Editorial

DOI 10.1515/zac-2017-0000

In recent years, a new debate about Marcion has emerged—although it is not at all clear why this has happened. In 2014, Markus Vinzent published *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*,[1] and in 2015, three major monographs on Marcion appeared: Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*,[2] Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*,[3] and Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*.[4] One must also include the English translation of Marcion's scriptural canon by Jason BeDuhn, published already in 2013 with a dedication to William R. Schoedel as his former academic mentor.[5] Is this sudden interest in Marcion just a mere accident? It was obviously not an anniversary of Adolf von Harnack's famous and still important reference work *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, from 1924,[6] which initiated the recent debate. Was it simply inevitable that after decades of discussions on the Gnostics in the second century Marcion would come to the fore again? Interestingly, now the main focus is one particular issue, namely, the relevance of Marcion for the written Gospels, of course especially for the *Gospel of Luke*. Nevertheless, a closer look shows that

1 Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (Studia Patristica Supplements 2; Leuven, 2014).

2 Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien* (2 vols.; Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 60,1–2; Tübingen, 2015).

3 Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel* (New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 49; Leiden, 2015).

4 Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge, 2015).

5 Jason BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR, 2013), X: "So when I found my research leading, by a natural progression of problems, back into Prof. Schoedel's own beloved second century and the question of the first emergence of the New Testament into history, my thoughts inevitably turned back to him." Cf. the reviews in *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 407–442, with 407–412 Eric Scherbenske, 412–417 Mikael Winninge, 417–426 Richard I. Pervo, 426–434 Clare K. Rothschild, and 434–442 a response by Jason BeDuhn.

6 Adolf von Harnack, *Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche* (2d rev. and enl. ed.; TU 45; Leipzig, 1924). The first edition appeared in 1921. See also Adolf Harnack, *Marcion: Der moderne Gläubige des 2. Jahrhunderts, der erste Reformator: Die Dorpater Preisschrift (1870): Kritische Edition des handschriftlichen Exemplars* (ed. Friedemann Steck; TU 149; Berlin, 2008).

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29

already a few years before 2014/2015, interest in Marcion was beginning to increase, as illustrated by a convergence of research activities.

One particular hot spot was the University of Edinburgh, where in 2009 two PhD theses were completed, one by Sebastian Moll on *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, published in 2010,[7] written under the supervision of Sara Parvis, and the other by Dieter T. Roth under the title "Towards a New Reconstruction of the Text of Marcion's Gospel: History of Research, Sources, Methodology, and the Testimony of Tertullian," which resulted in the publication *The Text of Marcion's Gospel* in 2015. His supervisors were Larry Hurtado and Paul Foster, accompanied by Paul Parvis. Indeed, both PhD theses attempted to revise Harnack's *Marcion*: Moll wanted to reverse Harnack's view on Marcion as a reformer of the church with continuing relevance today, to which the word "arch-heretic" in the title of his dissertation already points. Roth, on the other hand, focusses not on the theological interpretation of Marcion's ideas, but on the text of his gospel and its reconstruction. This was a long-demanded desideratum, especially after Ulrich Schmid had done this for Marcion's collection of Pauline letters in 1995.[8] In addition, Roth's thesis is in line with the research tradition of New Testament scholars in Edinburgh, namely, to include the second century with a special interest in the textual criticism of the New Testament.

When Moll and Roth were beginning their dissertations, Matthias Klinghardt at the University of Dresden published his first two articles on Marcion's *Gospel*: "Markion vs. Luke: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falls" and "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion."[9] Also in 2006, Joseph B. Tyson from Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, published *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*.[10] Interestingly, both New Testament scholars, Klinghardt and Tyson, wanted to renew the thesis of John Knox,[11] that Marcion used a much shorter "*Luke*" than our canonical *Luke*, i. e., that canoni-

7 Sebastian Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT 250; Tübingen, 2010).

8 Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Paulusbriefausgabe* (Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 25; Berlin, 1995); this is the publication of his dissertation, which he finished in 1994.

9 Matthias Klinghardt, "Markion vs. Luke: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falls," *New Testament Studies* 52 (2006): 484–513; idem, "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion," *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008): 1–27. See also idem, "Gesetz bei Markion und Lukas," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag* (ed. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt; Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 57; Göttingen, 2006), 99–128.

