

# Review Article

Dieter T. Roth

Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, 2nd ed, 2 vols. TANZ 60. Tübingen, Francke: 2020.

## Introduction

It is perhaps fitting to begin this review article of the second edition of Matthias Klinghardt's *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien* with his observation at the outset of an appendix added to this new edition: “[scholarship on] Marcion and his Gospel is booming.”<sup>1</sup> The accuracy of this observation is underscored by Klinghardt's comment that the monographs that have appeared in print over the past decade or so, not to mention a plethora of articles and essays, amount to approximately 4,400 printed pages.<sup>2</sup> That page count may need to be increased, however, on the basis of Klinghardt himself now having published a 1,279-page first edition of his work, the

<sup>1</sup> Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., TANZ 60 (Tübingen, Francke: 2020), 429. All translations here and throughout are my own.

<sup>2</sup> See Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 429n3. Included in this count are monographs by Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke–Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006); Volker Lukas, *Rhetorik und literarischer “Kampf”: Tertullians Streitschrift gegen Marcion als Paradigma der Selbstvergewisserung der Orthodoxie gegenüber der Häresie; Eine philologisch-theologische Analyse* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008); Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Jason BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2013); Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, StPatrSup 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014); Ulrike Margarethe Salome Röhl, *Der Paulusschüler Markion: Eine kritische Untersuchung zum Antijudaismus im 2. Jahrhundert* (Marburg: Tectum, 2014); Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, NTTSD 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Otto Zwierlein, *Die anti-häretischen Evangelienprologe und die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2015); Markus Vinzent, *Tertullian's Preface to Marcion's Gospel*, StPatrSup 5 (Leuven: Peeters, 2016); Pier Angelo Gramaglia, *Marcione e il Vangelo (di Luca): Un Confronto con Matthias Klinghardt* (Torino: Academia University Press, 2017); and Claudio Gianotto and Andrea Nicolotti, *Il Vangelo di Marcione*, Nuova Universale Einaudi 22 (Torino: Giulio Einaudi, 2019). I have discussed various issues related to Marcion's gospel arising from several of these works in, e.g., Dieter T. Roth, “Marcion's Gospel and the History of Early Christianity: The Devil Is in the (Reconstructed) Details,” *ZAC* 21 (2017): 25–40; Roth, “The Link between Luke and Marcion's Gospel: Prolegomena and Initial Considerations,” in *Luke on Jesus, Paul and Christianity: What Did He Really Know?*, ed. Joseph Verheyden and John Kloppenborg, BTS 29 (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 59–80; Roth, “Marcion's Gospel and the Synoptic Problem in Recent Scholarship,” in *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis*, ed. Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu, International Studies in Christian Origins/LNTS 573 (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 267–83; and Roth, “Marcion's Gospel,” in *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*, ed. Chris Keith, Helen Bond, and Jens Schröter, 3 vols. (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 2:291–301.

1,446–page second edition reviewed here, and a 1,409–page English edition.<sup>3</sup> Although this level of scholarly output undoubtedly makes the present era an exciting time for scholarship on Marcion and Marcion’s gospel, it also means that in the following review article, it will not be possible to enter into countless facets of the contemporary discussions swirling around Marcion. At the same time, a consideration of several crucial issues is nevertheless possible and hopefully also helpful. The structure of the following review article has been influenced by the fact that in the new edition of his work, Klinghardt has focused especially on my own reconstruction of Marcion’s gospel, and the methodological approach undergirding my reconstruction, as one “diametrically opposed” to his own.<sup>4</sup> For this reason, after providing a brief overview of the content of the second edition, especially as it relates to changes from the first edition,<sup>5</sup> I will focus on two important areas of agreement between Klinghardt’s and my own work that are underemphasized in his study and then consider a few areas of fundamental disagreement. In this way, it is my hope that this review article can contribute to ongoing, fruitful debates concerning this extremely important second-century “heretic” and his gospel.

