήμ and ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. Harnack only reconstructed the first element,359 though the time excidii would seem also to attest the presence of the second.

355 Harnack, Marcion, 231*.
356 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.
357 Harnack, Marcion, 231*.
358 Moreschini follows the reading of R2. M, γ, R1, and R2 read an almost impossible Sed monstrato dehinc tempore excidium coepisse vallari exercitibus Hierusalem …. One could imagine that EXCIDIIDUM was erroneously copied as EXCIDIUM, thus partially explaining the origin of the reading.
359 Harnack, Marcion, 231*. 

4.39.16 – In summa ipsius parabolae considera exemplum: Adspice\(^{360}\) ficum et arbores omnes; cum fructum protulerint, intellegunt\(^{361}\) homines\(^{362}\) aestatem adpropinquasse;…\(^{363}\) 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 παραβολή and continues with a rendering of the nearly universally attested ἰδετε τὴν σκηνήν καὶ πάντα τὰ δέντρα (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.\(^{364}\) 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.\(^{365}\) Harnack reconstructed ὁταν προβάλοσιν τὸν καρπὸν (αὐτῶν), γινώσκοντι οἱ ἁνθρώποι, ὅτι τὸ θέρος ἠγγίκεν\(^{366}\) 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 protulerent; yet, it is not certain that this was the reading of Marcion’s text. γινώσκοντι οἱ ἁνθρώποι is unattested elsewhere and Braun calls intellegunt homines a “tournoure générale” that shows “qu’il s’agit d’une citation très libre.”\(^{367}\) Harnack noted that the final phrase was

\(^{360}\) Kroymann corrected the reading to aspicite, a correction for which Braun contends there is no reason (Contre Marcion IV, 491n3).

\(^{361}\) Moreschini follows the reading of M, γ, Pamelius, and the subsequent editors. R and Gelenius read intellegent.

\(^{362}\) 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.


\(^{364}\) Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 491n3. Harnack, Marcion, 231* reconstructed the text as above, thus also not following Tertullian’s word order.

\(^{365}\) See the discussion on Luke 21:31.

\(^{366}\) Harnack, Marcion, 231*–32*.

\(^{367}\) Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 491n3.
unattested, though it should be noted that IGNTP lists several witnesses for the very similar τὸ θέρος ἔγγυς ἔστιν. 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.

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 ἦ γενεὰ ἀώτη with ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἦ γη. This view, however, though possible cannot be proved with certainty. Therefore, it is also not possible to know how closely nisi omnia peragantur is rendering Marcion’s text.

### 4.1.86 Luke 21:34–35a

4.39.18 – *Admoneantur et discipuli, ne quando graventur 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 ἣσαυτοίς), μήποτε βαρθεώσιν ύμῶν αἱ καρδίαι (ἐν) κραυγάλη καὶ μέθη καὶ βιωτικάς μερίμνας, καὶ ἐπιστῇ ἐφ’ ύμοῖς αἰφνίδιος ἢ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη ως παγίς. It is curious that Harnack followed Tertullian’s word order for

---


369 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.


371 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.

372 Harnack reconstructed ἐι μὴ πάντα γένηται (?) (*Marcion*, 232*).

373 Ibid.
saecularibus curis (βιωτικαίς 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 ἑπιστῇ ἐφ’ ὑμῶς αἱψεῦδιος, given that Tertullian, throughout this citation, may not be reflecting the precise reading of Marcion’s text, the reading αἱψεῦδιος ἐφ’ ὑμῶς ἑπιστῇ, attested by numerous manuscripts, cannot be ruled out. Two final, minor points are that Tertullian’s Latin cannot reveal whether Marcion’s text read βαρθῆσαι or βαρσὺσαι with D and the TR, amongst others, or whether the definite article appeared before ἤμερο. 374


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 ἤμερας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδασκῶν and τὰς [δὲ] νύκτας ἔξερχόμενος … εἰς … Ἑλαιών. 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 Ἑλαιών; 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 ὀρθηρίζειν and ὀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

4.1.88 Luke 22:1

4.40.1 – Nam e[t] tot festis Iudaeorum paschae diem <el>egit.

374 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.\textsuperscript{375}

### 4.1.89 Luke 22:3–5

4.40.2 – *Poterat et ab extraneo quolibet tradi,*\textsuperscript{376} ... *Poterat et sine praemio tradi.*

5.6.7 – ... *scriptum est enim apud me Satanas 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.\textsuperscript{377} 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.\textsuperscript{378} 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 (Ὁντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα) in view, even if the precise wording is unrecoverable. For v. 4, Tertullian only attests παροδῶ, 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.*\textsuperscript{379} 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 ὀσσάτως ... (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον) ἢ (καινη γεστριχεν!) διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου.\textsuperscript{380} 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 τούτο τὸ ποτήριον; yet, even if it does, it is not clear that ὀσσάτως

\textsuperscript{375} Harnack, *Marcion*, 232* also reconstructed ἔφοτήθι; however, is not clear that the festis in Tertullian’s phrase is referring to ἔφοτήθι in the phrase ἢ ἔφοτήθι τῶν αξύμων.

\textsuperscript{376} An additional allusion to Luke 22:5 occurs in 3.23.5.

\textsuperscript{377} Also noted by Harnack, *Marcion*, 232* and Zahn, *Geschichte*, 2:490.

\textsuperscript{378} Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 122–23.

\textsuperscript{379} An additional allusion to Luke 22:20 occurs in 4.40.6.

\textsuperscript{380} Harnack, *Marcion*, 233*. 

