

HERMANN DETERING: THE ORIGINAL VERSION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS – EXPLANATIONS ¹

1. Gal 1,1²

#1) Gal 1,1	– καὶ θεοῦ πατρός	cor
Marc 5.1.3; Orig. in Hieronymus GalComm (PL 26 [1845] 313A, 4-7); Epistle to the Laodiceans = Clabeaux #1) App B		
#2) Gal 1,1	αὐτὸν > αὐτὸν	cor
Orig. in Jerome (GalComm, PL 26 [1845] 313 A,4-7)		

¹ Translation based on the Revised version of 17. December 2003. Translated by Frans-Joris Fabri.

² Key to the apparatus criticus

# ID-Nr) Passage	Marcionite variant of the Orthodox Catholic Version, testified or reconstructed [omission = (-) addition = (+) substitution or transposition = (>)]	Decision: – cor (correct) – nlq (non liquet) – incor (incorrect)
Ancient Historical Record - Modern scholars (in case of conjectures)		

Quotations:

- Works in German: quotations are translated by FJF. For the original German quotations see the corresponding places in IV ERLÄUTERUNGEN;
- Quotations from the Bible are generally taken from the Revised Standard Version;
- Church Fathers, especially Tertullian (Roberts/Donaldson), from the English translations on Peter Kirby's site: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/>

Textual Evidence for and Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text.

#1) The omission of καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς is testified to by Tertullian: Tertullian, Marc 5.1.3: »Ipse se, inquit, apostolum est professus et quidem non ab hominibus nec per hominem, sed per Jesum Christum«.

The variant corresponds, as HARNACK, 68*, noticed, to the prologue of the (Marcionite) Epistle to the Laodiceans: »Paulus apostolus non ab hominibus neque per hominem, sed per Jesum Christum, fratribus«. Here a comparison of the prologue of Galatians in its (probable) Marcionite form as quoted by Tertullian and Origen (s.b.) with the prologue of Laodiceans (translated to the Greek by HARNACK, 139*f.).

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ
δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ οἱ σὺν
ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς
Γαλατίας,
χάρις ὑμῖν ...

Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ
δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ,
χάρις ὑμῖν ...

#2) That Marcion had αὐτόν instead of αὐτόν, is confirmed by Origen. Origen (GalComm, PL 26 [1845] 313 A,4-7):

»*Sciendum quoque in Marcionis Apostolo [Apostolico] non esse scriptum 'et per Deum patrem', volentis exponere, Christum non a Deo patre, sed semetipsum suscitatum, ut est illud, 'Solvite templum hoc, et ego in triduo suscitabo illud', necnon et illud [alibi], 'Nemo tollit animam meam a me; sed ego pono eam a meipso. Potestatem habeo ponendi eam et rursus potestatem habeo sumendi illam.*«

HILGENFELD, 439: »Though from this does not follow –as is usually stated– a variant ἐαυτόν instead of αὐτόν, since Marcion could have surmised ΑΥΤΟΝ to have a rough breathing mark, the omission of καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς does follow, at least for the version known to Jerome«.

Which is the Original Text?

According to HARNACK, 68*, Marcion is responsible for the modification, and his version is »typical for Marcion's doctrines about God and Christ «; i.o.w., according to HARNACK, Marcion's *modalism* caused the modification. Marcion wanted to say explicitly, that Christ had not been raised by God, but had raised *himself* (corresponding to Joh 2,19; 10,18). BLACKMAN, too, sees »a significant Marcionite omission«, 81, as in his opinion the verse in this form is »indicative of Marcion's modalistic christology« 44. The erasure »gives expression to his theory that Christ raised himself from dead, and did by no

means for anything depend on the Creator«, 44. Nevertheless the Marcionite version seems to be the original one, for the following reasons:

1) *There was no need for Marcion to discard* καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς. Against HARNACK'S and BLACKMAN'S opinion that by the omission, Marcion had wanted to emphasize Christ's independence from the Creator-God, one has to draw attention to other places in the Marcionite *Corpus Paulinum*, in as far as it is quoted by Tertullian, where the idea of a *resurrection achieved by God* is by no means suppressed.

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| a) Rom 8,11 | ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, <i>qui suscitavit Christum a mortuis</i> , Marc 5.14. |
| b) I Cor 6,124 | ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἤγειρεν, <i>qui dominum suscitavit</i> , Marc 5.7. |
| c) Eph 1,20 | ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, <i>suscitando eum a mortuis</i> , Marc 5.17. |

Already ZAHN, 496, made the remark, that the »erasure [of καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς] (was) not necessary for Marcion.«, though it »excellently« fitted his Christology. cf. BAARDA, 244, who quite rightly asks: »If Marcion were a modalist in the strict sense of the word, he apparently did not revise other passages in which Paul spoke of God having raised Christ from the dead. Why then would he have demonstrated his modalism so explicitly in Gal 1:1 and not elsewhere?«

Moreover, with καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς Marcion would not inevitably have thought of the Creator-God, as BLACKMAN has it, he easily could have interpreted the passage – if then it had been there – as a reference to the Father of Jesus Christ, meaning the Marcionite Good God.

2) *Linguistic Problems: the Preposition διὰ in Gal I,1*: strictly speaking, the preposition διὰ with gen., if neither understood in *local*, *temporal* or *modal* sense (Bl.-D. § 233, ThW II, 65), nor as introducing an urgent request, *instrumentally* indicates a »mediator« and can then be expressed e.g. by

»through mediation of«. Because of the preceding δι' ἀνθρώπου, this translation might seem to suggest itself but, due to the καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς it cannot be upheld. LIETZMANN, 227: »Since in the second phrase διὰ necessarily refers to both Jesus and God, it cannot have the meaning 'through mediation of' in δι' ἀνθρώπου: so the change of preposition is only for rhetorical plerophory...« Not so SCHLIER 27f.³

If one does not *a priori* consider καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς to belong to the original version of the text but sees it as an addition by a later editor, even here the preposition may very well be considered to have its usual meaning and consequently, – in contrast to the preceding δι' ἀνθρώπου – may be translated as »through mediation of Jesus Christ«. In the editor's work the doctrinal bias often takes precedence over accurate language. (cf. eg. what has been said about Gal 4,6).

