

Phillip Andrew Davis, Jr.*

Marcion's Gospel and its Use of the Jewish Scriptures

<https://doi.org/10.1515/znw-2021-0006>

Abstract: Despite the popular notion of Marcion's outright rejection of the Jewish Scriptures, his gospel draws on those Scriptures not infrequently. While this might appear inconsistent with Marcion's theological thought, a pattern is evident in the way his gospel uses Scripture: On the one hand, Marcion's gospel includes few of the direct, marked quotations of Scripture known from canonical Luke, and in none of those cases does Jesus himself fulfill Scripture. On the other hand, Marcion's gospel includes more frequent indirect allusions to Scripture, several of which imply Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural prophecy. This pattern suggests a Marcionite redaction of Luke whereby problematic marked quotes were omitted, while allusions were found less troublesome or simply overlooked due to their implicit nature.

Zusammenfassung: Trotz der populären Vorstellung von der markionitischen Ablehnung der jüdischen Schriften finden diese in seinem Evangelium vielfache Verwendung. Das mag den Anschein theologischer Inkonsequenz erwecken, doch ist im Evangelium Markions ein Muster erkennbar: Einerseits beinhaltet das Evangelium wenige der explizit markierten Zitate, die sich im kanonischen Lukasevangelium finden, und in keinem dieser Zitate erfüllt Jesus die Schrift. Andererseits kommen häufiger unmarkierte Anspielungen auf die Schrift vor, von denen einige Jesu Erfüllung der Schrift implizieren. Von daher legt sich eine markionitische Redaktion nahe, bei der problematische markierte Zitate gestrichen wurden, während Anspielungen entweder für weniger problematisch gehalten oder schlicht übersehen wurden.

Keywords: Marcion, Gospel, Luke, Jewish Scripture, Old Testament, Quotation, Allusion, Tertullian, Epiphanius

*Corresponding author: Phillip Andrew Davis, Jr., Universität Bonn, Ev.-Theol. Seminar, Am Hof 1, 53113 Bonn; pdavis@uni-bonn.de

In recent years a number of scholars have brought back to life the thesis, prominent in the 19th century,¹ that Marcion's gospel (hereafter: Mcn) is not a redaction of canonical Luke, as the church fathers contend, but rather that canonical Luke is secondary to Mcn. The forms of this basic thesis vary between Mcn representing the absolute earliest gospel² to Mcn resulting from Marcion's editing of an earlier gospel, which looked something like Luke.³ Perhaps the most plausible argument against the traditional hypothesis as handed down from the church fathers is that if Marcion redacted canonical Luke, he has not done a very good job of it, for he has apparently both failed to remove passages that challenge his purported theology,⁴ and removed some passages that would seem unproblematic or to have supported Marcion's theology.⁵

This paper seeks to engage this argument by examining a puzzling aspect of Mcn: its frequent use of Jewish Scripture. Despite the popular notion of Marcion rejecting Jewish Scripture altogether, scholars have highlighted that it does play a

1 See Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate," *JBL* 127 (2008): 513–527.

2 Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, 2 vols., TANZ 60 (Tübingen: Francke, 2015), 117–179; Markus Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection in Early Christianity and the Making of the New Testament* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 84–92; idem, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, StPatr Supplements 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 277–282. Vinzent contends that Marcion created the gospel genre, in contrast to Klinghardt, who sees Marcion simply as a recipient of the earliest gospel.

3 John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 77–113; Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*, WUNT 2/169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 173–210; Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 79–120; Judith Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 196–209. Jason BeDuhn's approach differs from these insofar as he sees Mcn and canonical Luke developing *independently* on the basis of an earlier gospel. See Jason D. BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013), 78–92.

4 For example, Jesus is referred to as son of David in 18,38 and Mcn 24,39 apparently lacked the command to touch and feel the resurrected Jesus, while including the statement that a spirit does not have bones as Jesus does. This latter case leads Tertullian to claim famously that Marcion must have allowed some elements contrary to his thought to remain in his gospel so as to hide his redactional activity or that he let those problematic elements remain that he was able to interpret away (*Marc* 4,43,7). So David Salter Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," *JBL* 108 (1989): 477–496, here 482.

5 The parable of the prodigal son is perhaps the most prominent example. But cf. Christopher M. Hays, "Marcion vs. Luke: A Response to the *Plädoyer* of Matthias Klinghardt," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 213–232, here 220–221.

recurring role in Mcn and Marcion's collection of Pauline letters.⁶ Indeed, there is agreement among scholars that Marcion seems to have found appeal to Scripture useful or necessary⁷ and Scripture in general to be a reliable source of information on the creator God.⁸ At the same time, Marcion understood Jesus to come from a different God than the God of the Jewish Scriptures and to be distinct from any Christ expected by them.⁹ This raises the question whether Mcn exhibits any consistency in its use of Scripture, such that a redactional concept becomes clear that could indicate Mcn's priority or posteriority to canonical Luke.

The study will focus both on explicit quotations of scriptural texts as well as unmarked allusions. Quotations refer here to citations that include an introductory formula indicating that the reference comes from Scripture. Allusions refer to the incorporation of at least a phrase from Scripture into the gospel text without any explicit marking, that is, "an overt weaving of at least a phrase from the antecedent text into the author's own language".¹⁰ Attention to these different types of citations may give us some insight on what a redactor would have likely been able to recognize as a scriptural citation, to which he could then react. A redactor wanting to omit scriptural references would unlikely overlook explicit citations, but allusions might be more easily missed. On the other hand, a redactor wanting to root a text more deeply in scriptural tradition may occasionally insert explicit quotations where useful, as Matthew frequently does in Markan contexts,¹¹ but

6 As Ulrich Schmid notes as to Marcion's collection of Pauline letters, "Beispielsweise ist die oft wiederholte Behauptung, Marcion habe bevorzugt ntl. Bezugnahmen auf das Alte Testament beseitigt, schlicht unzutreffend. Sein Umgang und seine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Alten Testament bedürfen in Zukunft einer differenzierteren Betrachtung." Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, ANTF 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 310. See also Tyson, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 44–45 and more generally Dieter T. Roth, "Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures in *Marcion's Gospel and Luke*," in *Connecting Gospels: Beyond the Canonical/Non-Canonical Divide*, ed. Francis Watson and Sarah Parkhouse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 41–56.

7 Edwin C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948), 113–117; Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 82–83.

8 Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 357–366, 410–411.

9 Winrich Löhr, "Markion," *RAC* 24:147–173, here 156–162; Moll, *Arch-Heretic* (see n. 7), 58–69. For example, Marcion apparently interpreted Jesus' silencing of Peter after his confession as a sign that Peter's confession was false (see n. 86 below). Cf. further Tertullian, *Marc* 1,15,6; 3,24,1; 4,6,3.

10 These definitions follow George H. Guthrie, "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research," *CurBR* 1 (2003): 271–294, here 273, and Phillip A. Davis, Jr., *The Place of Paideia in Hebrews' Moral Thought*, WUNT 2/475 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 143–144 n. 5.

11 Matt 8,17 (Isa 53,4); 9,13 (Hos 6,6); 12,7 (Hos 6,6); 12,18–21 (Isa 42,1–4); 13,14–15 (Isa 6,9–10); 13,35 (Ps 78,2); 19,19 (Lev 19,18).

could, depending on context, find that subtle allusions serve his purposes better. Consideration of such possibilities may help us see in what direction the data point as to the relationship between canonical Luke and Mcn.

Indeed, this study will suggest that the use of Scripture in Mcn evinces two distinct patterns: On the one hand, Mcn uses very few of the explicit quotations of Scripture known from canonical Luke and none of those where Jesus fulfills Scripture. On the other hand, Mcn contains more frequent unmarked allusions, and in several of these cases Jesus does appear to fulfill Scripture, raising the question of whether Mcn was consistent in avoiding obvious quotations while failing to recognize less obvious allusions.