## The Revised and Expanded Second Edition

The basic content of Klinghardt’s two-volume work has remained the same in the second edition. Volume 1 of the work presents Klinghardt’s study of various questions relevant to scholarship on Marcion’s gospel under the primary headings: (1) “The Question and Topic,” (2) “The Marcionite Gospel and Its Text in the Early Church,” (3) “The Literary Relationship Between \*Ev and Luke,” (4) “From the Oldest Gospel to the Four-Gospel Canon: A Tradition-Historical Outline,” and (5) “Outlook.” In volume 1, Klinghardt’s discussion ultimately serves to set forth his view that Marcion’s gospel, identified by the siglum \*Ev,<sup>6</sup> was a precanonical version of Luke and the source for precanonical versions of Mark, Matthew, and John. All of these precanonical versions, in Klinghardt’s model, were then subsequently edited and redacted in order to achieve their canonical form.<sup>7</sup> In volume 2, Klinghardt presents his reconstruction of \*Ev (a nearly 800-page appendix 1),

<sup>3</sup> Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, 2 vols., TANZ 60 (Tübingen, Francke: 2015); see n. 1 for the bibliographic reference to the second edition; Matthias Klinghardt, *The Oldest Gospel and the Formation of the Canonical Gospels*, 2 vols., BTS 41 (Leuven: Peeters, 2021). See also the review by Olegs Andrejevs recently published in *RBL* 05/2022 (<https://www.sblcentral.org/home/bookDetails/1000144>). Although the various editions of Klinghardt’s work comprise two volumes, the page numbers are always continuous from volume 1 to volume 2. The second edition was printed with slightly smaller pages so the increase in page numbers is not entirely due to newly added material.

<sup>4</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 431.

<sup>5</sup> The first edition has been reviewed alongside other recent works on Marcion’s gospel as in, e.g., Barbara Aland, review of Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel*, Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, *TLZ* 141 (2016): 1226–30.

<sup>6</sup> It is important to note, as discussed below, that in Klinghardt’s conception \*Ev represents Marcion’s gospel as conceived in Klinghardt’s theory, namely, as the *Urevangelium* and a text significantly more expansive than that which is actually extant in the heresiological attestation of Marcion’s gospel text.

<sup>7</sup> Klinghardt presents diagrams of his understanding of gospel relationships, including their posit-ed precanonical forms, in *Das älteste Evangelium*, 339, 341, and 402.

a translation of the text (appendix 2), and data concerning the heresiological attestation for \*Ev and points of contact in the manuscripts of canonical Luke (appendix 3).

In the foreword to the second edition, Klinghardt informs the reader that he has corrected a “substantial” number of errors and mistakes in the first edition, which had been overlooked to an “untenable extent” in his prior publication.<sup>8</sup> Given the incredible complexity involved when working on the text of Marcion’s gospel, a certain number of errors is almost unavoidable, and Klinghardt’s request for the reader’s forbearance concerning any remaining inaccuracies is understandable.<sup>9</sup> A further change mentioned in the preface involves the siglum used for Marcion’s gospel. Klinghardt believes he made an “embarrassing oversight” in the first edition in that he overlooked that Marcion’s gospel bore the title “gospel” (εὐαγγέλιον). Thus, the siglum “Mcn,” which Klinghardt used in the first edition, has been replaced in the second edition by “\*Ev.” Even though Klinghardt may be correct in his view that this change could avoid the confusion that he is advocating the view that Marcion authored the gospel, a position advocated by Markus Vinzent but not set forth by Klinghardt, the change is ultimately little more than cosmetic.<sup>10</sup> As in the first edition, regardless of whether the text is identified as Mcn or as \*Ev, that which Klinghardt is reconstructing is not Marcion’s gospel as attested in the explicit sources for Marcion’s gospel.<sup>11</sup> Rather, the text that Klinghardt is seeking to reconstruct is the “oldest gospel,” a text that is sometimes attested by the heresiological sources for Marcion’s gospel and sometimes in the broader Lukan manuscript tradition. As I have pointed out previously, it seems to me that there is a fundamental conceptual problem in Klinghardt’s approach when he contends that his siglum for Marcion’s gospel, were it not for their association with certain models in the history of scholarship, could be labelled appropriately as *Urevangelium*, *Protevangeliium*, *Protolukas*, or *Protomarkus* and that one can draw from readings in the Lukan manuscript tradition in order to reconstruct it.<sup>12</sup> In my view, one must first reconstruct critically Marcion’s gospel from the actual sources for it before positing its relationship to other gospels.<sup>13</sup> As discussed further below, my position is understood correctly by Klinghardt as diametrically opposed to his own.