3) *Problems of Doctrine*: a) In the canonical version the calling of the apostle is not only by Christ, but, καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς, by God as well. As rightly stated i.a. by SCHMITHALS, *Das kirchliche Apostelamt*, 15f, this is contrary to most of the other places in the Pauline Letters, in which *Christ* is seen as the only originator of the call: [Rom 1,4f]; I Cor 1,1 (Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, not διὰ Θεου); II Cor 1,1; I Thess 2,7; cf. Eph 1,1; Col 1,1; II Cor 11,13; I Cor 1,17; I Cor 9,1. From this SCHMITHALS, 15f infers: »Marcion omits καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς, obviously because of the correct observation that Paul usually ascribes the calling of the apostles to Jesus alone.« – The more adequate conclusion would very likely be that the Marcionite text be the more original one.

b) The twofold negative form οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου explicitly refutes the *human* origin of Paul's apostleship. All of the formal construction and the intrinsic logic strongly request Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς to be an absolute *divine* power contrary to the sphere of the human. Actually this idea is not consistently accomplished in the canonical version. The fact that the

³ Already Jerome (GalComm, PL 26 [1845] 313 A,4-7) unintentionally read ἀπο θεοῦ πατρὸς into the text instead of διὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς, which was in it. First he quotes the passage thusly: Paulus, qui neque ab hominibus, neque per hominem, sed a Deo Patre Patre (= ἀπο θεοῦ πατρὸς) per Jesum Christum missus est. Then he reproaches Marcion for having erased the words *et per Deum Patrem*.

insertion καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς places the Father on Jesus Christ's side, by no means emphasizes the latter to be divine as well, but, quite the contrary: instead of the association, the *difference* is accentuated between the one who raised from among the dead and the one who was raised. All in all, the emphatically stressed antagonism between the human and the divine spheres, prepared by the beginning of the verse, is weakened by the addition of »and the Father, who raised him from the dead« by subordinating Jesus Christ to the Father. As already VAN MANEN, 456 ff., stated, the insertion καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς weakens the original clear-cut idea of the divine appointment of the apostle by toning down the οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου.

Conclusion: The result of our textual critical investigation is that, compared with the canonical version, the Marcionite variants (#1 und #2) turn out to be the more ancient and the more original ones. As shown by the analysis of both *formal linguistic* details and *doctrinal content*, the addition to the text or its modification, missing in Marcion's version, did doubtlessly not belong to the original text. The differences observed rather suggest they be the work of a later editor.

2. Gal 1,4.5

#3) Gal 1,4.5
Van Manen

– 4.5.

cor

Textual evidence

The passage is not mentioned in any of the extant works on the Marcionite Apostolicon.

About the Problem of the Original Text

For both formal reasons of language and style and of dogmatic contents the passage seems not to be part of the original text:

Context

The extension of the greetings after the benediction formula χάρις ὑμῖν κτλ. is unique: cf. Rom 1,7; I Cor 1,3; II Cor 1,2; Eph 1,2; Phil 1,2; Col 1,2; I Thess 1,1; II Thess 1,2; Philm 1,3; cf. BENGEL to the place.: »Gratiae et appreciationi nusquam alibi Paulus talem periphrasin addit«.

For the part that juts out, no immediate *referent* can be found in the actual contents of Gal (as e.g. indicating a topic or a special occupation with the situation in the community), which might explain the irregularity in a non-artificial way (against SCHLIER, 31; OSTEN-SACKEN, 121; to these, s.below).

Particularities of Form and Language.

a) The term ἐξέληται (subj. aor. med. of ἐξαίρέω) is a hapaxlegomenon in the *Corpus Paulinum*. The term occurs 4 times in Acts (7,10. 34; 12,11; 23,27; 26,17) and 3 times in 1Clem (39,9; 52,3; 56,8 = quotes from LXX); this suggests an origin from the Septuagint. There, in fact, ἐξαίρέω as translation for hebr. נצַל (meaning »to save, to get out of«) occurs exceedingly often (155 times altogether, of which 16 in the Psalms).

b) 1,5 contains a *doxology* – the only doxology in Galatians and the only doxology in the entire *Corpus Paulinum* to close a prologue. SCHLIER, 35: »A praise of God like that one, closing the prologue, does not occur in the other letters of the apostle«; SCHLIER explains by the fact that the thanksgiving-formula in Galatians is missing, and says it was replaced by the doxology. This, however, remains a mere assumption.

Within the *Corpus Paulinum* doxologies only occur at Rom 1,25; 9,5; 11,36; II Cor 11,32; Eph 3,21; Phil 4,20; I Tim 1,17; II Tim 4,18 (Hebr 13,21). All of these (with the exception, of course, of the three last mentioned) flowed from the catholicizing editor's pen.

Gal 1,5 just like Rom 16,27, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν, is a »a Jewish phrase through and through « (SCHMITHALS, *Römerbrief*, 416f). This – as did already the word ἐξαίρέω – gives away the Jewish-synagogal origin of the passage. cf. LXX: 4 Macc 18,24 (verbatim: ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν).

Doctrinal Inconsistencies

According to BULTMANN, *Theologie*, 297, in Gal 1,4 appears the *redeemer motif*, used by Paul to describe Christ's work of salvation – besides other ones, e.g. the Jewish idea of atonement or the motif of the scapegoat sacrifice. Yet his explanation: »the ἐνεστὼς αἰῶν namely, is the aeon under the Law, as such under the powers of sin and death as well«, fails to deal with the actual wording of Gal 1,4, since ἐξαίρέω in its medial form means »'to get sb. out of, free from sth.'« not »to redeem« (s.above), for which in the Pauline letters ἀγοράζω or ἐξαγοράζω are always used (Gal 2,20 MRez; 3,13; 4,5; I Cor 6,20; 7,23; [Eph 5,16; Col 4,5]). SCHOEPS, *Paulus*, 249, on the other hand, correctly

puts the phrase in a *context of atonement*, and remarks that »being handed over to death because of our sins« may be seen as very much resembling »Abraham's expiatory sacrifice «.

The theology of atonement that appears in 1, 4 contrasts the other christological and soteriological ideas. Two different series of christological and soteriological ideas are juxtaposed without really being compatible:

Gal 1,4

1. *Christ gave himself for our sins* – τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν

2to »*set us free*«*from the present evil age* – ὅπως ἐξέλθῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος ποινηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

Gal 3,13; 4,5.6

1. *Christ redeemed us from the law*– Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρρα

2. *so that we might receive adoption* – ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν

3. *through the Spirit*– ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν

These diverging series of concepts, which in the Pauline Letters are frequently found interwoven or set one on top of the other in different layers, should not hastily be harmonized. First of all, one should try to get them apart.

Cf. VAN MANEN, 506: »Though he [the author] talks about Christ as παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ he does not add τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. His Christ's intention was not 'to set us free from the present evil age', but 'to redeem us from the curse of the law', 3,13 (cf. 4,4), with the result that we –not at a much later time but immediately– may receive the fruit of his death on the cross: 'the promise of the Spirit through faith', 3,14, and so we, as children of the free woman, no longer living under the law, from now on, may see ourselves as sons... 3,26; 4,5; 6,21-31; 5,1«

Conclusion: Here the editor against Marcion inserts into the text the main ideas of the Judaeo-Catholic *Soteriology* und *Eschatology*: the *futureological* eschatology as the messianic-apocalyptic expectation of redemption from the present aeon is set up in contrast or connected to the Marcionite-gnostic eschatology of the present; and so is the Judaeo-Christian *concept of atonement* (Christ's death as forgiveness of *sins*) to the Marcionite-Gnostic *concept of redemption* (Christ's death as redemption from the reign of the *Law*); cf. BULTMANN, *Theologie*, 295ff.

The anti-marcionite tendency shows itself once more in the words κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν: the θεός πατήρ of 1,3 has now become θεός καὶ πατήρ to make it perfectly clear, that the God of the OT and the »Father« of the Christians truly are not two, but *one* (VAN MANEN, 506). κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ without the explicit καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (indicating anti-Marcionite polemics) is further found in I Petr 4,19 and 1 Esr 8,16.