1 Explicit Quotations

Of the seventeen explicit quotations of Scripture in Luke,¹² Mcn contains only four with certainty, namely: the quotation of Exod 23,20 / Mal 3,1 in 7,27; Deut 6,5 in 10,27;¹³ Exod 20,12–16 / Deut 5,16–20 in 18,20; and Deut 25,5 in 20,28. Each of these shall be addressed in turn; in so doing attention will be paid to issues of reconstruction, because, as will become clear, the textual shaping of each of the passages discussed influences how the quotation can be read. In fact, despite the presence of these quotations in Mcn, each one at least allows for a comprehensible Marcionite interpretation.

1.1 Mcn 7,27

The first attested quotation in Mcn sets the stage for a pattern that will confront the reader of Mcn, namely that despite an appeal to Scripture, the citation does not necessarily have much to do with Jesus himself. In this first case, the quotation concerns the fulfillment of prophecy in John the Baptist. Jesus quotes Mal 3,1 / Exod 23,20 saying, “This is concerning whom it is written, behold I am sending my messenger before you who will prepare your way (ahead of you).”¹⁴

¹² Luke 2,23.24; 3,4–6; 4,4.8.10.12.18–19; 7,27; 10,27; 18,20; 19,46; 20,17.28.37.42–43; 22,37.

¹³ The reference to Lev 19,18 in verse 27b is unattested for Mcn.

¹⁴ Translations of Mcn are based on the reconstruction in Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, NTTSD 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2015). Where reconstructions differ in relevant ways, the issues will be discussed. In this case, the final phrase of the verse in parenthesis is attested by the *Dialogue of Adamantius* but not by Tertullian or Epiphanius. See Tertullian, *Marc* 4,18,7; Epiphanius,

Although the fulfillment relates more to John the Baptist than Jesus, Tertullian nevertheless happily notes that precisely a predecessor-successor relationship is implied in the quotation.¹⁵ Yet, Marcion may have had a way of explaining away this possible difficulty by means of the text of his gospel.

The verses 7,23 (“blessed is he who does not take offence at me”) and 7,28 (“no one born of women is greater than John the Baptist, but the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he”) appear to have provided Marcion an opportunity to see a break between Jesus and John, since Tertullian and Epiphanius suggest 7,23 was taken by Marcion to indicate that John did in fact take offence at Jesus.¹⁶ Mcn 16,16 (“the law and the prophets were until John; since then the Kingdom of God is being preached and everyone is being urged into it”) puts John together with the law and prophets in a previous era and may also have offered a hermeneutical key in the same direction. The point is, the simple presence of the quotation in 7,27 does not on its own indicate any sort of inconsistency between Marcionite theology and the Marcionite gospel. Instead, its context puts distance between Jesus and John.

1.2 Mcn 10,28

In the next quotation, in 10,28, Mcn's Jesus does offer a positive evaluation of the commandments of Torah, but again the Marcionite text and the larger Marcionite canon allow for a consistent interpretation. According to Luke 10,25–28, a lawyer asks Jesus how he might inherit eternal life. Jesus asks him about what the law says, to which the man responds by quoting Deut 6,5 and Lev 19,18. Jesus then approves of this answer. Mcn's version appears to have read at least slightly differently. The primary difference in Mcn is that, as Tertullian notes, Mcn lacks the adjective αἰώνιος.¹⁷ Tertullian suggests that for Marcion the answer to the question relates only to the gaining of long earthly life as the creator God promises in the Torah (Deut 6,2) and not to the eternal life offered by Marcion's good

Pan 42,11,6 [schol. 9]; 42,11,17 [schol. 9]; *Adam* 98,11–13. The following editions have been used for these primary texts: Claudio Moreschini, ed., *Contre Marcion*, vol. 4, transl. René Braun, SC 456 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001); Karl Holl and Jürgen Dummer, eds., *Epiphanius*, vol. 2, 2nd ed., GCS 31 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980); Willem H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, ed., *Der Dialog des Adamantius ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΝ ΟΡΘΗΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ*, GCS 4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901). The *Dialogue* is cited according to Bakhuyzen's page and line numbers.

¹⁵ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,18,7.

¹⁶ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,18,4; Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 8). See Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 231.

¹⁷ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,25,15.

God.¹⁸ Whether this interpretation really goes back to Marcion or is a supposition on the part of Tertullian cannot be determined. It is certainly possible to read “life” as referring to eternal life, as Tertullian himself argues, especially since in Mcn 18 a man will ask Jesus about eternal life.¹⁹ On this basis, Klinghardt argues that the Lukan redaction’s addition of αἰώνιος does not change the meaning of the question; rather it only makes it more precise.²⁰ In this way, the canonical reading could plausibly be seen as secondary to the reading in Mcn. Nevertheless, an omission of the word eternal on Marcion’s part would soften any connections between the law of the creator God and the expectations of Marcion’s previously unknown God as to the requirements for salvation.²¹ Ultimately, the consistency or inconsistency of the quotation with supposed Marcionite antinomianism depends on the Marcionite interpretation of the passage, and clearly the passage leaves itself open to that.

Tertullian and Epiphanius each attest for Mcn a slightly different structure of the conversation between the lawyer (or according to Tertullian a teacher of the law; “legis doctor”)²² and Jesus than in canonical Luke, but it is doubtful whether either structure would make much of an interpretational difference.²³ Whereas Epiphanius attests the same structure as canonical Luke, Tertullian suggests that it is Jesus, not the lawyer, who quotes the Scripture.²⁴ In other words, Jesus does not answer the lawyer’s question with a question of his own, and it is the lawyer who approves of Jesus’ quotation, rather than the other way around. This would imply that Jesus does not ask about what is written by the law and that the lawyer then approves of Jesus’ words. However, Tertullian does not quote from those parts of the text directly, and if Mcn read as Epiphanius attests, with

18 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,25,15–16.

19 But see the discussion of that passage below.

20 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 713. Paul-Louis Couchoud, “Is Marcion’s Gospel One of the Synoptics?,” *HibJ* 34 (1935–1936): 265–277, here 269–270, likewise argues here for the priority of Marcion.

21 Alfred Loisy’s response to Couchoud, “Marcion’s Gospel” (see n. 20) is demonstrative of both the reversibility of the argumentation for priority as well as of the differing ways in which Mcn’s reading can be interpreted. He argues, “Marcion has deliberately suppressed the word ‘eternal’ in the scribe’s question and transferred the great precept from his mouth to that of Jesus lest a Jewish doctor should appear to understand the way of salvation.” Alfred Loisy, “Marcion’s Gospel. A Reply,” *HibJ* 34 (1935–1936): 378–387, here 383.

22 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,19,7; 4,25,15. I doubt Klinghardt’s claim that Tertullian’s “legis doctor” necessarily indicates that the Greek of Mcn must have read νομοδιδάσκαλος, since the Greek νομικός requires some interpretation anyway. See Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 710–711.

23 *Contra* Loisy’s interpretation of the structure implied by Tertullian (see n. 21 above).

24 Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 23); 42,11,17 (schol. 23); Tertullian, *Marc* 4,25,15.