---
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followed ποτήριον in Marcion’s text instead of being clause initial.\(^{381}\) Second, Harnack contended that Marcion omitted καὶ νη\(\) 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.\(^{382}\) Given this fact, and that the Matthean and Markan parallels do not contain καὶ νη\(\), it should perhaps be questioned how certain the omission really is.\(^{383}\) Not only is it based on Tertullian’s silence, but, as Braun also notes, Tertullian adds the word oblignatum to the reference.\(^{384}\) 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 οὐκαὶ δι’ οὗ παραδίδοται ὁ οὐίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.\(^{385}\) Tsutsui contends that v. 22a must have been excised by Marcion because of the κατὰ τὸ ὄρισμάνυν, an omission confirmed by the introduction of an explicit subject in v. 22b.\(^{386}\) Though possible, Tertullian’s silence does not necessitate the excision, and filius hominex could be Tertullian’s own clarification of the subject of traditur or due to the influence of Matt 26:24.\(^{387}\) Finally, Harnack believed that Marcion’s text read “mit D e syr\(^\text{\textsuperscript{e}}\)” ; however, D and e actually attest οὐκαὶ ἐκεῖνο. Based on the likelihood that Tertullian’s citation here is not particularly precise, what followed immediately after οὐκαὶ in Marcion’s text remains unclear.


4.41.2 – Nam et Petrum praesumptorie aliquid elocutum negationi potius destinando zeloten deum tibi ostendit.

\(^{381}\) The former is the reading of P\(^\text{75}\), S, B, L, and a few other witnesses.

\(^{382}\) Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 123.

\(^{383}\) 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).

\(^{384}\) Braun, Contre Marcion IV, 500n3.

\(^{385}\) Harnack, Marcion, 233*.


\(^{387}\) 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 ἀπαρμήσῃ.\(^{388}\)

### 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.


4.41.3 – *Perductus in conessum an ipse esset Christus interrogator…. Si dixero enim, inquit, vobis, non credetis.\(^{389}\)* 4.41.4 – … Ergo, inquint, 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 το συνέδριον, v. 69 is multiply cited. Tertullian’s opening reference in 4.41.3 attests ἀνήγαγον\(^{390}\) 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 εἶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἶ πῶν ήμῖν, as Harnack apparently believed,\(^{391}\) 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 εἰπῷ ύμιν, οὐ μὴ πιστεύῃτε\(^{392}\), however, though the order εἰπὼν 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 εἰπὼν.

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

---

388 This word is also the only one reconstructed by Harnack, *Marcion*, 233*.
389 Though θ and Gelanius read *creditis*, Moreschini follows Pamelius and the other editors in reading *creditis*.
390 The reading ἀνήγαγον, attested in manuscripts including A, L, W, and the Majority Text is less likely but cannot be ruled out entirely.
391 Harnack, *Marcion*, 234* reconstructed εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός …
392 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 ἐὰν 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 ἐγώ εἰμι, gestrichen).393 This view is possible, though ultimately not provable.394 Some element of ambiguity is present in Jesus’ reply and the presence of the last three words would not necessarily negate Marcion’s interpretation.395 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,396 Braun argues that the final statement of 4.41.5 reveals the response of the Sanhedrin, which interpreted Jesus’ reply as an affirmation.397 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 dicas,…

393 Ibid. Lukas, Rhetorik, 323 agrees, writing “Bei der postwendend erfolgenden Antwort Jesu änderte Marcion offensichtlich den biblischen Text ab. Er las einzigen: vos dicitis und ließ die ursprüngliche Ergänzung ὅτι εγώ εἰμι 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.

394 It is worth noting that i also omits these words.


397 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 ἠγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον (v. 1) and the final accusation of v. 2, which Harnack reconstructed λέγοντα ἐαυτὸν βασιλέα Χριστόν. 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 ἐνοι.

The introduction to the citation from Luke 23:3 attests ὁ Πιλάτος [ἐπʼ ἡρώτησεν.³⁹⁹] 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.”⁴⁰⁰ 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.⁴⁰¹ 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.⁴⁰² 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.⁴⁰³

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.

³⁹⁸ Harnack, Marcion, 235*.
³⁹⁹ Since only one Coptic manuscript attests the omission of δε 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 NA²⁷², though the latter is supported by A, D, and the Majority Text, amongst other manuscripts.
⁴⁰⁰ Harnack, Marcion, 60.
⁴⁰¹ Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 125 also questions Harnack’s view.
⁴⁰² Tsutsui, “Evangelium,” 72–73, 125.
⁴⁰³ 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 Ἰησοῦν (v. 7). In v. 8 Tertullian alludes to the opening phrase, nearly uniformly attested in the manuscript tradition, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἐκάθισεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦν ἐκάθισεν. 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.


4.42.4 – 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 Βορσεββᾶν (v. 18) and probably to the crimes of insurrection and murder (v. 19). 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.


4.42.4 – Sed et duo scelesti circumfiguntur illi,… Vestitum plane eius a militibus divisum, partim sorti concessum, Marcion abstulit,…

Luke 23:33–34 is also attested by Epiphanius. Tertullian’s allusion to vv. 32–33 attests the “two criminals” (v. 32) and the circumfiguntur probably refers to the criminals being crucified on either side of Jesus (v. 33), even if the precise wording

---

404 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 (Πειλᾶτος) for ἀνέπεμψεν in v. 7, which is not required by Tertullian’s comment and is otherwise unattested.

405 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 Ν, the Persian Diatessaron, and three manuscripts of sa.

406 διὰ στάσειν and φόνον are nearly universally attested in the manuscript tradition with the latter only absent in a and the Persian Diatessaron.

407 The allusion cannot determine whether the order was κοκούργοι δυο, with Ρ75, Ν, and B, or δυο κακούργοι.
cannot be reconstructed. In addition, Tertullian overtly states that Marcion excised διαμετριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐξαλον κλήρους (v. 34).