3. Gal 1,6

#4) Gal 1,6	εἰς χάριν > ἐν χάριτι	incor
VAN MANEN con. grounded on Marc 5.2.4 Dam./Ruf 1.6		
#5) Gal 1,6	– Χριστοῦ	cor
Marc 5.2.4 Dam./Ruf 1.6 = Clabeaux #1), App A		

References to the Marcionite Text:

Tertullian Marc 5.2.4: »*Mirror vos tam cito transferri ab eo qui vos vocavit in gratiam ad aliud evangelium*«; to the contrary: Tertullian, De praescr. 27,3: »Tenent correptas ab apostolo ecclesias: O insensati Galatae, quis uos fascinavit? et: Tam bene currebatis, quis uos impediit? ipsumque principium: *Mirror, quod sic tam cito transferemini ab eo qui uos uocavit in gratia, ad aliud euangelium*«. Megethius only quotes (Adamant., Dial. I, 6) as found in Rufin, not following the Greek text: »*Mirror quod sic tam cito transferimini in aliud evangelium*«. HARNACK, 68*, reconstructs: ἐν χάριτι εἰς ἕτερον. The variant ἐν χάριτι, recommended in *De praescr 27* might, as VAN MANEN, p. 459f, rightly states, already be an assimilation to the canonical text.

As all exegetes concede, the meaning of the *canonical variant* is not clear: LIETZMANN, 229, hesitates to choose from three possibilities: 1) ὁ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι could »have the meaning of ‘who called you to the grace’, as shown for I Cor 7, 15; if so, the contrast with the Judaizing Christians’ mistaken ‘Christianity of the works’ is expressed in the strongest terms.«. 2) ἐν can be seen as *instrumental*, then the translation would be »who called you by means of his grace« (cf. Rom 3,24; 5,15; 11,6 u.ö. 3) As a third possibility, one can »interpret ἐν as about the state of mind one is in, ‘who called you in graciousness’«, cf. II Thess 2,16 (said of God); Col 3,16; 4,6 (said of humans). This lack of clarity seems to be the main reason for still more variants having come up:

ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ (P⁵¹ S A B Maj SyrP Boh Goth Arm Vg),

ἐν χάριτι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (D 326 1241^c min pc syr^{H*}),
 ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (sa Chry.),
 ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ (7 327 336 Orig^{lat} Thdt)

s. CLABEAUX, 83, as well.

According to VAN MANEN, the assumption εἰς χάριν be the Marcionite variant, is to be favoured for the following reasons: unlike in the canonical text the contrast of χάρις with ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is clearly emphasized in Marcion by the preposition εἰς. By the comparison of: *Turning towards grace* (εἰς χάριν) on the one hand, *Turning to another Gospel* (εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον) on the other hand, the antagonism of the Pauline Gospel and Judaist propagation of Christ is most strongly accentuated. »Grace is ... but another word for our 'Pauline Gospel', 'the Gospel of the non-circumcision', and the *other* Gospel is – as according to Tertullian, *Marc* 1.20, Marcion, but also Tertullian himself and Jerome, understood quite well – our 'Jewish Christianity, 'the Law« (VAN MANEN, 460f). Obviously, the Catholic editor wanted to weaken or obfuscate this antinomy by the unclear and ambiguous (s. above) ἐν. According to VAN MANEN, one cannot exclude the possibility either that it was Marcion, who changed the text for *clarification*, but this is less probable (cf. *Paulusbriefe ohne Paulus?* 467).

Contrary to that, ZAHN, 496, almost certainly rightly saw the variants offered by Tertullian and other Latin authors as »only different assumptions and translations of the alone testified to original εἰς χάριτι«. Moreover Van Manen's recommended Marcionite variant would be tainted with very poor style, something we would hardly assume the author of the letter, an able stylist, (εἰς χάριν εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον), ever to be blamed for.

To #5) CLABEAUX, 83f, made the correct remark: »It is surprising that any modern edition of the New Testament would include Χριστοῦ in this verse, even in brackets as the Nestle-Aland has it.'Εν χάριτι with no additions is the source of all the other readings. The various additions represent attempts to make the phrase ἐν χάριτι more precise. The phrase χάρις Χριστοῦ never occurs in the letters of Paul... It is unreasonable to take the earliest evidence so lightly, especially when it is supported by strong rational criteria.'Εν χάριτι should stand in Gal 1,6 with no additions«.

4. Gal 1,7

#6) Gal 1,7	ὁ ἄλλο πάντως οὐκ ἔστιν	nlq
Marc 5.2.5	> ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο	

#7) Gal 1,7
Dial I,6

+ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου

cor

Textual evidence:

#6) The wording of the Marcionite text is well testified to. Tertullian even cites the beginning twice, the 2nd quote immediately following the 1st, Marc 5.2.5: »*Nam et adiciens quod aliud evangelium omnino non esset, creatoris confirmat id quod esse defendit*«. Tertullian, after using the quote as evidence for the Pauline Gospel to have come *from the Creator-God*, quotes OT passages concerning the promise of the Gospel, and then quotes 1.6 again with the intention so to reduce *ad absurdum* the Marcionite statement, the Gospel be *evangelium dei novi*: »*est autem evangelium etiam dei novi, quod vis tunc ab apostolo defensum; iam ergo duo sunt evangelia apud duos deos, et mentibus erit apostolus dicens quod aliud omnino non est, cum sit et aliud, cum sic suum evangelium defendere potuisset, ut potius demonstraret, non ut unum determinaret*«. If there were a Gospel of the new God, there would be two gospels and this would make the apostle a liar, as he asserts there be no other one.

#7) The phrase κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, absent in Tertullian, was, according to HARNACK, inserted »in order to emphasize the Pauline Gospel as the authentic form of the Gospel of Christ«. It is nevertheless testified to in Dial. 1.6, where Megethius quotes as follows: οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, εἰ μὴ τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In his translation Rufin seems to ignore the κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου (for whatever reasons) and reads instead: «*Si enim Silvanus et Timotheus et Paulis euangelistae sunt, dicit autem ipse Paulus: Quod euangelizauimus uobis, uerisimile uidetur recipi debere, plures esse euangelistas, sed unum esse euangelium*». An accurate translation of kata, to. euvaggelion mou would have given better proof of this.

A bit higher up (line 5 f.), Megethius had already explicitly stated: Ὁ ἀπόστολος οὐκ εἶπε· κατὰ τὰ εὐαγγελία μου, ἀλλά· κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου. ἴδε πῶς λέγει ἔν εἶναι. Rufin: *Apostolus non dixit: Secundum euangelia mea, sed secundum euangelium meum*. In line 10ff, too, Megethius retorts: λέγει γὰρ· οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, εἰ μὴ τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταρασσόντες ὑμᾶς καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This again is missing in Rufin.

The high probability of κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου being part of the Marcionite Apostolicon can hardly be shown in a better way, even *against Tertullian*.