Jesus approving of the lawyer's quotation of Torah, then it would still be easy to understand how Tertullian could say that it is Jesus who answers the question since Jesus approves of the quotation. Ultimately, it makes little difference to the overall thrust of the passage in Mcn how the conversation developed: In either case Jesus approves of a quotation of the law in answer to the question of gaining life.²⁵

Neither Tertullian nor Epiphanius attests the quotation of Lev 19,18 found in canonical Luke, nor do they attest the presence of the parable of the Good Samaritan in 10,29–37.²⁶ As Klinghardt has noted, the presence or absence of these elements in Mcn likely go together. However, the fact that the reference to love of neighbor and the related parable are simply unattested – as opposed to being attested as absent in Mcn – makes any attempt to argue for an addition on the part of the Lukan redaction necessarily speculative. Klinghardt is right, however, to reject attempts to explain the non-attestation of these elements as due to Marcion's supposed antinomianism.²⁷ That simply cannot be decided based on what the witnesses to Mcn offer. In fact, as Klinghardt points out, under the assumption of Lukan priority to Mcn, Marcion would have worked inconsistently in his redaction had he omitted the command to love neighbor in this case since he retains the same command in Rom 13,8 and Gal 5,14.²⁸ Yet, were the love of neighbor command present, Marcion would have not worked inconsistently at all. Ultimately, however, it is impossible to say how Mcn read in this case, and it is important to keep in mind that it is not clear how Marcion may have actually interpreted this text or the relevant verses in Romans and Galatians.²⁹ All that

25 Thus Fitzmeyer can say of the Lukan version that the lawyer's answer "of course, becomes Jesus' pronouncement too, by virtue of his confirmation." Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV*, AB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 878. Cf. also Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 136 n. 240.

26 It should also be noted that Tertullian (*Marc* 4,25,15) only quotes three elements by which one should love God: "ex toto corde tuo et ex tota anima tua et totis viribus tuis". Canonical Luke, however, also includes καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου at the end. Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 137, notes in this context Tertullian's "propensity to omit elements in a list" as a possible explanation. The reconstruction of Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 710, misleadingly indicates that the fourth element is "durch die Häresiologen als fehlend bezeugt", although Tertullian does not explicitly state that to be the case. However, its absence does not appear to play a role in his argument for the priority of Mcn (only cf. pg. 719).

27 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 714–717.

28 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 715. For the Romans and Galatians texts, see Schmid, *Marcion* (see n. 6), 318.335.

29 On Gal 5,14 Tertullian (*Marc* 5,4,13) suggests the perfect tense ("fulfilled") could indicate that the command to love neighbor is no longer required, but that sounds like an *ad hoc* conjecture of

can be concluded at this point is that a relatively positive assessment of the law, at the very least insofar as keeping the law leads to long life, was present in Mcn and seems to stand in no contradiction to other texts in Marcion's canon that refer to the law positively.

1.3 Mcn 18,20

Another quotation of Scripture occurs in Mcn 18,20, amidst the conversation between Jesus and a certain man³⁰ about what the man should do in order to gain eternal life (this time explicitly "eternal"). The reconstruction of Mcn 18,18–23 faces a number of difficulties in verses 19 and 20 due to inconsistency among the various witnesses to the text, but only verse 20 affects our purposes here.

The problem in verse 20 is the question of who actually quotes the commandments; a decision here could imply more or less distance between Jesus and Torah. Whereas Tertullian attests the second person singular "you know the commandments",³¹ as in Luke, Epiphanius attests that Mcn read "I know the commandments".³² Based on the text of canonical Luke, one would expect that Jesus would still be the speaker,³³ yet the *Dialogue of Adamantius* may indicate a change of speaker, from Jesus to the questioner, by its inserting the phrase ὁ δὲ ἔφη.³⁴ However, the *Dialogue* retains the second person "you know". Thus, it is neither clear who "knows" the commandments nor who actually speaks them. It could be postulated that the first person would more likely have been placed on the lips of the questioner than on those of Jesus, so as to avoid direct connection between Jesus and the law.³⁵ Indeed, there seems to be little reason for Jesus to claim knowledge of the law for himself, as such a claim would disrupt the flow

what Marcion could have said. See also Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 269. Cf. further the methodological comments in Roth, "Prophets, Priests, and Kings" (see n. 6), 43–44.

30 That the man was an ἄρχων as in Luke, is not attested for Mcn. See Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 429; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 914–915.

31 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,36,4.7. Tertullian's first recitation possibly implies that Jesus inquires whether the man knows the commandments (Lieu, *Marcion* [see n. 3], 207, interprets it that way), but his second recitation implies a declaration.

32 Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 50); 42,11,17 (schol. 50).

33 Epiphanius seems to imply this in his reading, since he tries to explain the change from second person to first person as an attempt to avoid admitting that the commandments had already been written down (*Pan* 4,11,17 [elench. 50]). Cf. Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 207.

34 *Adam* 92,27. Cf. Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 385–386.

35 So Judith Lieu, "Marcion and the Synoptic Problem," in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. Paul Foster et al., BETL 239 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 731–751, here 736. Lieu, *Marcion* (see

of thought by falling out of line with the main question at issue.³⁶ It thus seems more likely that in the event of a first person reading, the questioner would have been responsible for the quotation, with the result that Torah is not placed on Jesus' lips. However, a firm decision as to speaker and grammatical person is not possible, and therefore the question of whether Mcn links Jesus more closely with the commandments or puts distance between them in verse 20 has to be left undecided.

In the context of the quotation, verse 22 exhibits a difference between Mcn and Luke relevant for the interpretation of the Torah quotation: Mcn 18,22 is missing the Lukan εἶτι, thus reading: "one thing you lack" rather than "still one thing you lack".³⁷ Tsutsui takes this to imply that Marcion wanted to establish distance between the requirements of the law and the requirements of Jesus. That is, Jesus' demands to sell everything and follow him do not supplement the requirements of the law; the two are not on the same level.³⁸ Although this suggestion might appear strained,³⁹ it nevertheless does make Mcn consistent with regard to the questions of "life" both here and in chapter 10: Earthly long life requires keeping the law, while eternal life requires more, namely, selling one's possessions and following Jesus. In fact, read together, the passages can imply this regardless of the missing εἶτι.⁴⁰ That Marcion might leave such passages standing in his gospel despite the fact that Jesus does not in either one speak negatively about the law (thus allowing the passages to be read as positive judgments about the law) may be surprising, but the possibilities his text leaves open for interpretation should keep us from evaluating the Marcionite gospel as editorially inconsistent.

Klinghardt, however, finds the inconsistency of Mcn in this passage not directly in the interpretation of the law. He rather argues that the passage undermines Marcionite theology insofar as it suggests 1) that there is only one God, 2) that this God is good, and 3) that this good God is the God of the commandments.⁴¹

n. 3), 207, also notes that Tertullian's interrogative in the second person could have the same interpretive effect.

³⁶ Cf. Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 919.

³⁷ The εἶτι is not reflected in Tertullian's "Unum, inquit, tibi deest" (*Marc* 4,36,4) nor present in Adamantius' quotation in *Adam* 92,31. Eutropius' quotation in *Adam* 94,2 does include it, which Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 387, suggests speaks for its absence in Mcn.

³⁸ Kenji Tsutsui, "Das Evangelium Marcions: Ein neuer Versuch der Textrekonstruktion," *AJBI* 18 (1992): 67–132, here 115–116.

³⁹ So Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 916; Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 208. Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 387 n. 172, evaluates Tsutsui's postulation as speculative, but plausible.

⁴⁰ For example, Couchoud, "Marcion's Gospel" (see n. 20), 269–270, makes the argument without appealing to the missing particle.

⁴¹ Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 916; Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 208.

Yet this is far from proven by the passage. First, however one reconstructs verse 19, whether as εἷς ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς ὁ πατήρ (Klinghardt) or as οὐδείς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ (Roth), neither reading necessarily suggests that there is only one God;⁴² they only confirm Klinghardt's second point, that this God is good, which for a Marcionite would mean the previously unknown God, not the creator God.⁴³ Second, the passage does not indicate that this God is the God of the commandments. The commandments may play a role in the discussion, but they have to do with the question of eternal life, not the question of who/which God is good. In fact, Klinghardt's own reconstruction, with "I know the commandments", which most likely would be spoken by Jesus' interlocutor, places even more distance between Jesus or the one good God and the commandments, since in that case, Jesus does not even himself bring the law into the conversation. So, the Marcionite version does not allow for Klinghardt's proposed inconsistencies; in fact, his own reconstruction makes his argument even more difficult.