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 sepultorem 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 sepulcrum 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 ἠτίσατο τὸ σῶμα (v. 52) and καθελὼν 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 συγκαταστεθείμενος (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

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 arbitrabantur.... Revertentes quoque a sepulcro mulieres et ab illa angelorum visione ad remunctiandam scilicet domini resurrectionem. l 4.43.3 – Bene autem quod incredulitas discipulorum perseverabat,.... l 4.43.5 – An eadem et angeli ad mulieres: Rememoramini quae locutus sit vobis in Galilaea, dicens quod oportet tradire filium hominis et crucifigisset tertia die resurgeret?

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 (ὤθρον βασέως) ἡλθον ἐπι το μνήμα (φέρουσαι) ᾧ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα. 410 Most of this reconstruction is unproblematic, though Tertullian’s reference to ante lucem seems quite clearly to refer to ὤθρον βασέως and the precise position of ἡλθον in the sentence remains obscure. 411

In 4.43.2 Tertullian first may allude to ἐν τῷ ἀπορείσθωι αὐτοῖς περὶ τούτου (v. 4a) and then provide the reason by referencing the unproblematic όχι εὕρον τὸ σῶμα in v. 3. 412 Tertullian continues by mentioning the “two men” in v. 4b, 413 where Harnack rightly noted that angeli is likely Tertullian’s own terminology. 414 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 ὑποστέφασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μυμείου ἀπήγγειλαν τοῦτα πάντα, 415 and in 4.43.3 the persistence of unbelief alludes to καὶ ἥπιστουσι αὐταῖς (v. 11). Tertullian’s testimony to the words

409 Moreschini follows the reading of R2 and R3, M, γ, and R1 read tamen figi, though in his first edition Rhenanus also conjectured carnem figi as the reading.

410 Harnack, Marcion, 237*.

411 IGNTP indicates that it is attested before ὤθρον, after βασέως, and after μνήμα.

412 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 precision emphatique” (“Le chapitre 24,” 27) cannot be substantiated by Tertullian’s silence.

413 Yet again, whether the word order was ἄνδρες δυο or δυο ἄνδρες cannot be determined.

414 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.

415 The order πάντα ταῦτα found in Ν, 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 μυμείου is attested as present by Tertullian.
of the men to the women attests μηνίσθητε ὅσα ἔλαλησέν ὑμῖν … ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ (v. 6) ἱέγουν ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου … καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήναι (v. 7). The word order tradi filium hominis, however, may be due to Tertullian as IGNTP 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, inquunt, ipsum esse redemptorem Israelis,… 14.43.4 – 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. δῦο ἔξω σύντων (v. 13) and ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας (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 λυτρωτής τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Harnack believed ἐνομίζομεν to be otherwise unattested, but IGNTP 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 ἥ[or ἐ]λπίζομεν with putabamus. 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. Tertullian’s testimony to v. 25 is found in the quotation in 4.43.4, which

---

416 Harnack, Marcion, 238*. rightly observed “Das bei Tert. fehlende ἢτι γὰν nach ὑμῖν ist vielleicht zufällig von ihm übergangen.” IGNTP lists only lectionary 184 as also attesting the omission.

417 Harnack, Marcion, 238*.

418 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.

419 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 ὃ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ὁς 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 (ὁς ἐλάλησεν ὁ προφήται).

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 βρωσίμου. 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 κηρυχθήσαι … εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

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).

420 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).

421 Harnack, Marcion, 239*-40*.

422 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.¹ 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

¹ 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. 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. 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].

---

2 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.”

3 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 κριτήριον or δικαστήριον and that the NA27 apparatus reflects this fact. Given, however, that the former is the reading of both early and varied witnesses such as P75, N, B, and D it seems slightly more likely that this reading was also found in Maricon’s text. Thus, I have considered Tertullian’s iudicem to be “probably” instead of simply “possibly” rendering κριτήριον. 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 κριτήριον having appeared in Maricon’s Gospel.

4 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 ... ἐξεπλήσσομαι δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐν ἔξουσίᾳ ἢν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

4:34 ... τί ἦμιν καὶ σοὶ Ἰησοῦς [Ναζαρηνεί 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 ἐπιτίθεις ἐθεράπευεν αὐτοῦ.

4:41 ἐξήρχοντο [δὲ καὶ likely present] δαμόνια ... κραυγάζοντα ... σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. [καὶ likely present] ἐπιτιμῶν (οὐκ εἰσ ἄυτα λαλεῖν) ...

4:42 ... ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον ... οἱ χολοὶ ... κατείχον αὐτῶν ...

4:43 ... (δεῖ με καὶ ταῖς ἔτεραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι) τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ...

5:2 ... (οἱ ἀλιείς) ...

5:9 θάμβος (γὰρ περιέσχει) αὐτὸν ... ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγρᾷ τῶν ἰχθυών ...

5:10 ... υἱὸς Ζεβεδαίου ... (τῶν Σίμων) ... (ἐπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα) μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γὰρ ἀνθρώπος ἐστὶν ζωγράφων.

5:11 ... πλοῖα ... ἀφέντες ... ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῶ.

5:12 ... λέπρας ...

5:13 ... ἡψατο ... (λέγων, Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἢ λέπρα αἵτινες ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ).

5:17 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

5:18 ... (ἀνθρωπον ὅς ἦν παραλειμένος) ...

5:20 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

5:21 ... τίς [δύναται likely present] {ἀφεῖναι ἀμαρτίας} εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ θεὸς.

5:26 ... (ἐξίδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον).