More significant are a number of changes in Klinghardt’s reconstruction due to his having become convinced that he either did not follow his own methodological principles strictly enough or that the proposals of others were superior. In the foreword, Klinghardt himself draws attention to changes made in \*9:22 and \*11:2 (due to inconsistent application of Klinghardt’s own methodological principles), \*9:60 (due to additional consideration of heresiological sources), and \*22:19 (more precise interpretation of the sources leading to a more precise line of argumentation).<sup>14</sup> Although I continue to find numerous aspects of Klinghardt’s reconstruction problematic, regardless of the extent to which one is inclined to agree or disagree with Klinghardt’s “global theory” of gospel relationships or the nature, extent, and details of his reconstruction of the supposed “old-

<sup>8</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, vii.

<sup>9</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, vii.

<sup>10</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 27. See, e.g., Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, *StPatrSup* 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 91–92. Klinghardt interacts with Vinzent’s view on pp. 416–21.

<sup>11</sup> See the overview in Roth, “Link between Luke and Marcion’s Gospel,” 63–64.

<sup>12</sup> See Roth, “Link between Luke and Marcion’s Gospel,” 61–64, 72–73.

<sup>13</sup> My own attempt to provide a critical reconstruction of Marcion’s gospel can be found in Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel*, *NTTSD* 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

<sup>14</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, vii.

est gospel” (“Marcion’s gospel”), it is vital for anyone working on Marcion’s gospel to consult his reconstruction and the tremendous amount of helpful data contained therein.

## Two Areas of Agreement

Before considering a few significant areas of *disagreement* between Klinghardt’s and my own respective approaches to reconstructing Marcion’s gospel, it is worth noting that there are two important and noteworthy areas of *agreement*. It is unfortunate, however, that these agreements are not highlighted more clearly in Klinghardt’s second edition. Klinghardt is right to bemoan the fact that, in the nineteenth-century discourse concerning Marcion’s gospel, “many insightful and productive observations and ideas were not given the consideration that they deserved and instead ended up overlooked and lost in a scholarly discussion that rapidly became increasingly difficult to follow.”<sup>15</sup> For this reason, the following two issues are underscored here in an attempt to ensure that this does not occur as often in the contemporary discussion, especially as both of the following points of agreement relate to our most important witness, Tertullian.<sup>16</sup>

The first issue relates to the question of “how one is to understand Tertullian’s references that Marcion allegedly excised passages from the canonical Gospel [of Luke] that are not found in Luke.”<sup>17</sup> The problem here is that, despite Tertullian having stated explicitly at multiple points in *Adversus Marcionem* that it was his belief that Marcion had mutilated canonical Luke to create his own gospel text, Tertullian accused Marcion of having deleted Matthean readings and texts from “the gospel.” As Klinghardt notes correctly, this problem is not one of “Matthean-sounding formulations in the Matthean-Lukan double tradition” but applies “to statements found *only* in Matthew.”<sup>18</sup> Immediately following this statement, Klinghardt inserts a footnote in which he refers to my 2008 *Journal of Theological Studies* article “Matthean Texts and Tertullian’s Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*,” an article in which I also discussed this issue.<sup>19</sup> It is therefore a little surprising that Klinghardt appears to continue his discussion almost entirely independent of any interaction with this publication. He mentions only the views that Tertullian was simply wrong when he made these accusations (a view advanced by

<sup>15</sup> See the discussion in Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 3–19, 409–10; and the overview in Dieter T. Roth, “Marcion’s Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate,” *JBL* 127 (2008): 513–27; and Roth, *Text of Marcion’s Gospel*, 8–23.

<sup>16</sup> As Judith Lieu has noted rightly, the Marcion “who has had the most impact on modern perceptions is undoubtedly the Marcion who emerges from Tertullian’s lengthy polemics against him, particularly the five books comprising *Against Marcion*” (*Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015], 50). For Marcion’s gospel, the importance of Tertullian is evidenced statistically, since of the 486 verses attested as present in Marcion’s gospel, Tertullian attests 438 of them, and for 328 verses he is the sole witness. By comparison, Epiphanius provides data for readings in 114 verses, and the *Admantius Dialogue* contains 75 verses that at least ought to be considered as possibly witnessing Marcion’s gospel. For details of the statistical analysis, see Roth, *Marcion’s Gospel*, 86, 271–72, 355–56. Tables providing an overview of all verses attested as present, verses attested as absent, and unattested verses for Marcion’s gospel can be found in Roth, *Marcion’s Gospel*, 49–78.