Ultimately, the Marcionite version of this passage offers enough leeway to grant a possible Marcionite interpretation. Knowing whether Jesus or his questioner quote the law in this case would make the redactional tendency more clear, but unfortunately a decision cannot be made on that issue. There appears then some consistency between this passage and the conversation about the law and life in chapter 10, but this cannot prove priority in one direction or another: It is equally possible for the Lukan redactor to have linked eternal life with doing the law in chapter 10 as it is for the Marcionite redactor to have distinguished between the requirements for long life and eternal life.⁴⁴

In view of these two texts dealing with the law, it should also be considered that Mcn might offer a further hedge against viewing the law positively, namely in 16,16–17, cited earlier, where Jesus affirms a break not only between the present and the time of John, but also with the time of the law: "The law and the prophets were until John; since then the Kingdom of God is being preached and everyone is being urged into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of a letter of my words to pass away."⁴⁵ There is an important difference

⁴² Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 914; see pg. 918 for an overview of all variant readings; Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 429.

⁴³ Of course Tertullian (*Marc* 4,36,3) makes a similar point as Klinghardt. He claims, rather than argues, that the verse does not indicate that only one of two Gods is good, but rather that there is only one supremely good God in the sense that there is only one God. But that there is only one God does not follow from his quotation of Mcn.

⁴⁴ *Contra Couchoud*, "Marcion's Gospel" (see n. 20), 269–270.

⁴⁵ Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 871–873, insists that due to Tertullian's reading "verborum domini" (*Marc* 4,33,9), Mcn must have also read "words of the lord", not the theo-

here compared to Luke, namely that Luke reads “one stroke of a letter of the law”. Has Marcion changed Luke here, or the other way around? On the one hand, it would seem strange for Jesus to refer to a stroke of a letter in connection with his spoken words; thus, we might find here a trace of Marcion's hand.⁴⁶ Additionally, in none of the other passages in the gospels where Jesus says his words will not pass away do we find *κεφαία*,⁴⁷ while the other occurrence of *κεφαία* in the gospels is connected directly with the written law.⁴⁸ On the other hand, Luke's reading of verse 17 stands in marked tension, if not outright contradiction, with verse 16, which suggests the time of the proclamation of the law and prophets is past.⁴⁹ In other words, Luke's version could easily be interpreted as a tendentious correction of Marcionite theology. In this case it is quite challenging to decide which version came first, but at least we can say that Marcion's version may have offered an interpretive lens for understanding Jesus' somewhat ambiguous relation to the law in our texts above.⁵⁰

logically tendentious “my words” (cf. 21,33 and Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 2nd ed. [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960], 220*). In this way, not the words of Jesus, but the words of the creator God are in view, which for Klinghardt counts as an inconsistency between Mcn and Marcionite theology. However, Klinghardt overlooks how Tertullian's reading fits into its context. In the next line, Tertullian equates the words of Jesus with the words of the creator by quoting Isa 40,8 on the abiding nature of God's words and then commenting that Christ himself, “the speech and spirit of the creator”, had prophesied of John in Isa 40,3 (*Marc* 4,33,9). In this text, the words of Christ and God become one in a prophecy that looks forward to the coming of the speaker himself: the Lord, Jesus. Thus, while some caution must be exercised in reconstructing the text, there is good reason to believe that Tertullian read “my words” in Mcn 16,17. That Klinghardt also reconstructs 21,33 with “of the lord” (canonical Luke reads οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου) likewise seems suspect on these grounds, especially since in that case Tertullian again exhibits the influence of Isa 40,8 on his rendering (*Marc* 4,39,18; cf. Roth, *Text* [see n. 14], 179–180).

46 So Loisy, “Marcion's Gospel” (see n. 21), 383. Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 872, makes the same point, but in order to raise doubts about the “my” reading in the first place (but see n. 45 above).

47 Cf. Matt 24,35; Mark 13,31; Luke 21,33.

48 Matt 5,18.

49 Cf. Couchoud, “Marcion's Gospel” (see n. 20), 270. A comparable situation may be found in 5,36–39, where the Lukan verse 39 (“No one drinking old wine wants the new, for he says the old is good”), which is missing in the D text, contradicts the preceding parables about not mixing old and new.

50 Cf. other cases where Jesus takes on a more positive position concerning the law in Marcion's gospel: 5,14; 16,29,31.

1.4 Mcn 20,28.37

In Luke 20,27–40, the Sadducees confront Jesus with the question of the resurrection on the basis of a hypothetical case of levirate marriage. In verse 28, the Sadducees summarize what “Moses wrote for us” in Deut 25,5 (cf. Gen 38,8) as the basis for levirate marriage. Though not directly attested for Mcn, the reference to the Mosaic law seems reflected in Tertullian’s summary of the passage insofar as he depicts the Sadducees as referring to a case “from the law” (“ex lege”).⁵¹ The presence of this quotation, however, poses no problems for the question of Marcion’s redactional consistency, since the quotation comes from the lips of Jesus’ interlocutors, whom Jesus will outmaneuver in argumentation.

Nevertheless, according to Tertullian and Epiphanius, Mcn did contain different readings than canonical Luke that may have lent themselves to Marcionite interpretation. First, whereas canonical Luke reads Jesus’ answer in verse 35 as οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, Tertullian’s testimony suggests that Mcn reads οὓς δὲ κατηξίωσεν ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τῆς κληρονομίας καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν [...].⁵² Tertullian suggests the Marcionite interpretation of the verse reads τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου as relating to ὁ θεός, implying that a different God (“the God of that age”) is in view than the creator. That is certainly a conceivable Marcionite interpretation that would otherwise be impossible on the basis of canonical Luke with its passive participle and lacking mention of God, but Tertullian’s critique has nothing to do with that. Instead he infers that the Mcn reading means that “the God of that age” considers those who do not marry as worthy of the resurrection; in other words, an ascetic condition is placed on the resurrection. However, that conclusion does not necessarily follow from the wording, and even if it did, neither canonical Luke nor the reading Tertullian considers correct (which retains God as active subject) completely excludes such an interpretation.⁵³ The Mcn reading of verse 35 may then be congenial to a Marcionite interpretation but not to the degree Tertullian claims.

Second, and more interesting for our purposes, Epiphanius attests that Mcn lacks the quotation of Exod 3,6 (“the Lord the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob”)

⁵¹ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,38,4.

⁵² Tertullian, *Marc* 4,38,7; Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 431; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 974.

⁵³ Thus Tertullian’s critique that Mcn’s Jesus answers a question about marriage in this age despite the Sadducees’ asking about marriage in the next age actually cuts both ways (*Marc* 4,38,7–8). Cf. Tsutsui, “Das Evangelium” (see n. 38), 120.

and its interpretation in 20,37–38.⁵⁴ Epiphanius does not criticize Marcion for excising a quote of Scripture, however.⁵⁵ Rather, he sees the omission as an attempt to avoid the teaching of the resurrection. Epiphanius emphasizes against the Marcionites that this passage correlates with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, which also attests to the resurrection of bodies.⁵⁶ For Epiphanius, this is a case of Marcion's own gospel refuting his supposed theology, despite the Marcionite attempt at redaction.⁵⁷ However, that the verses consist of a scriptural quotation explicitly linking the God of the patriarchs with resurrection does offer a possible grounds for its excision.