5:27 ... τελεῶν ... (ἐπεν αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι)

corrections 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 ... metà tòn telowôn (kai ἀμαρτωλῶν) ... 
5:31 ... ou xreíαιν ἔχουσιν οἱ ύπερβαίνοντες ἑαυτοῦ ἄλλα οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. 
5:35 ... ἕταν ἀπαρθή ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νύμφιος ... νηστεύουσιν ... 
6:1 ... ἐν σαββάτω ... ἐπείνασαν οἱ μαθηταί, ἔτιλλον τοὺς στάχυας ψύχοντες ταῖς χεραῖ. 
6:2 ... τῶν Φαρισαίων ... 
6:6 ... χείρ ... ἕηρα. 
6:7 παρετηροῦντο ... οἱ Φαρισαίοι (εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει, ἵνα εύρωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ). 
6:9 ... Ἐξεστιν τοῖς σαββάσιν ἀγαθοποιηθεὶς ἢ μή, ψυχήν σώσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι; 
6:12 ... ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος ... διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ... 
6:13 ... ἐκλεξάμενος ... διάδεκα ... ἀποστόλους ... 
6:14 Σίμων ... ἀνόμασεν Πέτρον ... 
6:21 μακάριοι οἱ πεινώντες ... ὁτι χορτασθήσονται. μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες ... ὁτι γελάσοσιν. 
6:22 μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν [μισήσουσιν ὑμᾶς] οἱ ἀνθρώποι ... καὶ ὄνειδίσουσιν καὶ ἐκβαλοῦσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν ἐνεκα τοῦ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 
6:25 οὐάι [ὕμιν may have been present] οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι [위원 likely not present], ὁτι πεινάσετε. οὐάι [ὕμιν may have been present] οἱ γελώντες νῦν, ὁτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαίσετε. 
6:26 οὐάι [ὕμιν may have been present] ὅταν [ὑμᾶς καλῶς ἐπώσιν] [ἱπτής may not have been present] οἱ ἀνθρώποι κατὰ ταῦτα [γὰρ may have been present] ἐποίουσι καὶ τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν. 
6:30α παντί ... αἰτοῦνΤά σε δίδου ... 
6:31 καὶ καθὼς [ὕμιν γίνοισθαι θέλετε] παρὰ [τῶν may have been present] ἀνθρώπων, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς. 
6:34α καὶ ἕαυ δανίσετε παρ' ὅν ἐλπίζετε ὑμεῖς ἀπολαβεῖν, ποία [χάρις ἐστὶν ὑμῖν]...
6:35b ... καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱῶ θεοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.

6:36 γίνεσθε [οὐν likely not present] ὀικτίμοιν, καθὼς [καὶ may not have been present] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀκόμη ὑμᾶς.


6:39 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

6:40 οὐκ ἐστιν μαθητής ὑπὲρ τῶν διδάσκαλων [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 ἀ 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 ... ἐθόξαζον τὸν θεόν ... [ὁτί likely present] [μέγας προφήτης] ἐγήγερται ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ [ὁτί likely present] ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεός 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 ἐξῆλθατε {θεάσασθαι εἰς τὴν ἐρμον}; ... 

7:26 ... προφήτην ... ναὶ ... καὶ περισσότερον.

7:28 ... μείζων (ἐν γεννητοῖς) γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου (οὐδείς ἐστίν): (ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν).

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 Ἡραίδου ... αἴτινες καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῶι ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς.
8:4 ... διὰ παραβολῆς.
8:8 ... ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούετω.
8:16 (οὐδείς) ... λύχνου ... καλύπτει ...
8:17 ... κρυπτόν ... φανερὸν γενήσεται ...
8:18 βλέπετε ... πῶς ἀκούετε ὁ δὲ ἐχὴ δοθησατοι αὐτῶι [δὲ likely not present, though καὶ may have been present] ὁ ὁ μὴ ἔχη, καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀφθισθατι αὐτοῦ. 
8:21 τὶς μοι μήτηρ καὶ τίνες μοι ἀδέλφοι, ἐὰν οἱ τοὺς λόγους μου ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιούντες αὐτοὺς.
8:22 ... διέλθομεν εἰς τὸ πέραν ...
8:25 ... τὶς δὲ οὕτως ἔστιν, ὃς [καὶ may have been present] τοῖς ἀνέμοις {καὶ τῇ βαλάσσῃ ἐπιτάσσει};
8:27 ... ἀνήρ ... δαμιόνια ...
8:28 ... Ἡσαῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ... μὴ με βασανίσης.
8:31 ... παρεκάλουν ... εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσον ...
8:32 ... (ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς).
8:43 ... γυνὴ τὶς (οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἴματος) ...
8:48 ... ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε ...
9:5 ... μὴ δέξωνται [ὑμᾶς likely present] ... {τὸν κοινορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν [ὑμῶν likely present] ἀποτιναξετε} εἰς μαρτύριον ...
9:7 ... Ἡραίδης ... ὑπὸ τινῶν (ὅτι) ἰσαννης (ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρωῦ).
9:8 ύπὸ τινῶν ... Ἡλίας ... ἀλλῶν ... (ὅτι) προφήτης εἰς τῶν ἀρχαίων (ἀνέστη).
9:12 ... ἐν ἐρήμω ...
9:13 ... ἄρτοι ... καὶ ἱχθύες ...
9:14 ... {ἀνδρεῖς πεντακσιοχίλιοι} ...
9:17 ... τὸ περισσέουσαν ...

9:21 ... παρὴγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο.

9:24 ὁς [γὰρ ἄν likely present] θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπὸλέσῃ αὐτὴν καὶ ὁς ἀπολέσῃ αὐτὴν ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ ... σώσει αὐτὴν.

9:26 ὁς [γὰρ likely present] ἀν ἐπασχυνθῇ με {καγω ἐπασχυνθήσουμαι} αὐτῶν [v. 26b may have been omitted]

9:28 ... (παραλαβών Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος ...