10 Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC, 2006).

11 John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago, 1942).

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29

cal *Luke* is an enlargement of Marcion's *Gospel*. Therefore, a revival of Knox—or even of positions from the mid-19th century[12]—is the second hot spot of the new debate on Marcion. Klinghardt, however, went much beyond Knox who at that time stated that "any reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel itself is impossible"[13] and presented only a frequently used list of "Marcionite," "non-Marcionite," and "uncertain" texts from *Luke*.[14] Nevertheless, Klinghardt has actually now reconstructed Marcion's *Gospel* in his 2015 publication, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, which can be understood as the realization of the ideas in his earlier articles. In addition, his opinion that all other Gospels were written in reaction to Marcion's *Gospel* surpasses Knox, who was only concerned with *Luke-Acts* as a post-Marcion double work. Klinghardt bases his considerations about the central role of Marcion's *Gospel* on observations concerning textual criticism and manuscript traditions, especially the so-called "Western tradition," which is in a way comparable to research interests in Edinburgh. Further, his thoughts on the composition of the canonical Gospels show a strong discomfort regarding the Two-Document Hypothesis, one of the conventional solutions of the Synoptic Problem. He refers especially to the so-called Minor Agreements as a "schwere Beeinträchtigung für das Modell" and criticizes "hilflos wirkende Versuche zur Rettung der Zwei-Quellentheorie."[15] According to Klinghardt, neither *Mark* nor the hypothetical document *Q*—whose existence cannot be proved[16]—predate Marcion's *Gospel*, since all gospels including *John* are understood as reactions to Marcion's *Gospel* and were written in the second century. Thus, Klinghardt's proposals represent, in a way, a backlash against source, form, and redaction criticism from the 20th century and belong to the growing preference of a canonical approach in recent decades. Accordingly, the basis for further New Testament research should be the canonical edition of the New Testament. Therefore, he also pleads for a revision of the text-critical deci-

12 This is explicitly stated by Klinghardt, who begins his monograph with a chapter on "Evangelienforschung im 19. Jh." (Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* [see note 2], vol. 1, 3–17), referring to Albert Schwegler, Albrecht Ritschl, Ferdinand Christian Baur, Gustav Volckmar, and Adolf Hilgenfeld. On these relationships, see also John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (see note 11), 78–83; also Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 513–527.

13 Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (see note 11), 111.

14 Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (see note 11), 86.

15 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see note 2), vol. 1, 8–9.

16 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see note 2), vol. 1, 20–21.

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29

sions of NA[28]:[17] the canonical edition should be printed in the text, and all preceding variants, also including of course Marcion's *Gospel*, should be arranged in the *apparatus*.[18]

This dissatisfaction with the Two-Document Hypothesis is also constitutive for the third author stimulating recent debates on Marcion, Markus Vinzent. Vinzent's interest in Marcion did not emerge from New Testament research, but—as a Patristic scholar—from his observations on the second century. It is specifically the question how early Christians thought about the resurrection which led him to Marcion. Already in 1995, he delivered a paper at the International Conference on Patristic Studies in Oxford, published as "Christ's Resurrection: The Pauline Basis of Marcion's Teaching," where he stated, "in addition to Marcion's undeniable dualism the topic of 'Christ's resurrection,' of which until now, we have not heard a word, was a central idea of Marcion."[19] The idea that Marcion initiated a rediscovery of Christ's resurrection, i. e., the alleged absence of Christ's resurrection between Paul and Marcion, was the starting point of his preoccupation with Marcion. His engagement with the resurrection of Christ—fleshly or spiritual—follows the paths of Vinzent's *Doktorvater* Reinhard M. Hübner (University of Munich), who investigated Monarchism, Gnostics, and Docetism in the second century. Vinzent also follows Hübner in dating the letters of Ignatius of Antioch to after the middle of the second century,[20] which supports his evaluations of Marcion. His growing interest in Marcion led to two further articles: "'Ich bin kein körperloses Geistwesen'" (1999) and "Der Schluss des Lukasevangeliums bei Markion" (2002).[21] Here, in his article of 2002, he already announced the desideratum of a book on the resurrection of Christ, realized in his first monograph on Marcion published in 2011, *Christ's Resurrection in Early Christianity and the*

17 NA[28] = Barbara and Kurt Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (28th rev. ed.; Stuttgart, 2014).

18 Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (see note 2), 22, 109, 371–374.