The findings in this Marcionite passage are occasion for little surprise. One quotation is present, but it is spoken by Jesus' opponents, who are then bested by Jesus' argumentation. The argumentation in verse 35 may have even been congenial to Marcionite interpretation. The missing quotation in verse 37 also fits expectations, since Mcn's Jesus does not thereby appeal to Scripture in order to prove his own teaching.

1.5 Summary

The quotations attested for Mcn above show that despite the presence of explicit quotations of Scripture in Mcn, either the content of the quotations or the shape of their contexts pose no necessary problems for a supposed Marcionite theology. Decisions about wording are not at all straightforward, however, and as we have seen, there are multiple possible ways each wording option might be interpreted. The use of Scripture in Mcn confirms the point made by Judith Lieu that Mcn was ultimately a text up for interpretive debate;⁵⁸ it did not make one theological interpretation necessary over another. But as to our main question of interest, it is

⁵⁴ Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 56.57); 42,11,17 (schol. 56.57).

⁵⁵ Cf. Harnack, *Marcion* (see n. 45), 229*, who suggests the verses were removed because of their reference to the patriarchs. Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 980, points out this runs against 13,16 as well as 16,20–31, both of which include references to Abraham. However, John J. Clabeaux demonstrates a plausible Marcionite handling of such Abraham passages in Marcion's "canon" of texts. See John J. Clabeaux, "Abraham in Marcion's Gospel and Epistles: Marcion and the Jews," in *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini, Volume One: Christianity in the Beginning*, ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Daniel Harrington, and Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 69–92, here 80–83.

⁵⁶ Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,17 (elench. 56).

⁵⁷ So also Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 976.

⁵⁸ Lieu, *Marcion*, (see n. 3), 183–187.233.

remarkable that the attested quotations are so few, and aside from the complexity of the law passages, the remaining two passages can be read from a Marcionite perspective with little difficulty.

2 Missing Quotations

In contrast to the few explicit quotations attested for Mcn, a majority of quotations found in canonical Luke are not only missing from Mcn, but may plausibly have run against his theological interests. Missing from his gospel are: 2,23 (Jesus' family devotes him to the Lord in accordance with the law); 2,24 (Jesus' family offers a sacrifice according to the law); 3,4–6 (John the Baptist is depicted as Isaiah's one crying in the wilderness);⁵⁹ 4,4–12 (in the temptation Jesus repeatedly responds to the tempter with Scripture); 19,46 (at the clearing of the Temple Jesus quotes Isa 56,7 / Jer 7,11); 20,17 (in the parable of the vineyard Jesus quotes Ps 118,22 concerning himself as the stone rejected); 20,37 (as discussed, Jesus quotes Exod 3,6, where at the burning bush Moses refers to the Lord as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as proof of the resurrection); and 22,37 (Jesus declares that Isa 53,12 must be fulfilled in his being numbered among the transgressors). These missing quotations appear quite significant, since in all except for 3,4–6 and 20,37, Jesus or his family is depicted either as explicitly acting in accordance with Scripture or as fulfilling scriptural prophecy.⁶⁰ Yet among those explicit quo-

⁵⁹ As Roth's reconstruction shows (412), the section from 3,2–20 is technically unattested. Harnack, *Marcion* (see n. 45), 183*–184* and Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 463, consider the section missing on the basis of Epiphanius' testimony in *Pan* 4,11,4–5, where he explains that the birth narratives, the genealogy and the baptism were missing. Though Epiphanius does not refer to John the Baptist's first public appearance and preaching, the large swath of material he mentions implies that those sections also were not present. Comparable is Epiphanius' summary of missing material from Luke 13,29–46 (42,11,6 [schol. 53]). He mentions that “that concerning the donkey and Bethphage and that concerning the city and the temple” were falsified, but does not actually mention Jesus' approach from the Mount of Olives specifically; yet, it seems to be implied as well. (In another context, Roth, *Text* [see n. 14], 327, notes concerning Epiphanius' citation of 18,31–33 that his citations tend toward summary.) Furthermore, that Mcn appears to have begun with Jesus going into Capernaum (Luke 4,31) might indirectly attest to the lack of the preparatory material about John. Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 76 n. 69, notes that Tertullian (*Marc* 4,11,4) may also imply that the material was not found in Mcn, as Tertullian says that not only Jesus but also John appeared suddenly.

⁶⁰ However, cf. 22,15, where Jesus notes his desire to celebrate the Passover with his disciples. Williams, “Reconsidering” (see n. 4), 482.

tations attested for Mcn we have no certain cases where Jesus fulfills Scripture or draws on the law for himself.

All of the quotations just discussed are clearly present or absent from Mcn, but there are two quotations, one of which is quite significant, that are unattested. The first is 4,17–21, where Jesus reads from Isaiah and declares Scripture to be fulfilled in him. Though these verses are unattested, reconstructions of Mcn tend to at least consider them as possibly absent;⁶¹ however, the context is attested.⁶² It would be very significant for Marcion to have retained these verses, cutting against the grain of the pattern we have just noted above. We might have expected Tertullian to have commented on the fact had they been there,⁶³ but there are some indications that the preaching in Nazareth had a shortened form in Mcn.⁶⁴ Yet an argument from what Tertullian or others might have done cannot bring us very far. Klinghardt argues that because the verses relate back to Jesus' baptism and anointing with the spirit, which Mcn did not include,⁶⁵ they likely stem from Lukan redaction of Mcn.⁶⁶ This is a plausible explanation, but like any argument concerning this passage must ultimately rest on silence.

The other case is the quotation of Ps 110,1 in 20,42–43: "The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet". While the scriptural quotation is unattested, the discussion surrounding it concerning the Christ being David's son is attested, including Jesus' conclusion in

61 Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 412; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 464; Harnack, *Marcion* (see n. 45), 186*; Tsutsui, "Das Evangelium" (see n. 38), 77–78. BeDuhn, *The First New Testament* (see n. 3), 130–131, argues that 4,16b–22 was omitted by Marcion on the basis of Tertullian, *Marc* 4,7,4. Tertullian mentions that Jesus in his first appearance explains that he comes not to destroy the law or prophets but to fulfill them. He then accuses Marcion of omitting this as an insertion. BeDuhn takes Tertullian's words, which echo Matt 5,17, as a pointer to Luke 4,21. This could be the case, but Tertullian's references to Matthean texts here and in the context raise some doubts. On this issue see Dieter T. Roth, "Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*," *JTS* 59 (2008): 580–597, here 592–593.

62 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,8,2–3; see further Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 398.

63 Cf., however, n. 61 above. Tertullian (*Marc* 4,8,2) states that Jesus' preaching contained nothing new or out of accord with the prophets, but that due to one proverb (presumably, "doctor, heal yourself") he was cast out. This could be true even if Mcn did not include the quotation of Isaiah, but the quotation would have offered an opportunity to play up Jesus' explicit fulfillment of the prophet. It is thus remarkable that in this context (*Marc* 4,8,1) Tertullian's interest in Jesus' accord with the prophets has to do with his being a Nazarene according to prophecy, that is, a prophecy cited only in Matt 2,23, not in Luke.

64 See Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 186–187,398.

65 See Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,4.

66 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 466.

verse 44 that “David calls him son”. The conclusion appears to suppose the presence of the quotation. Yet, since the passage can be read as undermining the idea of the Christ being David’s son, it may have proved advantageous for Marcion. Indeed, Tertullian’s discussion of this passage seems to constitute a reply to just such an argument, since he argues that Jesus was not correcting the scribes as to the Christ’s identity but showing that they failed to recognize what David had, that the Christ is more than his son.⁶⁷

It is impossible to be sure about the presence of the last two quotations examined, with the question of the Isaiah quotation in Mcn 4 carrying the most weight for our examination, but it has thus become clear that whereas the few explicit quotations present in Mcn could be interpreted away so as to pose no problems for a supposed Mcn theology, most of the missing quotations should garner no surprise. In contrast to the quotations present in Mcn, the majority of those missing depict Jesus (and his family) as acting in accord with or fulfilling Jewish Scripture in some way. All of this raises the question of the presence of allusions to Scripture in Mcn.