VAN MANEN'S and O'NEILL'S Attempts at Reconstruction

VAN MANEN, 461ff, draws attention to Chrysostomos on Gal 1,7 (T.X. p.667), where Marcion refers to Paul, in order to prove that there be only *one* Gospel: ἐπελάβετο τῶν εἰρημένων εἰπὼν ὅτι Ἴδοὺ καὶ Παῦλος εἶπεν οὐκ ἔστιν ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον. VAN MANEN, 461, would like to derive from the quote that Marcion —much like the Peschittha, which does not explicitly express the ἄλλο— »after εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον simply read: ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν —without ἄλλο.« For, according to VAN MANEN, »if he had read ἄλλο, he could not have said: “There is no ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον” but at the utmost: “The so called ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is nevertheless *not another one*...”« This would open the way for the thesis, that »there is no need to accept four or ‘all of the’ gospels, as did the Catholics, but just one, as did Marcion and his supporters«.

VAN MANEN emphasizes the fact, that »Tertullian discusses v. 6 and v.7 under the assumption that at least Marcion, but perhaps he himself as well, used to read here something about the *being extant* of the ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον and not about its ἄλλο εἶναι«. So VAN MANEN could assume, that Marcion simply read εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν.

Comparing this wording with the canonical text, VAN MANEN hasn't any doubt about his reconstructed Marcionite variant as having to be preferred as the original one over the incomprehensible and difficult canonical text. According to VAN MANEN ἄλλο might have been added by a Catholic revisor, who wanted to make it clear that the preaching of the other (Judaist) gospel, opposed by Paul, was in fact not different in respect of contents.

VAN MANEN's explanation, however, must fail because of the unmistakable wording of the text referred to by both Tertullian and the other witnesses (s. already ZAHN, 496f). Even if the Chrysostomos-quote is evidence for the use of Gal 1,7 by Marcion and the Marcionites to polemicize against the Catholics and their four gospels, there is no doubt whatsoever that both Tertullian and Jerome (in his commentary, Vallarsi VII, 380B) read »quod *aliud* omnino non est«.

VAN MANEN was not the only one to try and rule out ἄλλο as a gloss in his reconstruction of the original version of Gal. So did O'Neill, 22-23. His starting point is the grammatical difference between ἕτερον (*quantitative* meaning) and ἄλλο (*qualitative* meaning). To O'NEILL »the true solution seems to be that ἄλλο was originally a gloss against ἕτερον. The glossator was pointing out that Paul would have expressed his sentiments more clearly, in saying that the other gospel they had turned to was not really gospel at all, if he had used ἄλλο for ἕτερον. Paul seems to have appreciated the difference (cf.

Gal. 5,10 and 2 Cor. 11.4: ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν ... ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον), but his point would have been spoilt, not made, if he had used ἄλλο for ἕτερον in this context«. In view of the number and importance of the authors who quote the text –all of them having ἄλλο– this argument, too, remains questionable.

So finally two questions are still to be answered:

a) how the two variants, the canonical and the Marcionite one, should be understood, and

b) which of them is the more original one.

Concerning a), in my opinion, there might be here (#6 combined with #7) a *paradoxon*, which cannot be interpreted correctly but in a Marcionite way: To the Marcionite, the *other gospel* is at the same time the gospel of the *other, that is, the Stranger God* (just like the »strange Gnosis« to the Gnostic is the Gnosis of the Stranger God)⁴ Since the gospel preached by Paul's Judaist opponents is, of course, not the one of the other, the stranger God, but that of the detested Jewish Creator and Lawgiver God, the author of Galatians can say in a paradoxically pointed way: The gospel preached by the Judaists may (seen from the outside) be another, a second gospel; it is not, however, a truly »other« one (in Marcionite understanding: as gospel of the »other« God), in my sense of the word, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου.

With regard to #6, there is hardly any way left to decide, whether we have here the original Marcionite version or an addition by Tertullian (HANS VON SODEN assumed the latter, cf. HARNACK 68*. The fact, that the Catholic editor did not eliminate the revealing ἄλλο, is probably caused by his missing the main (Marcionite) point of the sentence. #7, on the other hand, was eliminated by the editor, because the mention of the *one Pauline Gospel* (understood as written Gospel) could be and actually was used by the Marcionites —as shown in Chrysostomos and, above all, in Dial I,6— for their rejection (dangerous for the Catholics) of the four Gospels

⁴ Cf. Harnack, 267* »Because this is unexpected and strange«, — the arrival of the »Stranger« — »the Marcionites themselves called their knowledge a 'strange' message of joyt«, with ref. to Clem, Strom. III, 3,12 Οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκίωνος τὴν ξένην ὡς φασὶ γινώσκουσιν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.

5. Gal 1,8.9

#8) Gal 1,8 Marc 5.2.5	+ ἄλλως	nlq
cf. Clabeaux #2), App B: ἄλλως for παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν		
#9) Gal 1,8 Dial I,6	– ὑμῖν	nlq
#10) Gal 1,8	εὐαγγελίσηται > εὐαγγελίζηται	nlq
Marc 5.2.6 Dial I,6. = Clabeaux #2), App A incor		
#11) Gal 1,9	εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται ἀνάθεμα ἔστω > ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω· εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.	nlq
HARNACK, 69*, based on Dial I,6 and Marc 5.2.5		

Significantly Divergent Quotes from the the Marcionite Text:

#8) #9): ἄλλως without ὑμῖν is excellently verified, above all by the works of Tertullian. Tert. *Marc 5.2.5*: »*Licet angelus de caelo aliter evangelizaverit, anathema sit*« ... *Sed et si nos aut angelus de caelo aliter evangelizaverit*«.

1,8 is further quoted by Tertullian in the following places, though in them Tertullian does not explicitly refer to the Marcionite Apostolicon:

De praescr. 6,5 (F. REFOULE, Sources Chrétiennes 46, 1957): *Itaque etiamsi angelus de caelis aliter euangelizaret, anathema diceretur a nobis.*

De praescr. 29,7: Ad eius doctrinae ecclesiam scriptum est, immo ipsa doctrina ad ecclesiam suam scribit: *Et si angelus de caelo aliter euangelizauerit citra quam nos, anathema sit.*;

De carne Christi (ἄλλως + ὑμῖν) :

6: *Etiamsi angelus de caelis aliter evangelizaverit vobis quam nos evangelizavimus, anathema sit;*

24, where Tertullian believes the Angel to be an allusion to the revelations of Philumene⁵ (since these had been mediated by an angel): *Etiamsi angelus de caelis aliter evangelizaverit vobis quam nos, anathema sit.*

#10) εὐαγγελίσηται instead of εὐαγγελίζεται :

Dial I,6 (Z.19): ἀλλὰ κἄν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελισηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα vobis (anathema sit + Rufin);

Epiphanius Refut 16 (Dindorf, Vol II. 379):): κἄν τε ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος εὐαγγελίσηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

Thereagainst, Dial I,6 (lines 6f.), just before the above quote, reads (Megeth.): εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίσηται παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. (Rufin omits παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν: »*Si uobis quis aliter euangelizaverit, anathema sit*«)

The Discussion of the Passage in Tertullian, Marc 5.2.6:

Tertullian had tried to show, that the assumption of two gospels coming from two different gods, was refuted by the words of Paul in 1, 7, where he emphasizes his statement that the other gospel, preached by the heretics was no gospel at all. Paul then would be a liar, saying there were no other gospel — though there be one. Tertullian, however, concedes that Marcion might have an answer to this objection (trying to give evidence for two different gospels) by quoting 1,8f. Paul's words there: »*Licet angelus de caelo aliter evangelizaverit, anathema sit*« might be interpreted as Paul having known that the Creator God, too, had a gospel of his own (quia et creatorem sciebat evangelizaturum). According to Tertullian, however, Marcion here, too, gets caught in his own argument. For it would not be possible for a person who had just denied the existence of two different gospels to argue that way (Duo enim evangelia confirmare non est eius qui aliud iam negarit). By *placing himself in front*, Paul expressed his opinion quite clearly: »*Tamen licet sensus eius qui suam praemisit personam: Sed et si nos aut angelus de caelo aliter evangelizaverit*«. Paul says this to emphasize. If he himself does not preach another gospel, surely no angel will do so. His mentioning an angel has the only purpose to show that where even an angel and an apostle aren't

⁵ Prophetess and companion of Apelles, one of Marcion's pupils.

believed, a fortiori human persons should not be believed. Paul so by no means wanted to connect the angel with a gospel of the Creator God.

The passage shows that, while discussing the quote, Tertullian still wants to defend the fundamental thesis: *no other Gospel!* For Paul there aren't two different gospels, but only the *one* Gospel of the Creator- and Redeemer God; neither can 1,8 be used as a rejoinder: the angel in 1,8 who might possibly preach another gospel, is not contrary to this since Paul does not —as obviously was the opinion of the Marcionites— mention him as being a *representative of the Creator God*, but only uses the angel *as a general example* of the idea, that belief in the Gospel that is preached must not depend on the person who preaches it; cf. HILGENFELD, 472: »If the falsification that had been inserted consisted of the acceptance of the Creator God and his Law, Marcion of course would eagerly welcome the warning against the preaching of an angel (of the Creator God). He couldn't but see the original falsification of the Gospel as a machination by the Creator God«.

Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text

Though Tertullian's polemics show clear traces of the rather badly refuted Marcionite point of view — so e.g. HARNACK 283* rightly uses the quote as roof of the fact, that the Marcionites knew not only 2 Christs, but 2 Gospels as well⁶ –, the Marcionite Text of Gal 1,8-9 does not. In view of the great number of divergent pieces of textual evidence and citations, one has to rely for its reconstruction on nothing but speculation and guesswork. So e.g. the question why Tertullian in the above discussed *Marc* 5.2.5, at first only mentions the *angelus* and only later – where he thinks he needs it for his argument – adds *nos*, is not answered. Likewise in the dark remains the reason why he mentions just one *angelus* in all the other places mentioned (though admittedly there he does not use the Marcionite version of the Pauline letters). After all, in my opinion, the reconstruction proposed by HARNACK, which connects the two quotations of Adamantus and Megethus and includes Tertullian's *aliter*, still seems to be the most plausible one.

⁶ „The Jewish Christ, too, will bring a Gospel (Marc V,2 to Gal 1,18), but no message about a ‚regnum caeleste’...“

VAN MANEN's Attempt at Reconstruction

But, of course, with VAN MANEN, 465, we may ask, whether v. 9 belonged to the original version, since the author of Gal. nowhere else uses εὐαγγελίζεται with the accusative case. VAN MANEN therefore assumes, that Epiphanius (Refut. 16) had conserved the original Marcionite version. It reads: κἄν τε ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος εὐαγγελίσηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. By explicitly mentioning heaven (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ), which did not occur at all in Epiphanius (= Marcionite text), the Catholic editor had wanted to exclude all reminiscence of gnostic spiritual realms.— But, above all, the majority of the other authors who have the quote, and especially Tertullian, oppose VAN MANEN's assumption. Tertullian surely sometimes is quite careless with citations (e.g. in one place *de caelo*, in another *de caelis*). We would, nevertheless, have to answer the question why he quotes from the Catholic text (*angelus de caelo*) in his work against Marcion as well, since there he intends to fight the heretic with his own weapons, i.e. based on the Marcionite text, and this without a clue as to why he has an exception of his regular usage here. —According to ZAHN, 497, VAN MANEN's attempt at reconstruction is based »on a quote from Ep., carelessly composed out of Gal 1,8.9... which has nothing whatsoever to do with Mrc.«

In respect of #8), #9), #10) and #11), we can't but answer the question, whether the (reconstructed) Marcionite text is nearer to the original version than the canonical one, by a *non liquet*, since a critical comparison of style is of not great help here, either. In my opinion, plausible criteria to decide on one of the two versions being more original can hardly be found. Nevertheless, in view of the importance of several authors that give the quotes, HARNACK's reconstruction seems to me to get nearest to the Marcionite version. There is no way of deciding on the originality of one of the versions since the different variants don't give a clue, either to doctrine or to style.

6. Gal 1,10

#12) Gal 1,10

+ (θεόν) τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου

nlq

Textual Evidence

According to HARNACK, though 69* V. 10 is »without textual evidence«; one cannot draw from this fact the conclusion that Marcion did not know v. 10 at

all. The question, however, remains whether his version was identical with the later canonical one.

Because of the problems this text raises, I would like to propose a conjecture:

If we understand πείθειν as »persuade, try and convince someone«, the result is a nonsensical proposition: one can »convince« humans, but not God., all attempts of exegetes at distilling a statement from this that makes sense, are artificial and, in my opinion, in vain. So e.g. SCHLIER, 42: »... no, he does not talk humans over, one might rather say, he talks God over by proclaiming the curse against the forgers of the Gospel, he wants to gain God's favour. «.

Because of the difficulties this sentence raises, BOUSSET, 37, (whose explanation, that the opponents had reproached Paul of being able to convince *even God* by his artifices, might possibly best of all have a claim to plausibility) rightly draws the conclusion: »One would by far prefer to get rid of these words once and for all«.

Neither has Radical Criticism been able to solve the problems this sentence causes. VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA'S assumption, the author might have used II Cor 5,11 as a model for a rather unsuccessful imitation (*Pro domo* 193), is not very convincing in respect of the author's literary skills and because in II Cor 5,11 πείθειν τὸν θεόν is nowhere to be found.

The other possible translation of πείθειν by »to make s.o. favourably disposed to oneself«, is not accepted by exegetes, because with it, the resulting problems seem to be even bigger. One will have to concede, however, that obviously »these two rhetorical questions« must be seen »as being parallel, so that ἀνθρώπους πείθειν must be taken in the same sense as ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν«, BULTMANN, *ThW VI* 2-3, Art. πείθω. From this in my opinion correct insight, we would have to take the logical step of translating πείθειν corresponding with ἀρέσκειν by »to make s.o. favourably disposed to oneself«, (and not by »persuade, try and convince someone«, (against BULTMANN). But even then, the question remains unanswered what the *meaning* of that sentence may be.