<sup>17</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 68.

<sup>18</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 68.

<sup>19</sup> Dieter T. Roth, “Matthean Texts and Tertullian’s Accusations in *Adversus Marcionem*,” *JTS* NS 59 (2008): 580–97.

Theodor Zahn, Adolf von Harnack, and others)<sup>20</sup> and a curious reference to “the most recent attempt at an explanation,” an article by David Salter Williams published over three decades (!) ago, that “assumes that Tertullian’s text of Luke was quite different from our critical text: it indeed included those passages Tertullian accuses Marcion of deleting.”<sup>21</sup> Far more significantly, although Klinghardt only discusses three of the seven relevant passages,<sup>22</sup> he recognizes rightly that in these passages, the best explanation is that,

Since Tertullian was convinced that Marcion not only redacted the text of canonical Luke but also took it out of the context of the canonical Bible, Tertullian could bring up the accusation—in his characteristic terminology—of mutilating the four-Gospel book as well: Marcion had not only “gnawed away” and “emended” Luke but *the Gospels* collectively.<sup>23</sup>

It should not be surprising that I find Klinghardt’s explanation here to be correct since it reflects, in essence, my own conclusion from 2008:

I would submit that with only one clear exception, where Tertullian’s memory failed him, the accusations, or at least most of them, concerning the deletion of Matthean verses or elements levelled by Tertullian against Marcion are best explained by Tertullian’s theological perspective that the four gospels comprise a single, unitary “Gospel”, and therefore were motivated by Marcion having rejected the Gospel of Matthew.<sup>24</sup>

In the midst of scholarly disagreements, it is valuable to attend to and mention explicitly such an element of agreement, especially since it is highly relevant for the reconstruction of Marcion’s gospel text.

A second area of agreement, however, is even more substantial in that it involves the language in which Tertullian was interacting with Marcion’s gospel. Concerning this point, Klinghardt refers, again correctly, to the position suggested by Harnack<sup>25</sup> (and followed by others) that Tertullian was consulting a Latin version of Marcion’s gospel as a position “that would affect directly the assessment of Tertullian’s” presentation of Marcion’s gospel.<sup>26</sup> Klinghardt is

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott; Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*, 2nd ed., TUGAL 45 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924), 216\*; and Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols. (Erlangen: Deichert, 1888–1892), 1:683.

<sup>21</sup> David Salter Williams, “On Tertullian’s Text of Luke,” *SecCent* 8 (1991): 193–99; Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 69. It should also be noted that Klinghardt has not quite accurately presented Williams’s position as Williams did not argue that Tertullian’s Luke included all the passages Tertullian accuses Marcion of having deleted. Williams wrote, “As I have stated, our problem is that although Tertullian identifies Marcion’s text base as Luke, he condemns Marcion for having excised certain passages which do not actually appear in Luke, but are found in Matthew and/or Mark. *In at least one case, it is possible that this may be accounted for by a harmonistic reading in Tertullian’s text of Luke*” (“On Tertullian’s Text,” 196, emphasis added). Williams’s remarks on this one passage, namely, Luke 6:35–36 and Matt 5:45, are considered by him to be “exploratory and programmatic,” but only suggestive of it potentially being “profitable to re-examine certain aspects of this work [on Tertullian’s text of Luke]” (199).

<sup>22</sup> Klinghardt discusses Matt 15:24, 26 and Matt 5:17. Additional directly relevant accusations by Tertullian involve Matt 2:11 (*Marc.* 3.13.6) and the readings in Matt 5:45 when discussing Luke 6:35–6 (*Marc.* 2.17.1; 4.17.6), Matt 10:10 when discussing Luke 9:3 (*Marc.* 4.21.1), and Matt 10:34 when discussing Luke 12:51 (*Marc.* 4.29.14). See Roth, “Matthean Texts,” 581.

<sup>23</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 74, emphasis original.

<sup>24</sup> Roth, “Matthean Texts,” 597.

<sup>25</sup> Harnack, *Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, 47\*–55\*.