3 Allusions

Compared to the few direct quotations of Scripture, Mcn contains more frequent allusions. This analysis is based primarily on those allusions (as defined at the outset) indicated in the NA²⁸ by means of cursive print, since these cases would be recognized by the majority of scholars, whereas other, more opaque uses of Scripture, might require some debate. One important example not in cursive print is discussed below. Aside from the numerous allusions contained in the large blocks of Luke 1–2 and 3,2–4,13 missing in Mcn, there are seven allusions that are attested for Mcn, three others are missing,⁶⁸ and one that is simply unattested.⁶⁹ Several of these cases demonstrate that in contrast to the direct quotations, we do find cases where Jesus himself fulfills Scripture in the allusions.

⁶⁷ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,38,10. See also Roth, “Prophets, Priests, and Kings” (see n. 6), 51.

⁶⁸ Namely, 13,35 and 19,38, both of which draw on Ps 118, and the allusion to Ps 22,18 in Luke 23,34b.

⁶⁹ Namely, Hos 10,8 in 23,30.

3.1 Attested Allusions

The first allusion occurs in Luke 7,22. Though the verse does not allude to a single scriptural passage (and is perhaps for this reason not marked as an allusion in the NA²⁸), Jesus answers John the Baptist's question of whether he is the expected one by describing his activities with an amalgam of language from Isaiah: He heals the blind, lame, leprous and deaf, raises the dead, and proclaims good news to the poor.⁷⁰ Tertullian does not quote the verse from Mcn, but he does attest its presence in noting that Jesus answers John's question about the works prophesied about the expected one by announcing those works.⁷¹ As noted earlier, the whole passage concerning the relationship between John and Jesus seems to have been a *crux interpretum*, such that Marcion appears to have understood that John was offended at Jesus' deeds belonging to someone other than the one John expected.⁷² Yet the language of Isaiah used in 7,22 plays into Tertullian's hand, as for him it is evidence that Jesus indeed fulfills John's expectations, and thus is not from another God. However Marcion may have precisely read the passage, it is striking that the Jesus of Mcn implicitly fulfills scriptural expectations. Since we have found no other places in Mcn where Jesus fulfills explicit scriptural quotations, one wonders whether Mcn may have overlooked such a passage due to its lack of explicit marking.

The next allusion occurs in 9,54, where Jesus' disciples ask to call down fire on the Samaritans who rejected Jesus. In Luke's version, the verse picks up on 4Kgdms 1,10.12.⁷³ The exact wording of Mcn cannot be recovered, but Tertullian twice attests to the verse.⁷⁴ Tertullian's discussions suggest Marcion may have interpreted the surrounding passage as exhibiting Jesus' mercy in contrast to the stern judgment of the creator God, since in the passage Jesus rebukes his disciples for raising the question of calling down fire. This is a good example of Scrip-

⁷⁰ Isa 26,19; 29,18; 35,5–6; 42,7.18; 61,1. Most striking of course is Isa 61,1, which is quoted in Luke 4,18.

⁷¹ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,18,6. See further Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 402–403.

⁷² Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 231; cf. Tertullian, *Marc* 4,18,4: “Sed ‘scandalizatur Iohannes auditus virtutibus Christi, ut alterius’.”

⁷³ Luke 9,54b: θέλεις εἶπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλώσαι αὐτούς. 4Kgdms 1,10b.12b: καταβήσεται πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ καταφάγεται σε καὶ τοὺς πεντήκοντά σου [...]. The Lukan passage (9,51–56) draws on the context of 4Kgdms also in other ways: a prophet is rejected in Samaria (4Kgdms 1) and the ἀνάλημψις (cf. Luke 9,51) of the prophet also becomes a theme (cf. ἀναλημφθῆναι in 4Kgdms 2,9).

⁷⁴ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,23,7; 4,29,12.

ture offering a “negative foil for Jesus by Marcion and his followers”.⁷⁵ In other words, the use of Scripture becomes useful for making a theological point about the creator God in contrast to Jesus and his God.

In 13,27 and its context Jesus discusses those excluded from the kingdom. In the parable, the head of the house responds to those trying to enter with the words of Ps 6,9: “Depart⁷⁶ from me all you workers of lawlessness.”⁷⁷ It is striking that Mcn’s Jesus teaches with such clear words from the Scriptures, because in contrast with the direct quotes concerning the law, Jesus here uses the Scriptures on his own initiative to support his teaching about the kingdom he represents rather than responding to questions about Torah. However, in the next verse, which in Luke refers to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, Mcn mentions only the “righteous” entering the kingdom.⁷⁸ If the reading “righteous” traces back to Marcionite redaction, then we might have evidence of a tendentious change that overlooked a scriptural allusion in 13,27 as a part of Jesus’ teaching; however, the changes in verse 28 could go in either direction, such that the Lukan version could constitute a reaction to Mcn.⁷⁹

The next allusion brings us to several references to the Son of Man in Mcn. First, in 12,35 Jesus alludes to Exod 12,11, exhorting his hearers to gird their loins and have their lamps burning in readiness for the coming of the Son of Man (12,40). Tertullian appears to reflect a possible Marcionite interpretation of this verse, such that the Son of Man is identified with the Christ of the creator God who comes like the thief portrayed in the preceding parable (12,36–39).⁸⁰ Mcn’s Jesus then exhorts his hearers to preparedness with the words of Exodus, but this preparedness relates to a scriptural figure who apparently is still to come and who is not to be identified with Jesus.

⁷⁵ Roth, “Prophets, Priests, and Kings” (see n. 6), 55.

⁷⁶ That Tertullian’s “Recedite” (*Marc* 4,30,4) reflects Matthew’s ἀποχωρεῖτε (7,23) instead of Luke’s ἀπόστητε, as Klinghardt claims, seems doubtful. See Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 820.

⁷⁷ It is not completely certain whether Mcn read ἀνομίας instead of the Lukan ἀδικίας. Tertullian’s “iniquitatis” (*Marc* 4,30,4) could render either Greek term (but cf. Roth, *Text* [see n. 14], 235 n. 267), but it is also possible that Tertullian has been influenced by Matthew or the LXX, both of which refer to lawlessness. The *Dialogue of Adamantius* (28,11; 44,16) also witnesses to ἀνομία but it renders the entire allusion in the Matthean form.

⁷⁸ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,30,5; Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 40).

⁷⁹ So also Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 821.823. In Klinghardt’s theory, Matthew would have, however, been the first to make mention of the patriarchs in his revision of Mcn, which Luke would have then taken up as well.

⁸⁰ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,29,8.