9:29 ... καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ [λευκὸς likely present] ἔξαστράτησεν.

9:32 ... εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ... [Moses and Elijah] συνεστῶτας αὐτῶ.5

9:33 ... (ἐν τῷ διαχωρίσεθαι ...) ὁ Πέτρος ... καλὸν ἐστίν {ὅδε ἡμῶς} εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσαμεν ὅδε τρεῖς σκηνὰς, {μίαν σοί καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἡλίᾳ μίαν}, μή εἰδὼς ὁ 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 ... ἀκολουθήσας σοι ὁποῖον ἀν ἀπέρχη.

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 ὁπίσω ...  

10:1 ... ἀνέδειξεν ... ἐτέρους ἐβδομήκοντα ... ἀπέστειλεν ... εἰς ... πόλιν ...

10:4 ... μὴ δε ῥαβδου, μὴ ὑποδήματα ... μηδένα κατὰ τὴν όδον ἀσπάσσομε.
10:5 εἰς ἥν ... ἀν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν ... λέγετε· εἰρήνη (τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ).
10:7 ... ἄξιος [γάρ may have been present] ὁ ἠργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ ... 
10:8 ... δέχωνται ...
10:9 ... (λέγετε αὐτοῖς) ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἡγισε διὰ τῆς τοῦ αὐτοῦ οἰκίας.
10:10 ... μὴ δέχονται ὑμᾶς ... (εἰπάτε).
10:11 ... τὸν κοινορτόν ... (αἵματοςσωμάτων) ... πλήν ... γινώσκετε [ὅτι likely present] ἡγισε διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.
10:16 ... ὁ (ἄθετον ὑμᾶς) ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ ... 
10:19 ... (δίδωμι σὺ δίδωσα) ... τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατείν ἐπάνω ... ὀφεῖλε καὶ σκορπίζων ...
10:23 ... μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί οἱ βλέποντες ἐπὶ βλέπετε.
10:24 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι προφῆται σοὶ εἶδαν, σὺ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε.
11:1 ... ἐν τῷ ἐγένετον τοῖς προσευχομένοις (ἐὰν πιέλει τις τὸν μαθητήν) [καὶ may have been present] ἐκδίδαξεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ.
11:2 πατέρ [ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς likely not present] ... τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ... ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου.
11:4 ... ἀφεῖ ... τὰς ἁμαρτίαςς ... μὴ ἀφεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσενεχθῆναι εἰς πειρασμόν.
11:7 ... (καὶ τὰ παιδία μου μετ’ ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τὴν κοίτην εἰσών) ... 
11:8 ... (εἰ καὶ οὐ δῶσει αὐτῷ ἁμαρτάνει διὰ τὸ ἐνίαι φίλου αὐτοῦ, διὰ γε τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ) ...
11:14 ... δαιμόνιον ... κακόν ...
11:15 ... ἐν θελεξεβούλ ... ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.
11:18 (εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῦ διεμερίσθη) ...
11:19 εἰ [δὲ likely present] ἔγω ἐν θελεξεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱὸι ὑμῶν ἐν τέν ἐκβάλλουσιν: ...
11:20 εἰ δὲ ἔγω ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἃρα ἡγισε διὰ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
11:21 ... ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος ...
11:22 ... Ἰσχυρότερος ... (νικήσῃς or νικήσει) ...
11:28 ... μενοῦν ... μακάριοι οἱ ἀκοῦοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ποιοῦντες ...
11:33 ... λύχνου ... (εἶς κρύπτην) ... ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ... ἵνα πάσι λάμπῃ ...
11:37 ... ἐρωτᾷ αὐτὸν Φαρισαίος ... ὁπως {Ἀριστήνη (παρ’ αὐτῷ)} ... ἀνέπεσεν.
11:38 ... ἧρατο) {διακρεινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ} (λέγει) διὰ τι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη ...
11:39 ... (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι) {τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος τὸ ἔξωθεν} καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ύμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγής καὶ πονηρίας.
11:40 ... οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν;
11:41 ... δότε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐλεημοσύνην ... πάντα καθαρά {ἔσται ὑμῖν}.
11:43 ... πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ... ἀσπασμοὺς ...
11:46 ... (καὶ ὑμῖν τοὺς νομικοὺς οὐαι) ὅτι φορτίζετε (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους) φορτία δυσβάστακτα ... τῷ δακτύλῳ ... (οὐ) προσφαίετε ...
11:48 ... μαρτυρεῖτε μὴ συνεδοκεῖν τοῖς ἑργοῖς τῶν πατέρων ύμῶν ...
11:52 ... τοῖς νομικοῖς ... τὴν κλείδα τῆς γνώσεως (αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε).
12:1 ... (ἡξεταὶ λέγειν) πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ... προσέχετε ... ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης {τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἤτις ἐστὶν υπόκρισις}.
12:2 οὐδὲν δὲ σὺ(ν γ)κεκαλυμμένον [ἔστιν likely present], ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθῆσαι, καὶ οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθῇσαι.
12:3 ... (πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἑλάσθησα) ... (κηρυχθῆσαι) ...
12:9 ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενος μὲ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπαρνηθῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ {τῶν ἀγγέλων likely not present, though a final decision requires the reconstruction of 12:8 where the evidence of Epiphanius must be taken into account]
12:10 [καὶ πάς may have been present] ὁς ᾧ ἐπὶ [λόγου likely present] εἰς τὸν ύιόν του ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, ὃς δ’ ᾧ ἐπὶ εἰς {τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιον}, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.
12:11 ἐπὶ ... τὰς ἀρχὰς ... (μὴ μεριμνήσατε πώς ἢ τί ἀπολογήσασθε ἢ τί εἴπητε).