<sup>26</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 68.

also right in stating that “Harnack’s argument is quite weak,” that “Harnack’s argumentation seems to be contrived,” and that “Harnack’s references do not support” his thesis.<sup>27</sup> For this reason, Klinghardt assumes that “Tertullian—just like Epiphanius and Adamantius” used a Greek copy of Marcion’s gospel.<sup>28</sup> Unfortunately, however, Klinghardt presents his position largely on the basis of his belief that the burden of proof lies with the view that Tertullian had a Latin translation of Marcion’s gospel and that “until proven otherwise (which would require a systematic and complete analysis of Tertullian’s citation habits as well as his multiple citations), it is advisable to forego assuming a Latin *Vorlage* for the reconstruction” of Marcion’s gospel.<sup>29</sup> As Klinghardt observes, arguments based on “vocabulary and style” are indeed “notoriously problematic when used to justify source-critical judgements” and “demand a complete analysis of Tertullian’s citation habits in *all* of his writings.”<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, “for a substantiated conclusion, all references [in Tertullian’s works]—beyond *Marc. 4*—would need to be examined.”<sup>31</sup> Klinghardt is absolutely correct, and this rather laborious analysis is what I provided in a lengthy 2009 article published in *Vigiliae Christianae*, entitled “Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion’s Gospel?”<sup>32</sup> On the basis of the evidence involving the eighty-seven lemma or phrases at which comparison is possible between references to Marcion’s gospel and other references in the entirety of Tertullian’s corpus, I concluded “that the evidence is better explained by 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 Marcionem*.”<sup>33</sup> The point here is not to engage in a stereotypical scholarly complaint of someone “not citing my work.” The point, rather, is that Klinghardt and I, once again, agree on an important issue related to the study of Marcion’s gospel and a vitally important point when considering the reconstruction of Marcion’s gospel text. Even though this agreement was not noted in Klinghardt’s study, it can at least be highlighted in this review article.

## Areas of Methodological Disagreement

As mentioned above, although Klinghardt and I have agreed on several important issues relevant for the reconstruction of Marcion’s gospel, it is also abundantly clear that there are fundamental areas of disagreement. Once again, since space does not permit entering into every disagreement in detail, I will here focus on two foundational issues discussed by Klinghardt after the publication of the first edition of his work and found at the end of the first volume of the second edition in the above-mentioned appendix entitled, “The Marcionite Gospel in Recent Discussion: An Epilogue on Methodology.”<sup>34</sup> In these comments penned for

<sup>27</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 75, 78.

<sup>28</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 78.

<sup>29</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 78.

<sup>30</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 76, emphasis original.

<sup>31</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 78.

<sup>32</sup> Dieter T. Roth, “Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion’s Gospel?,” *VC* 63 (2009): 429–67.

<sup>33</sup> Roth, “Greek Copy or Latin Gospel?,” 467. My somewhat cautious conclusion reflects the difficulty of making a definitive judgment in the light of the challenges presented by the evidence and historical circumstances of Tertullian’s writing, a point also highlighted by T. J. Lang, “Did Tertullian Read Marcion in Latin? Grammatical Evidence from the Greek of *Ephesians 3:9* in Marcion’s *Apostolikon* as Presented in the Latin of Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem*,” *ZAC* 21 (2017): 63–72.

<sup>34</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 429–65.

the new edition, I appreciate Klinghardt's correct observation, referenced in the introduction above, that my own methodological approach is "diametrically opposed" to his own and that, "since Roth very clearly establishes the foundations of his line of argumentation, this is where the conversation should begin."<sup>35</sup> In the spirit of collegial scholarly disagreement, I am happy to have the opportunity here to continue the conversation.