I think the problem can be solved by assuming that here, too, the Marcionite (= the original) text had a somewhat different wording from the reworked Catholic canonical one, namely θεόν τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, instead of just θεόν, meaning the Marcionite *Demiurge* (cf. II Cor 4,4). Then the sentence would become comprehensible at once: »Paul« defends himself against the reproach he lived to please human people. He, who wants to dispose people favourably to himself and wants to live pleasing them, lives—in Marcionite understanding—to »the God of this Aeon«. Moreover, the assumption that the original author of Gal 1,10 had the θεόν τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in mind, is confirmed by a careful look at the context. He has just cursed even an *angel*

(of the Creator God), in case he would preach another Gospel than the one he preached himself. Now he asks the rhetorical question: Is anybody who wants to please human people and »the God of this Aeon«, capable of doing this?

With this explanation, only one question would remain unanswered: why was τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου erased by the Catholic editor only here and not in other places as well, e.g. in I Cor 1,20. 2,6.8; II Cor 4,4; Col 2,2 ?

7. Gal 1,13.14 (Paul as Persecutor)

#13) Gal 1,13.14.	-13.14	cor
-------------------	--------	-----

Textual Evidence

The passage does not occur in any of the texts that refer to the Marcionite Apostolicon.

1,13-14 is a later insertion: to prove that he were not dependent on the other apostles the author had in 1,12 mentioned a special revelation by Jesus (ὁ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), which is not at all referred to in 1,13-14. Conversely, 1,15.16f, a further explanation and direct continuation of 1,13-14 (ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ), immediately follows the contents of 1,12. The insertion is introduced in a quite laborious way, in so far as the editor reminds his readers of circulating traditions about »Paul« (cf. Eph 3,2).

B. BAUER, *Kritik I*, 14: »For you have heard of my former life in Judaism«, he says in V. 13,— ‘heard of’ – that sounds as coming from strangers without Paul’s own impact and notification— ‘heard of’, as of some strange story, which they might possibly not have heard of yet as well.«.

Even more serious than the »frosty and forced stylization« —though one might think the pseudepigraphic author capable of it— are the particularities of language in this passage. Already VAN MANEN, 506-507, O’NEILL, 24-27, and WIDMAN, 189f,f drew attention to them:

1. ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: According to VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, 33, the letter to the Galatians contains quite a few interior problems. Following DELAFOSSE, he notices the different use of the term ἐκκλησία: once in plural, 1,22, once in singular, 1,13. In the singular form he sees a »terme qui fait penser à l’Eglise chrétienne unique du II^e siècle.«

Likewise VAN MANEN assumes the term ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ to give away another hand than the one that produced 1,22 (ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ). Correct is that, contrary to v. 23, in v. 13 the term is not

used for a local congregation, but for the entire Ecclesia, and that »Paul«, as O'NEILL, 26 remarks, »almost always uses the word to refer to a local congregation« (I Cor 15,9 is, together with the entire passage 15,1-11, rightly seen by O'NEILL as a »later credal summary«).

Nevertheless, to me VAN MANEN's allusion to 1,22 seems mistaken, since that passage, too, when looked at carefully, turns out to be a later insertion and, contrary to VAN MANEN's assumption, all the same to be written by the same hand that wrote 1,13. O'NEILL here had the better insight. He discards both 1,13-14 and 1,22-24 as later glosses.

2. Ἰουδαϊσμός (1,13.14), συνηλικιώτης (1,14) and πατρικός (1,14) are, as O'NEILL rightly noticed, hapaxlegomena; likewise the term ἀναστροφή further occurs only in (non-Pauline) Eph 4,22, I Tim 4,12 and Hebr 13,17. Moreover: »The enclitic ποτέ occurs three times here, once more in Galatians (at 2,6), and only nine times elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, excluding Ephesians and the Pastorals (where it occurs seven times). The style of the section is even and steady, unlike the style of Paul. The sentences consist of 20, 19, 12, and 20 words respectively. καὶ joins distinct clauses with verbs in the indicative three times (1.13,14,24), which is rather frequent in comparison with the five times in the rest of the epistle (1.17, 18; 3,6 O.T.; 5,1; 6,2). The imperfect occurs seven times in this section, and only eight times elsewhere in the epistle (1.10 twice; 2,6; 2,12 twice; 3,23; 4,3, 29). Two of the imperfects are periphrastic, and we are told that the periphrastic construction was on the increase«.

3. The word πορθεῖν, Gal 1,13, too, elsewhere in the Paulina only occurs in 1,23 ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει. O'NEILL draws attention to this, but without pointing out that the term —with the exception of Paul— elsewhere only occurs in Acts. In Acts 9,21, Luke reports the astonished reaction of those, that were listening to the preaching of (the converted) Paul: ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες καὶ ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο. That's a parallel to 1,23 ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἣν ποτε ἐπόρθει!

In my opinion, this is where we find the key to the problem: the dubious passage was obviously inserted on the basis of Acts (and its image of Paul). Obviously, by this insertion the Paul of the original letter to the Galatians was to be reconciled with the Paul of Acts —a catholicizing tendency we can observe in TERTULLIAN as well, i.e. to try and turn everything compatinle with the orthodox point of view.

Correct VAN MANEN, 507: »Probably on this occasion, our Catholic revisor thought it desirable to remind his readers of the fact that Paul, now staunchly opposing a life under the

Law, had been a thoroughbred Jew before, in the traditions described in Acts 9, 21 and 22,3«

8. Gal 1,15

#14) Gal 1,15 Dial IV,15	ὄτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεὸς]	nlq
#15) Gal 1,15 VAN MANEN	εἰς τὴν χάριν > διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ	incor

#14) Dial IV, 15 (line 25f): ὄτε δὲ, φησίν, εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου. Missing in Rufin. HARNACK, 69*: “But there is no guarantee for this quote to be from Marcion’s Bible.”

#15) There is no textual evidence for this phrase. The citation Dial IV,15 ends with μητρός μου.

VAN MANEN’S conjecture, 507f, is to read εἰς τὴν χάριν instead of διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. In respect of Tertullian’s (Marc 5.2.4.) recommended variant for Gal 1,6 (*qui vos vocavit in gratiam*) this is consistent indeed. Since there is no support by any textual evidence, however, VAN MANEN’S conjecture remains highly insecure.

9. Gal 1,18-24 (First Trip to Jerusalem)

#16) Gal 18-24 Marc 5.3.1; Haer 3.14.3	– 18-24	cor
---	---------	-----

I. Evidence for the passage 18-24 not being included in Marcion:

Tertullian, **Marc 5.3.1**: »*Denique ad patrocinium Petri ceterorumque apostolorum ascendisse Hierosolymam post annos quatuordecim scribit, ...*«.

Irenäus, **Haer 3.14. 3**: Deinde post XIII annos ascendit Hierosolymam cum Barnaba, adsumens et Titum = Fourteen years later he went up to Jerusalem, together with Barnabas, taking Titus along with him, too.