12:12 τὸ γὰρ ἄγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὁρᾷ, ὥς δὲ εἰπέν.

12:13 ... τίς ... εἴπε τῶ ἄδελφῳ μου μερίσασθαι μετ’ ἐμοῦ τῇ κληρονομίᾳ.

12:14 ... τίς μὲ κατέστησεν κριτὴν [ἵνα μερισθήν may not have been present] ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς.

12:16 ... παραβολήν ... (ἀνθρώπου τινός) πλουσίου ...

12:19 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

12:20 εἶπεν [-deals likely present] αὐτῷ ὁ θεός· ἀφρωδὲς, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν [ἀπὸ σοῦ may have been present] ὥς ἢ ἦτοιμασας, τίνος ἔστατι;

12:22 ... (μὴ μεριμνᾷτε) τῇ ψυχῇ (τί φάγητε, μηδὲ) τῷ σῶματι (τί ἐνδύσησθε).

12:23 ἢ ... ψυχῇ (πλείον ἐστιν) τῆς τροφῆς ... τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος.

12:24 ... κόρακας ... οὗ σπείρουσιν οὓδε θερίζουσιν οὓδε συνάγουσιν εἰς ἁποθήκας [καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς attested though likely not present] ...

12:27 ... τὰ κρίνα ... {οὐχ ὑφαίνει οὓδε νήθει} ... οὔδε Σολομῶν (ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἐν τούτων).

12:28 ... τὸν χόρτον ... ὁ θεὸς ἀμφιέξει attested though likely not present] ... ὀλιγόμοιτοι.

12:35 ... αἱ όσφύες περιεξωσμέναι ... οἱ λύχνοι κατίμενοι.

12:36 ... προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ... ἀναλύσῃ ἐκ τῶν γάμων ...

12:37 ... δούλοι ... κύριος ...

12:39 εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδοστότης ποίᾳ ὁρᾷ ὁ κλέπτης (ἔρχεται), [ἦγερνότατον ὃ ἐν καὶ likely not present] οὐκ ἐν ἀφήκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἴκον αὐτοῦ.

12:40 ... γίνεσθε ἔτοιμαι, ὅτι ἢ ὁρᾷ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

12:41 ... ὁ Πέτρος ... πρὸς ἡμᾶς (ἥ καὶ πρὸς πάντας τὴν παραβολὴν ... λέγεις);

12:42 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

12:43 ... ἔλθων ὁ κύριος ...
12:44 … ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν [άυτοῦ likely present] καταστήσει αὐτόν.
12:45 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]
12:49a πῦρ ἥλθον βαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γῆν …
12:51 δοκεῖτε [ὅτι likely present] {παρεγενόμην εἰρήνην βαλεῖν} ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, οὕτω, λέγοντα ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ διαμερισμὸν.
12:53 διαμερισθῆται πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί, καὶ μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρὶ καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρί, καὶ πενθερά ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην … καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν …
12:56 ὑποκριταῖ, τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς δοκιμάζετε, {τὸν δὲ καὶροῦ} τοῦτον [πῶς may not have been present] οὐκ ὦ δάτη δοκιμάζειν.
12:57 … καὶ ἂφ’ ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον.
12:59 … οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθης ἐκείθεν ἐως καὶ ἁποδῶς τὸν ἔσχατον κοιμάσῃν.
13:14 (τῷ σαββάτῳ ἑθεράπευσεν) …
13:15 … ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν τοῖς σάββασιν οὐ λύει {τὸν ὄνον ἤ τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ} ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγόν ποτίζει.
13:19 ὡμοία ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ κόκκωρ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐσπειρεῖν ἐν τῷ κῆπῳ ἑαυτοῦ.
13:20 … τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
13:21 ὡμοία ἐστίν ζύμη …
13:25 ἂφ’ οὐ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν … κρούειν … ἀποκριθεὶς (ἐρεῖ) … οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμῶς likely present] πόθεν ἔστε.
13:26 … ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίσχες καὶ ἐν τοῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας.
13:27 … ἀπόστητε ἀπ’ ἐμοὶ πάντες ἐργάται ἀνομίας.
14:12 … ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον … φῶνει …
14:14 … οὐκ ἐχοῦσαι ἀνταποδοῦναί … ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει …
14:16 … ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίησε δεῖπνον [μέγα may have been present] καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοὺς.
14:17 … ἀπέστειλεν …
14:18 ... (ἵρξαντο) ... παρατείσθαι ... ἀγρόν ἱγόρασα ...

14:19 ... (ζεύγη) βοῦν ἱγόρασα ...

14:20 ... γυναῖκα ἔγημα ...

14:21 ... ἀπήγγειλεν ... τότε ἐπαρβείς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ... ἥξελθε ... εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ρύμας τῆς πόλεως ...

14:22 ... ἔτι τόπος ἔστιν.

14:23 ... εἰς τὰς ὀδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς ...

14:24 ... οὐδείς ... γεύσεται ...

15:3 ... παραβολήν ...

15:4 ... πρόβατα ... ἀπολέσας ...

15:5 ... εὑρόν ...

15:6 ... συγχάρητέ ...

15:7 [the allusion to χαρά ... ἐπὶ ... ἀμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι may have come from this verse]

15:8 ... δραχμάς ... ἀπολέσῃ ... ζητεί ...

15:9 ... εὐρόσα ... συγχάρητέ ...

15:10 [the allusion to χαρά ... ἐπὶ ... ἀμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι may have come from this verse; τὸν ἀγγέλου 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 ἔγνω ὡς καγώ) {λέγω ὑμῖν}, {ποιήσατε ὑμῖν} φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας ...