The first point relates to a foundational methodological issue, and Klinghardt notes correctly that fundamentally opposite decisions concerning a central methodological problem "are reflected in countless differences between our reconstructions."<sup>36</sup> I have argued that one must give attention to the reconstructed text of Marcion's gospel prior to discussing the relationship between Marcion's gospel and canonical Luke.<sup>37</sup> Klinghardt has argued that determining the editorial direction is a prerequisite for reconstruction.<sup>38</sup> Klinghardt recognizes the potential circularity of his position but claims that he avoids it by contending that the priority of Marcion's gospel "can be ascertained *independently* of a detailed reconstruction" on the basis of only the larger differences concerning the gospel's beginning, middle, and ending.<sup>39</sup> This "heuristic supposition" must then "evidently, be reinforced by numerous additional observations."<sup>40</sup> This claim strikes me as problematic. First of all, throughout the history of scholarship, the direction of redaction has never been able to be established merely on the basis of the gospel's beginning, middle, and end. The fact that no consensus has been able to be brought about through arguments concerning these "big picture" differences presents a significant challenge to Klinghardt's belief these types of arguments are not only possible but also able to be convincing. After all, it must be pointed out that it is at least possible to make very different arguments concerning these larger differences. The precise opposite argument, namely, that Marcion's gospel is *not* prior to canonical Luke, was set forth in 2010 by Sebastian Moll, who is just as convinced of the correctness of his position as Klinghardt is of his own.<sup>41</sup> Or, in 2006, Joseph Tyson argued that the beginning (Luke 1–2) and end (Luke 24) were post-Marcion additions, but that in the middle (Luke 3–23), "it is not difficult to account for his [Marcion's] omissions from this text."<sup>42</sup> If nothing else, the wide variety of views represented in scholarship on Marcion's gospel underscore the necessity of specific details being brought to bear in the discussion. Furthermore, if that which has supposedly been established is nevertheless still in need of being reinforced through numerous detailed observations, it seems to me that one still ends up assuming that which needs reinforcement when constructing the required reinforce-

<sup>35</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 431. I am also appreciative of the compliment included in the reference to my methodological argument in the English edition of Klinghardt's work: "I shall focus my response on Roth's well thought through methodological argument" (Klinghardt, *Oldest Gospel*, 411).

<sup>36</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 432.

<sup>37</sup> See the comments to this effect in, e.g., Roth, "Link between Marcion's Gospel and Luke," 60; and Roth, *Text of Marcion's Gospel*, 1.

<sup>38</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 431.

<sup>39</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 434, emphasis original.

<sup>40</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 434.

<sup>41</sup> See Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, WUNT 250 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 93–98. It is also worth noting that, contra Klinghardt, Enrico Norelli, *Markion und der biblische Kanon*, Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen 11 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 111n18, finds Moll "convincing" in his explanation that Marcion's editorial activity can be explained against the background of Marcion's theological convictions.

<sup>42</sup> Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 117.

ment. Although Klinghardt contends that his approach “is not circular,”<sup>43</sup> it is difficult to see how this is not the case.

This leads me to a second point, namely, that Klinghardt argues that one *must* assume a redactional direction and that, despite my claim that I have sought not to do so, Klinghardt is convinced that I have in fact assumed Lukan priority throughout.<sup>44</sup> The first element in my discussion of this second point concerns the contention that I have assumed Lukan priority as it relates to passages “concerning which the hersiological attestations are ambiguous. These are, in the first instance, *contradictory attestations*.”<sup>45</sup> Although a full discussion of this point would require significantly more space than is available in a review article, I fundamentally disagree with Klinghardt’s characterization of these differences in the sources. Klinghardt states that, through these differences, the sources show that they “reveal ... only different, more or less clearly deviating exemplars of a text” and in the footnote to this comment states that the sources “indeed attest a *different* text” of Marcion’s gospel.<sup>46</sup> This language of “varying exemplars” and “*different* textual forms” reveals that Klinghardt apparently views these different attestations to be accurate in their reflection of their exemplar and thus as attesting different exemplars. Here it seems to me that Klinghardt has assumed that these differences in attestation have come about exclusively through differences in exemplars, when, in fact, the differences could have, and in my view did, come about due to a wide variety of factors. This is the basic criticism of Ulrich Schmid in a 2017 article,<sup>47</sup> which it does not seem that Klinghardt has appreciated properly based on both his previous comments and his statements in the appendix of the second edition of *Das älteste Evangelium*.

Schmid argues that if one assumes that the differences between the attestation in the sources reflect, in every instance, a different exemplar, one ends up ultimately with a reconstruction of Marcion’s text whose transmission history in the sources for that text occurs in a manner completely different than the transmission evidenced for canonical Luke at the same points in the manuscript tradition. Schmid is correct when he states, “This, however, seems to me to be neither necessary nor advisable.... Here the fact that Klinghardt accepts the testimony of the individual sources practically at face value comes home to roost. He burdens the sources with more than they can bear and thus falls prey to their respective idiosyncrasies, which, through inattentiveness and their own biases, distort the picture.”<sup>48</sup> Schmid is thus underscoring that Klinghardt has simply accepted the patristic textual witness as it stands without considering the variety of issues that may call many of those readings into question.

