

Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 49; Leiden: Brill, 2015. Pp. 491. ISBN 978-90-04-24520-4. Hardcover €158/\$220.

- [1] Needless to say that a discussion of the canon of the New Testament cannot be led without talking about Marcion and his writings, above all his gospel. Consequently, the present monograph, Dieter T. Roth's revised and expanded dissertation from 2009, written under the auspices of Larry Hurtado and Paul Foster at the University of Edinburgh, is dedicated to a still relevant scholarly *desideratum*: the (critical) reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel. But the book does not offer that only; it soundly focuses on and discusses the sources that can and should be used for reconstructing what we do not have any more today; and it ends with further *desiderata* for future research. All in all, Roth accomplishes what will become the standard edition of Marcion's Gospel, no matter if this or that reconstruction is challenged and requires modification or correction in the future.
- [2] Apart from what is expected from a book in the series *New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents*—a preface, a list of abbreviations, a comprehensive bibliography with primary and secondary sources, and the usual indices (of sources and modern authors)—the volume is structured as follows: a brief introduction, history of research, a discussion of sources and methodology, Tertullian, Epiphanius, the *Adamantius Dialogue*, additional sources, the reconstruction itself, and conclusions and *desiderata*, something which appears as a standard and logical progressive treatment of the subject matter.
- [3] In his short introduction (pp. 1–6) Roth defines the purpose and goal of his work (see above), interacts with other attempts that have been made so far and others who focused on Marcion's *Apostolikum*, that is, at least on the half of Marcion's canon (e.g., U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, ANTF 25 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995]). In footnote 200 on p. 44 he mentions forthcoming studies by Judith Lieu, Matthias Klinghardt, and Markus Vinzent. Judith Lieu's *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), implicitly proves that Roth's initiative to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel critically has very much been needed, as she herself dedicates her studies to the "Marcion who is offered by those who wrote against him" (p. 10) and the "Marcion [who] emerges when the most marked characteristics of the profiles that have been discovered are set within the currents of the second century" (p. 11). Consequently, Marcion's Gospel itself is an indispensable marker for who Marcion was, how he dealt with (sources of) the New Testament, and his significance for and among early Christians and research nowadays. Vinzent's *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, *Studia Patristica Supplement 2* (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), primarily specializes on the importance and time of Marcion for early Christianity. He concludes: "All witnesses, including Mark, have integrated the one source Marcion... The comparison speaks strongly of Marcion as their common source" (p. 274). For Vinzent Marcion is the one who created the genre *gospel* (cf. The review by P.A. Himes, TC 20 [2015; <http://purl.org/TC>). Klinghardt's *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien I: Untersuchung; II: Rekonstruktion, Übersetzung, Varianten*, TANZ 60.1–2 (Tübingen: Francke, 2015), offers an impressive and massive treatment of Marcion's Gospel and, apart from a history of research, discussions of methodology, and other very valuable studies, a reconstruction of Marcion's text(s) based on a scrutinizing comparison between the Gospel of Luke and Marcion's Gospel. For Klinghardt, Marcion's Gospel represents a pre-Lukan and pre-canonical text that served as a *Vorlage* for all the other gospels to follow and, thus, manifest the oldest literary source about the life of Jesus.
- [4] But back to Roth's critical reconstruction of Marcion's Gospel. Roth is right in stating that (p. 6) "since several flaws in earlier studies are due to a lack of an accurate understanding of the *status quaestionis* at various points in the history of research on Marcion's Gospel, it is only by engaging previous scholarship on Marcion's Gospel that one can hope to avoid such errors." Consequently, he investigates into previous scholarship in detail and provides an impressively concise and sound history of research (pp. 7–45), by means of which he proves that a reconstruction is then a very useful one when it is not determined by hypothesis about the date of Marcion's Gospel and its interrelations with the canonical gospel, above all, Luke. With all that hypothetical and theses out of the way, Roth lists and (partly) discusses citations and allusions to Luke, which rightly forms the firm starting point for every serious attempt to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel (pp. 46–82) before he explicitly focuses on Tertullian, for whom he distinguishes between "Multiple Citations" (pp. 83–184) and "Citations only in *Adversus Marcionem*" (pp. 185–269). All the (possible) citations are discussed in detail. Similarly, Roth engages with Epiphanius and his habits of citing (pp. 270–346), the *Adamantius Dialogue* (pp. 347–95), and "Additional

Sources” (pp. 396–409), that is, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Pseudo-Tertullian, (Pseudo-)Ephrem, Jerome, Philastrius, and Eznik. By setting aside all these sources, Roth allows his readers to differentiate diverse qualities and relevancies of individual Christian authors for the reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel that follows in the next chapter. His method-critical handling of the terms *citation* and *allusion* presents a wise and significant role-model for other applications of these often problematically used commonplaces.

- [5] In chapter 9, Roth boils down his previous discussions of sources and potential citations and forms the Gospel reconstruction. As he states himself (p. 410): “[o]f considerable importance is the observation that numerous readings in the verses reconstructed below differ to varying degrees from Harnack’s reconstruction, and several verses for which the sources are silent and that Harnack indicated were omitted in Marcion’s Gospel are here more appropriately identified as *unattested*.” By applying bold print, italics, regular type, parentheses, curly brackets, and ellipses Roth visually distinguishes “between various levels of certainty for attested readings.” Chapter and verse numbers of canonical Luke serve as guides to identify the readings. A cross-reference system helps to find the place this reading has been discussed in the monograph. Further means of differentiating between certain levels of certainty (e.g., “unattested,” “may have been present,” “likely not present,” “attested but no insight into wording can be gained”). The reconstruction (pp. 412–36) is critical and sound but easy to use at the same time.
- [6] Not much is left to be said after nine chapters densely filled with information and conclusions so that chapter 10 (“Initial Conclusions and Avenues for Future Research”) only covers three full pages and just a third of a fourth page. For Roth—and this represents a very logic consequence from the methodological structure of the monograph—a *desideratum* for the near future must be a closer examination of the actual relationship between (the text[s] behind) Marcion’s Gospel and that of Luke (see section [3] of this review, about Lieu, Vincent, and above all, Klinghardt). He himself remains undecided or, in other words, open for sound reasoning about “the relative priority of Luke or Marcion’s Gospel” (p. 437). Of course, if accepted as such, Roth’s reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel will have influence on the apparatus of critical editions of the Greek New Testament (p. 439).
- [7] Dieter T. Roth’s monograph is a very valuable contribution to the discussion about Marcion and his significance for interrelationships between his and the canonical New Testament gospels, mainly Luke. His reconstruction is going to form the solid basis for dating texts, for dependencies and independencies, for the development and progress of the New Testament canon. He is very much thanked for having accomplished an indispensable tool that has even become more important in light of the recent publications mentioned in section [3] of this review.

Thomas J. Kraus
University of Zürich