16:11 εἰ [οὖν may have been present] ἐν τῷ {μαμωνᾷ ἀδίκῳ} πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύει;
16:12 [καὶ likely present] εἰ ἐν τῷ ἄλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐχ εὑρέθητε, τὸ ἐμὸν τίς (δῶσει ἕμιν);

16:14 … οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι … ἡγομνήσθησαν …

16:15 … ὑμεῖς ἔστε οἱ δικαιούντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων … ὁ δὲ θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, τὸ ψῆφισμάν ἐστὶν παρὰ ἀνθρώποις βδέλυγμα ἐστὶν τῷ θεῷ.

16:17 εὐκοπῶστερον … 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 ἐτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ … ὁ ἀπολυμαίνων ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν ἀμοίβας μοιχός ἐστιν.

17:2 συνέφερεν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννηθή ἦ ἐν {μιλικὸς λίθος} {περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ περιέκειτο} καὶ ἔρρίπτω εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ {ἵνα ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων σκανδαλίσῃ}.

17:3 … ἀμαρτῇ … ὁ ἀδελφός … ἐπιτίμησαν …

17:4 … ἔδω ἐπτάκις [τῆς ἡμέρας likely present] ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ … (ἀφήσεις or ἀφεῖς) …

17:11 … Σαμαρείας …

17:15 εἰς [δὲ likely present] ἔξ 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 ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ … οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.

17:21 οὐδὲ λέγουσιν ἴδου ὡς … ἴδου ἐκεῖ; ἴδου γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.

17:25 πρῶτου [δὲ may have been present] δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν ἄνθρωπον πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι …
17:26 ... (εἰ) ταῖς ἡμέραις Νῶε ...  
17:28 ... (εἰ) ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ ...  
17:32 μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ.  
18:1 ... παραβολήν ... ( πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐγκακεῖν)  
18:2 ... κριτής ...  
18:3 χήρα ...  
18:5 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]  
18:7 ὁ [δὲ likely present] θεός ... ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ...  
18:10 (ἀνθρωπόι δύο) ... εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσεύχεσθαι ... Φαρίσαιος ... 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᾽ ἐκεῖνον) ...  
18:23 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]  
18:39 οἱ δὲ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων τὰ νυφλῳν ἵνα σιγήσῃ ...  
19:2 ... Ζαχαρίας ...  
19:6 ... ὑπεδέξατο αὐτοῦ ...  
19:8 ... τὰ ἡμίσια ... τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ... { (τοῖς πτωχοῖς) δίδωμι }, καὶ εἰ τινὸς τῇ ἐσωκοφάντησα, { τετραπλοῦν ἀποδίδωμι }.  
19:9 ... σήμερον σωτηρία (τούτω τῷ οίκῳ) ...  
19:10 ἧλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ζητήσαι καὶ may not have been present] σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.  
19:11 ... παραβολήν ...  
19:13 ... δούλους ... ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ... μνάς ...  
19:22 ... αὐστηρός ... ἄρων ὁ οὐκ ἔθηκα καὶ ἑβρίζων ὁ οὐκ ἔστειρα.
19:23 ... (σὺν τόκῳ) ...
19:26 ... καὶ ὁ δοκεῖ ἐχεῖν αἰρθήσεται ...
20:1 ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ...
20:4 τὸ βάπτισμα [the presence or absence of τὸ cannot be determined] ἵνα καὶ ἐξ υἱῶν ᾧν ἦν ἦν ἔως ἀνθρώπων.
20:5 ... ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ... διὰ τί ... οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ.
20:6 ... ἀνθρώπων ... καταληθῆσαι ἡμᾶς ...
20:7 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]
20:8 ... οὗδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποιᾷ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ.
20:24 ... δηνάριον ... Καίσαρος.
20:25 ... ἀπόδοτε [τοίνυν may have been present here or before the verb] τὰ [the presence or absence of τοῦ cannot be determined] Καίσαρος [the presence or absence of τῷ cannot be determined] Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.
20:27 ... (τίνες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ λέγοντες ἀναστασιν μὴ εἶναι) ... 20:28 ... (Μωϋσῆς ἐγράφεται) ...
20:29 ἐπὶ τὰ ἀδελφοὶ ... (λαβὼν) 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 (τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνῆ}) ...
20:34 ... ἀποκριθεῖς ... οἱ υἱοὶ (τοῦτον τοῦ αἰῶνος) γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται.
20:35 οὗς [δὲ likely present] κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκεῖνον τῆς κληρονομίας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται.
20:36 οὗδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἓτι μέλλουσιν, ἵσαγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν [καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν may have been present] ... θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες.
20:39 ... (τίνες τῶν) γραμματέων ἐπανει διδάσκαλε, καλώς εἰπας.
20:41 ... (πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυίδ υἱόν;)
20:44 Δαυίδ ... κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ ... 
21:7 ἐπηρώτησαν [δέ likely present] αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί ... 
21:8 ... πολλοὶ [γάρ likely present] ἐλεύουσαν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνοματί [μου likely present], λέγοντες [ὁτι may have been present]· ἐγώ εἰμι 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 ἐπὶ ἔθνος}. 
21:11 {λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ σείσμοι τε} ... {φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεία ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ} ... 
21:12 πρὸ δὲ τοῦτων ... διώξουσιν ... (ἀπαγομένων ἐπὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἠγεμόνας) ... 
21:13 (ἀποθητεῖται ύμίν) εἰς μαρτύριον. 
21:14 ... μὴ προμελετῶν ἀπολογηθῆναι. 
21:15 ... σοφίαν, ἢ οὐ δυνάμεναι (ἀντιστήναι 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 ἑαυτούς. 
21:20 ... κυκλομένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ ... ἢ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. 
21:25 ... (ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἀστροις σημεία), καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχῇ ἔθνων ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἀς ἥχους βαλάσσης κυμαινούσης 
21:26 ... προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχόμενων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ κακῶν {αὐταὶ γάρ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτοῦ} ... 
21:27 καὶ τότε ὀψωνται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν μετὰ δυνάμεως [καὶ δόξης likely not present] πολλῆς. 
21:28 τοῦτων δὲ γυναικῶν ἀνακάμπτε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς [ὑμῶν likely not present], διότι ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν. 
21:29 ... παραβολήν ... ἰδεῖτε τὴν συκὴν καὶ {τὰ δὲνδρα πάντα}. 
21:30 ἀπελθόντες δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαόν τῆς Εἰρήνης ἔδραμεν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ποσιδονίζων ἐν ἀνοίγοις γυναικῶν καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν οὐρανῶν [ἐπὶ τᾶς πάντα] ...
21:30 ὅταν προβάλωσιν τὸν καρπὸν, γινώσκουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅτι τὸ θέρος ἤγγικεν.