Klinghardt’s response to this criticism is somewhat curious to me and begins, once again, with the differences in attestation in the sources: “These contradictory attestations necessarily require the diachronic determination of the relationship between Marcion’s gospel and Luke, since only the determination of the editorial direction can explain how these contradictory attestations have arisen and how, ultimately, they are to be resolved.”<sup>49</sup> It is striking that Klinghardt claims that it is one single issue, namely, the editorial direction, that can alone ex-

<sup>43</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 434.

<sup>44</sup> In his review of the English edition of Klinghardt’s work, Andrejevs indicates that he views Klinghardt as having incorrectly accused me of committing the error of prejudging the editorial direction (Andrejevs, review of *Oldest Gospel and the Formation of the Canonical Gospels*, 3).

<sup>45</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 435, emphasis original.

<sup>46</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 435 and 435n13, emphasis original.

<sup>47</sup> See Ulrich Schmid, “Das marcionitische *Evangelium* und die (Text-)Überlieferung der *Evangelien*,” *ZAC* 21 (2017): 90–109.

<sup>48</sup> Schmid, “Das marcionitische *Evangelium*,” 108–9.

<sup>49</sup> Matthias Klinghardt, “Das marcionitische *Evangelium* und die Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments: Eine Antwort an Thomas Johann Bauer und Ulrich B. Schmid,” *ZAC* 21 (2017): 116.

plain the contradictory attestation.<sup>50</sup> It is therefore somewhat confusing and slightly ironic that Klinghardt's "first objection to Roth's approach" is that "a reconstruction without taking into account the editorial direction is *not meaningful*, since it inappropriately simplifies the complex conditions of the heresiological attestation."<sup>51</sup> In fact, it is my approach that sees a wide variety of possible causes for such differences, as evidenced through the weighing of multiple citations in the witnesses, for such varying attestation (including, e.g., memory errors, unconscious influence of citation habits, as well as possible differences in the exemplars), and it is actually Klinghardt's approach that reduces the complex status of the witnesses and makes the issue of redactional direction the singular issue of concern.

As Klinghardt continues his response to Schmid, he seems to think that the primary target of Schmid's criticism is the fact that Klinghardt has used the entire Lukan textual tradition in his reconstruction and believes that Schmid's observations do not refute his contention that there are variants in the New Testament manuscripts that have a precanonical origin.<sup>52</sup> But, unless I have misunderstood Schmid, although Schmid may view these issues as problematic, neither of them is actually the fundamental issue that he is raising. In fact, it is again rather ironic that Klinghardt states that one should not compare "apples and oranges, or manuscripts with references to manuscripts" and asks "what would have been the result, if Schmid had not compared the New Testament manuscripts of Luke, but rather the patristic attestation of the text of Luke with the patristic attestation of Marcion's Gospel?"<sup>53</sup> This question, however, is actually the point. Klinghardt appears to treat the patristic witnesses as if they were the equivalent of manuscripts (reflecting varying exemplars), whereas they must be treated as witnesses susceptible to additional influences precisely due to their being patristic attestations and *not* manuscripts. The fact that Klinghardt is convinced that it is impossible "to comply with Ulrich Schmid's wish when he required of me to 'examine anew the reliability of each individual source in each individual passage, and, if necessary, to question it'" and that my own study of citation habits as it relates to Marcion's gospel, which engages in precisely the type of comparison referenced above, somehow "presupposes the priority of the *canonical over the Marcionite versions*" reveals that the implications of the fact that one is dealing with patristic citations has not been fully recognized by Klinghardt.<sup>54</sup> This observation leads to the second element of the second point, with which I will conclude.

Klinghardt also contends that my handling of Matthean influence in citations<sup>55</sup> and the manner in which I consider the manuscript tradition betrays an assumption of Lukan priority. Perhaps not surprisingly, I again would disagree. It is important to recognize that everyone agrees that Marcion's gospel and canonical Luke are related in a unique manner. Even Klinghardt states, "It is undisputed that Marcion's Gospel and canonical Luke are interrelated through literary dependency and that they are connected through an editorial process."<sup>56</sup>

<sup>50</sup> That Klinghardt views all of the varying attestations monolithically is further underscored as he continues his response to Schmid's criticism in a telling comment that because there are a handful of examples of differences that cannot be explained through the citation habits of the patristic sources, "these examples necessarily require a different solution. And this different solution then explains without any difficulty the remaining 60 examples that at first blush appear to be less significant" (Klinghardt, "Antwort an Bauer und Schmid," 117n18).