Though 12,35 may thus have little consequence for Marcionite interpretation of Jesus, the allusion is nevertheless curious. In 21,27, Jesus alludes to Dan 7,13: "And then you will see the Son of Man coming from the heavens with power."⁸¹ Tertullian's discussion of the passage implies Marcion may have interpreted the catastrophic events preceding the coming of the Son of Man as stemming from the creator God, while the positive promises (such as in verse 28) have to do with the good God. Tertullian seeks to tie the Son of Man with both the good and bad, such that no distinction can be made, and he argues that whether Marcion identifies the Son of Man with Tertullian's Christ or Marcion's, he will have to associate the Son of Man with both.⁸² It is not clear in this discussion how Marcion really interpreted the Son of Man figure, however. The text of Mcn may offer a clue suggesting the Son of Man did refer for Marcion to his Christ, because according to Tertullian, Mcn 21,27, differently from Luke 21,27, may have described the Son of Man coming "from the heavens," and not "in a cloud".⁸³ Harnack picks up on this, calling the change tendentious, so that Christ would not be associated with earthly fog.⁸⁴ However, Tertullian's wording may not be trustworthy since in the transfiguration he also says the voice came from heaven (9,35), only then to refer to a cloud later.⁸⁵ It is thus difficult to say how Marcion would have interpreted this allusion to Dan 7. The question is made even more complex considering that the previous allusion seems not to have been interpreted as referring to Jesus, while other verses in Mcn, such as 9,22 and 24,6–7, imply quite strongly the identification of Jesus as Son of Man.⁸⁶ Even more interesting is Jesus' saying at his Jewish trial in 22,69, "From now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God." This line, though not indicated as an allusion in the NA²⁸, nevertheless, as Tertullian himself highlights,⁸⁷ combines the motif of the coming Son of Man in Dan 7,13 with the language of Ps 110,1. Taking the allusions seriously, then, it is difficult not to see Jesus fulfilling Scripture in an implicit way in Mcn.

81 The translation follows Roth's reconstruction, but see below. Klinghardt's reconstruction is not significantly different. See Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 432; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 1000.

82 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,39,12–15.

83 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,39,10. See the discussion in Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 177.

84 Harnack, *Marcion* (see n. 45), 231*.

85 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,22,1.7–8. Cf. Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 230; Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 128.

86 Concerning the context of 9,22, Tertullian (*Marc* 4,21,7) implies that Marcion understood Jesus' silencing of Peter's confession to signal that Peter was wrong about Jesus' identity as the Christ. However, this does not necessarily imply that Jesus was not the Son of Man according to Mcn. In fact, Tertullian emphasizes as counterargument that the fate of the Son of Man described in 9,22 was prophesied.

87 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,41,4.

The final two allusions link Jesus with the fulfillment of Scripture even more closely. In 12,53 we find an allusion to Mic 7,6a: “The father will be divided against son and son against father and mother against daughter and daughter against mother, and mother-in-law against daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law.” Jesus invokes the allusion in order to illustrate his bringing of division, not peace (12,51). That this allusion appears in Mcn even provides Tertullian with an occasion for mocking Marcion precisely because Marcion’s Jesus proves to fulfill the very Scripture he rejects.⁸⁸ However, this being one of the most explicit texts linking Jesus with Jewish Scripture, one might ask whether Marcion, assuming he did in fact edit Luke, simply failed to recognize the scriptural reference; after all, the structure of the allusion diverges from the pre-text in Micah, insofar as in Mcn and Luke the hostility between family members goes in both directions, while in Micah it is only the younger generation that rises up against the older. By contrast, the same allusion in Matthew follows Micah much more closely and includes Mic 7,6b, which is not cited in Mcn or Luke.⁸⁹

The final allusion is a bit trickier. In Luke 23,46, Jesus cries out with the words of Ps 31,6, “Father into your hands I commit my spirit.” Though Jesus’ loud cry and expiration are attested by Tertullian and Epiphanius, neither actually quotes the Psalm.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, Tertullian notes Jesus’ fulfillment of Ps 31,⁹¹ which appears to presuppose its presence, since making this point undermines Marcion’s theology, which is obviously in Tertullian’s interest.⁹² Moreover, that Tertullian records “hoc dicto expiravit” also speaks for the presence of the quotation, since “hoc dicto” requires something said beforehand.⁹³ Of course, the cry of “father” implied in “vociferatur ad patrem” could suffice, but considering Tertullian’s note on the fulfillment of the prophets that follows, this seems unlikely.⁹⁴

⁸⁸ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,29,14.

⁸⁹ Mic 7,6 reads διότι υἱὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, θυγάτηρ ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς, ἐχθροὶ ἀνδρὸς πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. Cf. Matt 10,35–36: ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οἰκιακοὶ αὐτοῦ.

⁹⁰ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,42,6; Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 73); cf. Adam 198,8–10. Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 218 n. 98, notes that the *Dialogue of Adamantius* is less likely following Mcn at this point, however.

⁹¹ His reference to the thirtieth Psalm presumably reflects the numbering in the LXX.

⁹² Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 218, notes that both Epiphanius and Tertullian focus much more on Jesus’ expiring as a counter to Marcionite docetism.

⁹³ Cf. Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 1100.

⁹⁴ The Psalm quotation receives one of Roth’s lowest probability rankings, suggesting the reading is possible but no confidence can be placed in it. See Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 434. Klinghardt,

Assuming Mcn included the allusion to Ps 31, what are we to make of this? Other than this allusion, Mcn includes three others that also imply an inconsistency between Mcn and Marcionite Christology (7,22; 12,53; 21,27 cf. 22,69). In light of the lack of problematic direct quotations, these subtler allusions raise the question of whether Marcion was a poor editor. Did he not recognize these allusions as references to Jewish Scripture? Or did he simply make use of a gospel that already included passages he would have to interpret away (and his interpretations are simply out of our reach)? We return to these questions in section 4 below.

3.2 Missing Allusions

The two allusions clearly missing from Mcn both draw on Psalm 118. The first is 13,35, in Jesus' lament over Jerusalem: "Behold, your house is forsaken, and I tell you, you will no longer see me until [it comes when] you say, 'Blessed is the one coming in the name of the Lord.'" The second is 19,38, where at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the disciples cry out, "Blessed is the king coming in the name of the Lord [...]." These allusions belong to larger sections of text that apparently were lacking in Mcn's gospel according to Epiphanius,⁹⁵ perhaps in part due to their depicting Jesus as both another of the prophets coming to die in Jerusalem and as the expected coming king. Epiphanius explains the omission of the latter section as being due to the quotation of Isa 56,7 / Jer 7,11 in 19,46.⁹⁶ It is noteworthy that the allusion to Ps 118 plays no role in Epiphanius' argument, while the explicit quotation does. Given that these are the only two allusions clearly not present in Mcn outside of Luke 1–3, it seems unlikely that Mcn – had he edited Luke – would have omitted the passages solely on the basis of the allusions, but more likely on the text's implications about Jesus' identity.

A final allusion should be mentioned here, namely the allusion to Ps 22,18 and the casting of lots for Jesus' clothing in Luke 23,34b. The attestation for this text is not consistent; Tertullian claims that Marcion removed the line due to the prophecy of the Psalm, while Epiphanius attests the dividing up of his garments but not the casting of lots.⁹⁷ Yet, it seems likely that the allusion was missing in Mcn, since Roth makes a strong case for the summary nature of Epiphanius'

Das älteste Evangelium (see n. 2), 1100, argues for taking the reading that diverges the most from the canonical reading and rejects the Psalm quotation.

⁹⁵ Luke 13,29–35; 19,29–46. Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 41.53).

⁹⁶ Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 53).