21:31 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε ταύτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἦστιν ἤ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

21:32 ... οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐὰν μὴ πάντα γένηται.

21:33 (ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ) παρελεύσεται, ὁ δὲ λόγος μου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

21:34 (προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς), μὴ ποτὲ βαρηθῶσιν (αἱ καρδίαι ύμῶν) (ἐν) κραυγῇ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ (βιωτικαίς μερίμναις) καὶ (ἐπιστῆ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς αἴφνιδιος) [ἡ may not have been present] ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη.

21:35a ὡς παγίς ...

21:37 ... τὰς ἡμέρας {ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων}, τὰς ... νῦκτας ἐξερχόμενος ... εἰς ... Ἐλαιών.

21:38 ... ἀρθηρίζειν ... ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

22:1 ... πάσχα.

22:3 [Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς was not present] ἱούδαν ... (ὅντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δεκατεσσαράντα).

22:5 ... ἀργύριον ...

22:20 ... τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἦ ... διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου ...

22:22b ... οὐαὶ ... δι’ οὖ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

22:33 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

22:34 ... ἀπαρνήσῃ ...

22:66 ... ἀπίγαγον ... εἰς τὸ συνέδριον ...

22:67 ... οὗ εἶ ὁ χριστός ... ἐὰν (εἰ πῶ ύμῖν), οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε.

22:69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν [δὲ may have been present] ἑσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ.

22:70 ... οὗ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ... ὑμεῖς λέγετε ...

22:71 [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]

23:1 ... ἤγγιον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτου.
23:3 ο [δὲ likely present] Πιλάτος ἠρώτησεν … σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς; … σὺ λέγεις.
23:7 … ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἰησοῦν …
23:8 ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἴδων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν …
23:9 … (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ).
23:18 … βαραββάν.
23:19 … (διὰ στάσιν … καὶ φόνου βληθείς 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 διό} …
23:51 … οἶκ ἦν συγκατατεθεῖμένος (τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πραξεί αὐτῶν) …
23:52 … τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἠτίαστο τὸ σῶμα …
23:55 … οἱ γυναῖκες …
24:1 … {ὁρθροῦ βαθέως ἠλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα} (φέρουσαι δὲ ἠτίμασαν ἀρώματα.
24:3 … οὐχ εὐρον τὸ σῶμα …
24:4 … (ἐν τῷ ἀποκριθαί αὐτάς περὶ τούτου) … (αὐράξις διό) …
24:9 … ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπῆγγελταν (ταῦτα πάντα) …
24:11 … (καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταίς).
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]
24:21α ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνομίζομεν, [ὁτι likely present] αὐτὸς ἐστιν ὁ λυτρωτής τοῦ Ἰσραήλ …
24:37 … ἐδόκουν φάντασμα θεωρεῖν.
24:41 ἔτι [δὲ likely present] ἀπιστοῦντων αὐτῶν ... τι βρασίμου ... 
24:47 ... κηρυχθήναι ... ἐἰς πάντα τὰ ἐθνῆ ...
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. 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.

1 There are 57 verses in chapter 5 containing secure readings or wordings.
Marcion used. 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 ἢρεστο διακρείνομενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διά τι. Also worth noting are the second ἵνα μή in 6:37, ὑφαίνει and νηθεῖ in 12:27, and possibly εὑρέθητε 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 in the light of the findings of this study. For the verses reconstructed in chapter 5 NA has references to Mcion in 29 verses. 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 ὁταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμῖν is not definitively absent from Marcion’s text; (4) in 6:26 πάντες and in 6:36 καὶ, though they may have been absent from Marcion’s text, are again unattested by Tertullian; (5) in 10:24 καὶ βασιλείᾳ is not attested, but it is unclear if it was absent; (6) in 11:2 Mcion is problematically listed as supporting the reading of 700 and GrNy and related reading in 162. The parentheses around Mcion do not really alleviate the problem as 162 is also set in parentheses but its points of contact with 700 and GrNy

---

2 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.

3 See the NA 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; and (7) in 16:18, the unattested πῦς is viewed as omitted, but it may have been present. In addition, it may also be noted that there are several readings admitted attested by Tertullian, though considered merely possible in the reconstruction that are referenced as readings for Marcion’s text in NA27. These verses include 6:21, 31 (the two instances of third person plural verbs); 8:3 (2x); 11:41; 12:51 (ἀλλαζο); 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.

4 In the introduction NA27 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.

5 Chapter 5 indicated that no confidence can be placed in possible readings definitely being those of Marcion’s text.
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