From this follows, that neither Tertullian nor Irenaeus read *πάλιν*, in Gal 2,1; i.o.W., that Paul in their text obviously mentioned but *one* trip to Jerusalem;

differently VAN MANEN, 510, who assumes, Tertullian had *omitted* Paul on purpose, to combine the two trips to Jerusalem and reduce them to *one only* (see ann. to 2,1.); HARNACK, 70* states: »18-24 ... is completely ignored by Tert. If this passage had not been missing completely (probably so), Marcion needs must have corrected it. Surely, the first trip to Jerusalem was not mentioned«.

ZAHN, 497: » Since Tr. links this up to Acts 15 and from there goes to Gal. 2, Gal 1,18-24 probably was absent totally or in a greater part.«

VAN MANEN thinks 1,18-21 is original, and he, as well as O'NEILL, discards only 22-24 as interpolated. (s. footnote to 1,13-14). For their argument: s. II.c)

MCGUIRE, 55, discards 18-22 referring to Irenaeus and Tertullian:

» Irenaeus, in his late 2nd century work *Against Heresies*, appears to quote the usual reading of Gal. ii, i-“went up again to Jerusalem“-but makes no specific reference to the Pauline visit described in i, 18f. Tertullian, in his *Prescription against Heretics*, even alludes to Paul's having gone to Jerusalem to meet Peter but it soon becomes apparent that the author is simply reading his own interest in Peter into the account of the meeting with Peter, James and John. Treating Acts ix, 26f as the account of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem, he seems to apply both Gal. ii, 1-10 and *an account similar to* i, 18f to the second visit. Moreover, in this instance Tertullian is writing primarily for orthodox consumption; in his early 3rd century anti-Marcionite treatise, where he must meet hostile readers on their own ground, he refers to Paul as going up (not „up again“) to Jerusalem *after fourteen years* „so great had been his desire to be approved and supported by those whom you [Marcion] wish on all occasions to be understood as in alliance with Judaism!“ Obviously Marcion's text of Galatians did not include the account of a previous visit „after three years“ and Tertullian, if indeed he had ever seen such a reading, was not inclined to take it seriously. «.

II. How are 1,18 and 2,1 connected?

In verse 2,2, ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν· καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, the pronoun αὐτοῖς does not refer to anything, since one has to go back as far as 1,17 to understand that it obviously means the πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους . SCHLIER, 66, however, and most of the other exegetes do not apply the pronoun to these, but to the more nearby εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα in 2,1: »Αὐτοῖς, according to a known usage of the pronoun, is said of the inhabitants of a town which was mentioned before«. Since Paul did not present his Gospel to *all* of Jerusalem's *inhabitants*, but only to the leaders of the Jerusalem congregation, the explanation is not of great help. SCHLIER'S and LIETZMANN'S idea, the pronoun referred to »the undefined members of the Christian Church in Jerusalem«, is after all but a stopgap explanation.

O'NEILL, 27: »This reading seems very strained. The particle δέ loses all its adversative force, and would require to be translated 'and also privately', which is scarcely possible«. In respect of this and further problems, O'NEILL finally draws the conclusion to drop αὐτοῖς (with Codex Ψ) entirely and to regard it as an interpolation.

In my opinion, however, the only possible and at the same time the most simple solution is: not αὐτοῖς, which is given by the majority of the authors that cite the text, but 1,18-24 clearly is an interpolation, which interrupts the original connexion between 1,17 and 2,1. VAN MANEN'S assumption, the original Marcionite text had already mentioned two different trips to Jerusalem by the apostle, cannot but fail because of 2,2.

III. Particularities of Language, Problems of Content as Argument against the Originality of the Passage 18-22

a) The much discussed verb ἱστορῆσαι, 1,18 (cf. KILPATRIK, *Galatians* 1,18 ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν) is hapaxlegomenon and elsewhere only occurs [as v.l.] in the speech on the aeropagus in Acts 17,23.

b) οὐ ψεύδομαι 1,20: The formula is found in Rom 9,1; II Cor 11,31 and I Tim 2,7. Apart from I Tim 2,7, where the set phrase is taken over from Rom 9,1; II Cor 11,31 or Gal 1,18, οὐ ψεύδομαι is found in —more or less extensive— editorial insertions. This is especially the case in Rom 9,1 —a place which is interpolated together with the entire passage Rom 9-11, absent in Marcion— likewise II Cor 11,31. It's surely no coincidence, that the averment οὐ ψεύδομαι is found here again in a place, where once more a notification from Acts (the escape from Damascus, Acts 9,22-25) is inserted in a Pauline letter.

c) O'NEILL, 25: »The verse 23 πίστις is used of the Christian religion, as in Acts 6,7, and the only possible parallels in Paul are at 3.23-5, 6.10 and Rom. 1,5, all passages that are of doubtful authenticity«.

d) After in 1, 17, with greatest emphasis, the author of Gal had just asserted that he had *not* immediately gone to Jerusalem after his conversion, one expects a somewhat greater temporal distance than just *3 years!* 2,1 with the notification of *14 years* is much more plausible as a continuation of 1,17.

e) BRUNO BAUER, 16: »If he [Paul] stayed in Jerusalem for two weeks, spent time with Peter and James, and if the presence of the other apostles in the sacred city was as self-evident as expressed by his solemn oath, it would have been impossible for him not to meet them «.

IV. Explanation for the Insertion

O'NEILL, 26, explains the insertion of 22-24 this way: »The author possessed Judean traditions about Paul, the persecutor who became the champion of the faith, and he inserted them into Galatians at the appropriate points in the story. His source was Judean as opposed to Jerusalemite, so that he has to explain that, although they used to say 'He who once persecuted us', they did not know him by sight«.

In my opinion, however, the passage is another attempt at bringing the story of Acts and the biographical details about the apostle in Galatians into line as far as possible. This undertaking was not an easy one, but not a totally hopeless one, either, since Acts had not exactly defined the period between conversion and first trip to Jerusalem, and 9,23 only mentions ἡμέραι ἱκαναί. On the other hand, one could neither understand by these the 14 years of Gal 2,1, nor could the trip to Jerusalem be dated all too soon after the conversion, since the author of Gal 1, 16 had explicitly stated, that he had *not immediately* (εὐθέως) contacted those, who had already been apostles before himself. Thusly finding himself between Scylla and Charybdis, the editor decided for a period of 3 years, probably thinking by doing so still to be to some extent in agreement with the Lukan ἡμέραι ἱκαναί, and to not explicitly contradict the emphasized statement of Gal 1,17, that Paul had *not immediately* contacted those in Jerusalem. (he would have done so, if he had taken Luke's wording ἡμέραι ἱκαναί). The opinion that Gal 1,18 refers to Acts 9,23, and that the 3 years are a specification of Luke's ἡμέραι ἱκαναί, was already brought forward by LOMAN, *Nalatenshap* 118f., though he sees it as given by the author of Gal and not by a revisor.

An harmonization of the diverging biographical details in Gal and Acts about the apostle was of greatest importance for Catholic Christianity, as shown in Iren Haer 3.13.3: »If, then, any one shall, from the Acts of the Apostles, carefully scrutinize the time concerning which it is written that he (Paul) went up to Jerusalem on account of the forementioned question, he will find those years mentioned by Paul coinciding with it. Thus the statement of Paul harmonizes with, and is, as it were, identical with, the testimony of Luke regarding the apostles.«.