19 Markus Vinzent, "Christ's Resurrection: The Pauline Basis of Marcion's Teaching," in *Papers Presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies* 3: *Preaching, Second Century, Tertullian to Arnobius, Egypt Before Nicaea* (ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone; Studia Patristica 31; Leuven, 1997), (225–233) 226.

20 Cf. the article: Reinhard M. Hübner, "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius," *ZAC* 1 (1997): 44–72.

21 Markus Vinzent, "'Ich bin kein körperloses Geistwesen': Zum Verhältnis von Kerygma Petri, 'Doctrina Petri' und 'IgnSm III'" in *Der paradox Eine: Antignostischer Monarchianismus im 2. Jahrhundert* (ed. Reinhard M. Hübner; VCS 50; Leiden, 1999), 241–286; idem, "Der Schluss des Lukasevangeliums bei Markion," in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung/Marcion and His Impact on Church History* (ed. Gerhard May, Katharina Greschat, and Martin Meiser; TU 150; Berlin, 2002), 79–94.

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29

Making of the New Testament.[22] The second book *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (2014) develops his ideas further, and concentrates on Marcion himself.[23] In contrast to Klinghardt and to Roth, Vinzent does not present a reconstruction of the *Gospel* of Marcion, although he proposes the most provocative thesis of all, namely, that it was Marcion himself who invented the gospel as a new genre and composed a new text, his *Gospel*, combining the sayings of Jesus with narrative elements. For him, Marcion's activities are like a big bang for early Christianity: He stimulated the rediscovery of Paul and initiated the writing of a *Gospel* and the production of a New Testament canon.

Not surprisingly, this series of new books on Marcion has stimulated a new debate and provoked reactions, as a long list of shorter reviews and longer review articles demonstrates.[24] In addition, some conferences have included discussions and panels on Marcion. For instance, at the Annual Meeting of the Society of

22 Markus Vinzent, *Christ's Resurrection in Early Christianity and the Making of the New Testament* (Farnham, 2011). German translation: idem, *Die Auferstehung Christi im frühen Christentum* (Freiburg i. Br., 2014). Cf. the review of Ekkehard Mühlenberg in *ThLZ* 137 (2012): 832–834, and the review article of Mark Edwards, "Markus Vinzent on the Resurrection," in *"If Christ has not been raised . . .": Studies on the Reception of the Resurrection Stories and the Belief in the Resurrection in the Early Church* (ed. Joseph Verheyden, Andreas Merkt, and Tobias Niklas; Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 115; Göttingen, 2016), 123–134. Cf. also the review of Barbara Aland on Vinzent, Roth, and Klinghardt in *ThLZ* 141 (2016): 1226–1230.

23 In the meantime, he has published a third book on Marcion: Markus Vinzent, *Tertullian's Preface to Marcion's Gospel* (Studia Patristica Supplements 5; Leuven, 2016).

24 Listed are only some review articles, mainly written by the combatants themselves: Dieter T. Roth, "Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, and Reconstruction," *The Expository Times* 121 (2010): 287–294; idem, Review of Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, *JThS* 66 (2015): 800–803; idem, "Marcion and the Early New Testament Text," in *The Early Text of the New Testament* (ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Krüger; Oxford, 2012), 302–312; cf. also Roth, "Marcion's Gospel and Luke" (see note 12); Christopher M. Hays, "Marcion vs. Luke: A Response to the *Plädoyer* of Matthias Klinghardt," *ZNW* 99 (2008): 213–232; James Carleton Paget, "Marcion and the Resurrection: Some Thoughts on a Recent Book," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35 (2012): 74–102; Judith M. Lieu, "The Enduring Legacy of Pan-Marcionism," review of *Christ's Resurrection in Early Christianity and the Making of the New Testament*, by Markus Vinzent, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64 (2013): 557–561; Judith M. Lieu, "Marcion and the New Testament," in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge* (ed. Andrew B. McGowan and Kent H. Richards; Society for Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 67; Atlanta, 2011), 399–415; Ulrich Schmid, "How Can We Access Second Century Gospel Texts? The Cases of Marcion and Tatian," in *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity/Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2007 (*ed. Christian-Bernard Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott; Histoire du texte biblique 6; Lausanne, 2003), 139–150; Markus Vinzent, "Marcion's Gospel and the Beginnings of Early Christianity," *Annali di storia dell' esegesi* 32 (2015): 55–87.