⁹⁷ Tertullian, *Marc* 4,42,4; Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 71); 42,11,17 (schol. 71).

attestation, casting doubt on whether Epiphanius reliably reflects Mcn in this instance. He writes, “In sum, given that Epiphanius is likely simply summarizing elements of the entire account as evidenced, in particular, by the Matthean wording in v. 33 [s.c. ἐλθόντες, εἰς, λεγόμενον, and Κρανίον τόπον]; skipping to a verse beyond the one he discussed in the scholion; and the elenchus revealing that it was only the fact of the crucifixion in which he is interested, it may very well be the case that these elements did not arise directly from the wording of Marcion’s gospel.”⁹⁸ These observations weaken Klinghardt’s claim that the contradictory attestation is difficult to explain on the basis of Lukan priority to Mcn.⁹⁹ Either way it is explained, supposing the absence of the allusion, this case complicates our observations thus far. If Mcn were dependent on canonical Luke, then the omission is easy to explain as tendentious, though strikingly inconsistent with the presence of other problematic allusions. Yet if the relationship were reversed, the verse would have been added by Luke, perhaps in reaction to Mcn. The point is, we have to keep in mind the reversibility of the redactional evidence, while not losing sight of the larger patterns.¹⁰⁰

4 Other References to Prophetic Fulfillment

We have seen thus far that Mcn very sparingly employs explicit quotations of Scripture, and missing from it are quotations in contexts of Jesus living according to or fulfilling Scripture. As far as allusions, however, we have found several significant cases of Jesus fulfilling Scripture in some way. Although we might take these findings as evidence of inconsistency, indicating that Marcion simply used a version of the gospel rather than having edited Luke, I would like to bring attention to a few other significant omissions from Mcn that suggest with the evidence above that Marcion may have indeed edited a version of Luke.

Specifically, Mcn lacks several passages speaking more generally of the fulfillment of Scripture by Jesus. For example, missing is Luke 18,31: “Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and there all the things written by the prophets

⁹⁸ Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 338. Harnack, *Marcion* (see n. 45), 236*, accepts Tertullian’s attestation while acknowledging, but not explaining, Epiphanius’.

⁹⁹ Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see n. 2), 1094. He goes on to argue against the presence of the allusion by appealing to his criterion that the reading that diverges most from the canonical reading is to be preferred and suggests Epiphanius had a copy of Mcn contaminated with the canonical reading.

¹⁰⁰ Thus see the comments on Luke 16,16–17 in section 1.3 and on Luke 5,36–39 in n. 49 above.

about the Son of Man will be accomplished.”¹⁰¹ A similar statement is missing in 21,22 regarding the destruction of Jerusalem: “For these are the days of vengeance, to fulfill all the things written.”¹⁰² Interesting here is that the foretelling of the destruction of Jerusalem in verse 20 was present in Mcn, such that only the sentence running from verse 21 to 22 and culminating in the notice of fulfillment is clearly missing.¹⁰³ This runs counter to the general tendency of complete passages to be present or missing rather than singular elements.¹⁰⁴ Finally, in 24,25, Mcn reads differently than canonical Luke. According to Luke, the risen Jesus says to the disciples on the road to Emmaus, “O fools, and you slow of heart to believe in all the things which the prophets have spoken.” Mcn by contrast lacks the appeal to the prophets, reading either “the things which were spoken to you”¹⁰⁵ or “the things which I spoke to you”.¹⁰⁶ The narration in verse 27 that Jesus went on to explain the Scriptures to the disciples is unattested for Mcn. Two other passages in chapter 24, verses 32–35 and 44–46, both of which address the fulfillment of Scripture, are also unattested by our sources. In connection with what we have seen above, it is quite suspicious that it is the direct statements as to Jesus’ fulfillment of Scripture, however vague, that are missing from Mcn compared to the unmarked allusions.

There is one last example to mention that speaks for this reading of the evidence. In Luke 11,46–52, Jesus pronounces woes upon the lawyers for their guilt in killing the prophets. Interestingly, Mcn is only missing verses 49–51 from the center of this passage, the content of which is all attributed to “the wisdom of God”. This is curious, because the words contained in the missing verses fit right in line with Jesus’ message in the larger passage. Why should Marcion have wanted to omit just these three verses when the theme is the same? As Lieu points out, the omission cannot simply be due to the reference to the prophets, since the verses remaining in Mcn also refer to the prophets. Lieu rather suggests the

101 Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 52).

102 Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 59). Epiphanius claims that Marcion omitted the text due to the fulfillment note.

103 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,39,9.

104 Though see section 1.4 above on 20,37–38.

105 Tertullian, *Marc* 4,43,4. On whether Tertullian’s passive (“[...] omnibus, quae locutus est ad vos”) reflects a free rendering of a third person singular or of a first person singular, as found in Epiphanius and the *Dialogue of Adamantius*, see Roth, *Text* (see n. 14), 268. With Roth, I have chosen to take Tertullian’s passive at face value so as to avoid speculation.

106 Epiphanius, *Pan* 42,11,6 (schol. 77); *Adam* 198,6. Michael Wolter sees even in the Mcn reading of 24,25 a typical Lukan formulation with typically Lukan content that speaks against viewing Mcn as pre-Lukan (cf. Luke 1,45; Acts 27,25). See Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 3.782–783.

verses were omitted “because the passage firmly locates those prophets in the past under the Creator’s regime, whereas in its absence Jesus’ words become a potentially open-ended narrative of the opposition between the faithful (including the ‘prophets’) and those who would kill them.”¹⁰⁷ This is certainly a possibility, but in light of our findings so far, perhaps the verses are missing for another reason, namely due to the introduction: “For this reason the wisdom of God said [...]”. It sounds as if Jesus is appealing to an authoritative text – perhaps from a lost work known as the Wisdom of God – especially since the formulation introduces a lengthy quotation. While this is not the only interpretation of the problem,¹⁰⁸ it would help explain the omission. After all, not only does the quote echo scriptural themes, but Marcion may have rightly recognized that Jesus and his own apostles would incidentally fulfill the words of this authoritative, prophetic statement: “I will send to them prophets and apostles, and some of them they will kill and persecute [...]”.¹⁰⁹

5 Conclusions

We have found that despite the obvious use of scriptural quotations and allusions in Mcn, Jesus himself in no place in Mcn fulfills an explicit scriptural quotation; that no passage occurs where Jesus is said to fulfill Scripture generally; and that the passages Jesus does fulfill, he does so only implicitly, where allusions occur. With the explicit quotations of the Torah, Jesus does not treat Scripture negatively, but each passage appears to have read in ways that would have at least allowed for a Marcionite interpretation. This does not mean, however, that these latter variants in Mcn necessarily preceded the readings known from canonical Luke or *vice versa*. In most cases, priority is ambiguous. Ambiguity is also evident regarding the scope and sources of the missing scriptural material: Usually Mcn lacks entire pericopes, but in several cases it is only one or two relevant verses that are missing. And, although Knox and Tyson – arguing for the posteriority of canonical Luke – point out that a large proportion of material missing from

¹⁰⁷ Lieu, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 229.

¹⁰⁸ For an overview of the various positions, see I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 502–504.

¹⁰⁹ This proposal is more consistent than Moll’s rule 4 (“The Old Testament or its figures are no authority for Christ”), to which he appeals for this omission, and which is rightly criticized by Roth. See Moll, *Arch-Heretic* (see n. 7), 94; Roth, “Prophets, Priests, and Kings” (see n. 6), 46 n. 30.

Mcn belongs to Lukan *Sondergut*,¹¹⁰ their observation applies to very little of the missing scriptural material, most of which is known from Matthew and/or Mark.¹¹¹ In light of these ambiguities, the findings of this study must be considered as only part of a larger discussion. Nevertheless, the greater frequency of scriptural allusions and Jesus' fulfillment of them in Mcn stands out in comparison to the use of explicit quotations and suggests a redactional concept. This would imply that Marcion either knew canonical Luke or a gospel with recognizably Lukan features and removed the immediately obvious trouble points, while he either found allusions less troublesome or simply did not recognize them.

110 Knox, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 106–110; Tyson, *Marcion* (see n. 3), 85–90.

111 Only the missing quotations in 2,23–24 and 22,37 belong to Lukan *Sondergut*. The quotation in 4,18–19 possibly (see the discussion in section 2 above) could – under the auspices of Knox and Tyson's argument – have been added in by a Lukan redactor, as well as the apparent quotation of “the wisdom of God” in 11,49–52, but both of these occur in uniquely Lukan contexts that are attested for Mcn.