<sup>51</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 433, emphasis original.

<sup>52</sup> Klinghardt, "Antwort an Bauer und Schmid," 117–18.

<sup>53</sup> Klinghardt, "Antwort an Bauer und Schmid," 117–18n22.

<sup>54</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 450, 452 citing Schmid, "Das marionitische Evangelium," 98.

<sup>55</sup> N.B.: this is a different issue than the one mentioned above in which Tertullian explicitly accuses Marcion of having omitted Matthean verses or readings.

<sup>56</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 432.

The assumption that I have actually made is that, because of this relationship, the Lukan textual tradition can provide insight into attested readings for Marcion's gospel<sup>57</sup> and that the Lukan textual tradition is an identifiably distinct tradition from other gospel traditions, like the Matthean textual tradition, even if contamination has occurred. I have also demonstrated through the study of multiple citations that the patristic witnesses have a tendency, among other things, to cite verses in their Matthean forms, and I have agreed with Kenji Tsutsui's analysis of the Adamantius Dialogue that the Dialogue's citations of texts have been made more Matthean during its transmission history.<sup>58</sup> For instance, in an example Klinghardt discusses of my approach (Luke 6:23), Tertullian attests ἀπτῶν and Epiphanius attests ὑμῶν as the possessive pronoun following οἱ πατέρες. I argue that, since the second-person possessive pronoun is only attested in three minuscules and an Ethiopian manuscript in the entirety of the Lukan manuscript tradition, and since Epiphanius uses the same pronoun in a reference significantly later in his *Panarion*, one should follow Tertullian's witness, although I also concluded in my reconstruction that Tertullian's reading is "very likely" instead of "secure."<sup>59</sup> The idea that these observations do not provide helpful insight or that they can only be made if one assumes Lukan priority is simply not evident. Klinghardt is, to a certain extent, correct in his observation that in my assessment of the patristic witnesses concerning the issue of possible Matthean influences, I have "a basic mistrust of any [Matthean] attestation."<sup>60</sup> I would actually go further, however, and say that I have an initial mistrust of *any* attestation found in the patristic witnesses. This mistrust, however, is not an a priori mistrust but a mistrust that arises out of having found the patristic citations in far more instances than not to have been shaped by a wide variety of influences that must be recognized and weighed critically, a conclusion consonant with the results of decades of scholarship on the use of the church fathers in New Testament textual criticism.<sup>61</sup>

## Conclusion

There is obviously a certain sense in which the comments written on these few short pages are entirely inadequate as an attempt to even begin interacting with the thousands of pages written by Klinghardt. Nevertheless, it is my hope that the reflections in this review article concerning both agreements and disagreements present in the contemporary discussion concerning Marcion's gospel will stimulate further discussion about this fascinating and important text in

<sup>57</sup> Once again, it is important to underscore that in my approach, although the Lukan textual tradition can provide insight into attested readings for Marcion's gospel it should not be used to generate readings for Marcion's gospel.

<sup>58</sup> See the brief overview of this point in Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, and Reconstruction," *ExpTim* 121 (2010): 293–94 and the more extensive discussions in Roth, *Text of Marcion's Gospel*. See Kenji Tsutsui, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Markioniten im Adamantios-Dialog: Ein Kommentar zu den Buchern I–II*, PTS 55 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004), esp. 92.

<sup>59</sup> My reconstruction of Marcion's gospel includes "levels of certainty" in order to provide additional nuance due to the challenging nature of the reconstruction of the text (see Roth, *Text of Marcion's Gospel*, 410–12).

<sup>60</sup> Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 445.

<sup>61</sup> See, e.g., the essays by Gordon D. Fee and Roderic L. Mullen, H. A. G. Houghton, and Sebastian Brock on the use of Greek, Latin, and Syriac fathers in New Testament textual criticism in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 351–428.

---

early Christianity and contribute in some small measure to the ongoing, and indeed booming, discussion of Marcion and Marcion's gospel.