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29

Biblical Literature (SBL) in Atlanta in November 2015, the two SBL program units "Formation of Luke and Acts" and "New Testament Textual Criticism" jointly organized a panel discussion with Dieter Roth ("Marcion's Gospel: Reconstructions and Their Implications"), Jason BeDuhn ("Marcion's Evangelion and the Two Source Hypothesis"), Ronald van der Bergh ("Marcion's Legacy and the Old Testament Quotations in Codex Bezae's Luke"), Judith M. Lieu ("Marcion's Gospel and the Question of Theological Tendency") with Markus Vinzent as respondent. At the *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* (SNTS) annual meeting in Montreal, Canada in August 2016, there was a session (*Quaestiones Disputatae*) on "Marcion's Gospel and the New Testament: Catalyst of Consequence" with Matthias Klinghardt, Jason BeDuhn, and Judith M. Lieu on the panel.

The question of Marcion and his *Gospel* is very complicated given that many highly complex issues are interwoven. To mention only the most important: manuscript traditions and textual criticism of the New Testament, including the Western tradition; the Synoptic Problem, including the question of pre-canonical Gospel versions and the Minor Agreements; general questions about the development of Christianity, including the issue "orthodoxy and heresy" in the second century. This last aspect describes the research interest of Judith Lieu in her monograph *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic*. She emphasizes that "Marcion who is encountered is the Marcion transmitted by those who write against him, . . . constructed by the rhetoric of each author."[25] In addition, she pleads that identifying the text Marcion received as well as the deliberate choices or changes made by him will prove "difficult if not impossible"[26]—rejecting, therefore, the concern of the other mentioned authors with reconstructing Marcion's *Gospel*.

It is obvious that neither short reviews nor statements in panel discussions can really deepen the discussion and develop it further. After presenting the main positions, one has to stop where the work has to begin. In addition, several research areas must cooperate on these issues, especially New Testament scholars and scholars concerned with Early Christianity. Therefore, the editors of the *Journal of Ancient Christianity* have decided to publish a special issue on Marcion. Included are two papers by Jason BeDuhn and Dieter T. Roth, who present the debated issues from their point of view. These are followed by an article on Luke 24 and the resurrected Jesus by Daniel A. Smith, who, as a New Testament scholar well engaged in the Synoptic Problem and the Two-Document Hypothesis, takes up the questions of Vinzent. Included is also a paper by T. J. Lang on the important detail whether Tertullian knew Marcion's texts in Greek or in Latin. After-

25 Lieu, *Markon and the Making* (see note 4), 7, 9.
26 Lieu, *Markon and the Making* (see note 4), 203.

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29

wards, both Thomas Johann Bauer and Ulrich Schmid concentrate on one very important component of Klinghardt's reconstruction of Marcion's *Gospel*, namely the "Western tradition" of the New Testament—Bauer working on the *Vetus Latina* traditions on *Luke* and Ulrich Schmid working on the critical edition of the New Testament at the *Institut für Textforschung* in Münster. A response by Matthias Klinghardt to those articles is included as well. The aim to reconstruct Marcion's *Gospel* is called into question by Judith M. Lieu, who—on the basic assumption that the second century only knows a fluidity of texts—takes a fresh look at Gal 1–2 and the reception of εὐαγγέλιον as used in that passage. The closing article by Claudio Moreschini widens the horizon as he reflects on the cultural framework and philosophy of Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* in general.

This special issue of the *Journal of Ancient Christianity*, featuring a collection of invited papers, represents something new in the history of the journal. It takes up the idea of a rubric "discussion papers" in former issues. Many things have been said and written about Marcion in recent years—hopefully this issue will help to take the discussion further!

Uta Heil
Vienna, February 2017

Bereitgestellt von | Vienna University Library
Angemeldet
Heruntergeladen am | 31.05.17 10:29