Tertullian, too, clearly shows his interest in the details of Galatians and Acts being in agreement with each other. In Marc 5.2.7, he emphatically states that Paul reports what happened after his conversion exactly in the same way as does Acts (»Exinde decurrens ordinem conversionis suae de persecutore in apostolum scripturam Apostolicorum confirmat«). If then Acts were in agreement with Paul's own statement, Marcion obviously had to refute Acts, since it didn't preach any other god but the Creator God of the O.T..

To Tertullian, the conformity of the statements in Galatians and in Acts is unquestionable proof of the fact, that the Paul of Galatians preached the same God as Acts, i.e. the Creator God and his Christ: »Now, it is not very likely that these should be found in agreement with the apostle, on the one hand, when they described his career in accordance with his own statement; but should, on the other hand, be at variance with him when they announce the (attribute of) divinity in the Creator's Christ-as if Paul did not follow the preaching of the apostles when he received from them the prescription of not teaching the Law (qui formam ab eis dedocendae legis accepit)«.

To all this, see COUCHOUD, 23f, as well:

It seemed very much to the point to modify certain historical facts to bring them into line with the correct dogma. Hence another group of corrections were introduced, the most important of which are to be found in the Letter [24] to the Galatians where they aimed at rebutting or weakening Paul's independence.

Gal. 2 : 1: "Fourteen years later I went up to Jerusalem". The Catholic revisor writes "I went up *again* (pa,lin)....". In this fashion he reveals himself to be the author of the verses 1 : 18–20 where an alleged earlier journey of Paul to Jerusalem is reported: "*Then after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to get acquainted with Peter and stayed with him fifteen days. I saw none of the other apostles-- only James, the Lord's brother. I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie*".

Inventing this first trip the editor wants to prove, against the text, that Paul did not delay entering into contact with the heads of the Jerusalem Church. His fiction is more timid than that of the editor of *Acts* (9 : 26–30), who informs us that Paul was introduced by Barnabas to the Apostles, a short time after his conversion, and then guided by them in the streets of Jerusalem and preaching there together with them.

V. Possible Objections

Against the above given explanation one might object: Why does the editor heavily emphasize the fact that he hasn't seen *anyone but* Peter and James, since his interest is said to have been in connecting Paul as closely as possible with those in Jerusalem? Moreover, why doesn't his insertion follow even more accurately the depiction of Acts?

Keeping in mind the editor's task, these questions can adequately be answered: We have to consider: in 1,17, Paul had explicitly denied to have been in contact after his conversion with those, who were apostles before himself. The editor now could erase this statement, –or reinterpret it. As a skilled editor, who did not want to write a new text but to alter the extant one, he chose the second way. So he reinterpreted 1,17 in the sense, that Paul had seen Peter and James, yet not the other apostles. Because of the context, this was a concession he could not dispense with. Though this splitting up results in a rather artificial construction (as already B. BAUER noticed: did then the

other apostles happen to be on a journey? did Paul consciously avoid meeting them?), Paul nevertheless was set into the Jerusalem tradition. Paul had seen Peter and James and had been with Peter for two weeks! — that should be enough to prove (to the Marcionites) that the Paul of Galatians had not any more than the Paul of Acts received a special revelation and consequently was not the subject of divine revelation in his own right. May then the report in Galatians not fully be in agreement with Acts (9, 27), where Paul is conducted to the apostles (the author surely meant ,all of the apostles’) by Barnabas. It is the logical result of the special task undertaken in this place by the editor: one way or the other, he had to pervert the meaning of 1,17 to get Paul in contact with the other apostles after all. And his depiction does not really contradict Acts: by his construction he managed to explain why, in 1, 17, Paul nevertheless could say he had not gone up to Jerusalem to those, who had already been apostles before himself (in fact, he had not gone to all of the apostles!) — and, the all important project, he had managed to confirm the Catholic point of view.

10. 2,1-4 (*The Second Trip to Jerusalem*)

#17) 2,1 Marc 5.3.1	– πάλιν	cor
#18) 2,1 Marc 5.3.1	– μετὰ Βαρναβᾶ	cor
#19) 2,2 Marc 5.3.1	– κατ’ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἕδραμον	cor

Textual Evidence:

Tertullian, **Marc 5.3.1**: Denique ad patrocinium Petri ceterorumque apostolorum *ascendisse* Hierosolymam post annos quatuordecim scribit, ut conferret cum illis de evangelii sui regula, ne in vacuum tot annis cucurrisset aut curreret, si quid scilicet citra formam illorum evangelizaret; **Marc 4.2.5**: propterea Hierosolymam *ascendit* ad cognoscendos apostolos et consultandos, ne forte in vacuum cucurrisset, id es ne non secundum illos credidisset et non secundum illos evangelizaret; cf. **Marc 1.20.2**: ... ab illo certe Paulo qui adhuc in gratia rudis, trepidans denique ne in vacuum cucurrisset aut curreret, tunc primum cum antecessoribus apostolis conferebat.; moreover: **De praescr. haer. 23,6f**: Atquin demutatus in praedicatorum de persecutore deducitur ad

fratres a fratribus ut unus ex fratribus, ad illos ab illis, qui ab apostolis fidem induerant. [7] Dehinc, sicut ipse enarrat, *ascendit* Hierosolymam cognoscendi Petri causa, ex officio et iure scilicet eiusdem fidei et praedicationis.

Marc 5.3.1 and other places clearly show that Tertullian did not (and neither did Irenaeus) read *πάλι*ν – obviously neither in the Marcionite, nor in his own Catholic Bible (to this, see the previous ann.).

VAN MANEN, 510, thinks, Tertullian omitted *πάλι*ν with a *biased purpose*. Yet that's improbable, since there was no reason for Tertullian to do so. On the contrary, as an advocate of the *interpretatio catholica* he had to be more interested in reconciling Galatians with the details in Acts, which mention *several* trips to Jerusalem achieved by the apostle. The quotes do *not* show that Tertullian found *ad patrocinium Petri ceterorumque apostolorum* in the Marcionite text — as already HARNACK, 70*, rightly noticed, this may be a commentary by Tertullian. HARNACK reconstructs: »Here the phrase read Ἐπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα and μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἕδραμον.«

Tertullian's Discussion of the Phrase in Marc 5.3.1

Obviously, the 2nd chapter of Galatians was of utmost importance in the discussion with Marcion. There is no other explanation for the fact, that Tertullian, working on passage 2,1-14 discusses almost every single line. Marcion and the Marcionites seem to have backed up »their view of Paul and the first apostles with this passage« (HILGENFELD, 440).

A striking feature of Tertullian's rendering 2,1-2 in *Marc 5.3.1* is that, more than in other places, Tertullian adds commentaries to and omits phrases from the text he quotes with a clear tendency, and that he so does without a basis even in the canonical version. By adding the remark, that Paul had betaken himself *ad patrocinium Petri ceterorumque apostolorum*, Tertullian immediately makes himself perfectly clear about his (Catholic) opinion on the relationship of Paul with the other apostles: it's a *client-patrons relation*. Tertullian's conspicuous unscrupulousness in here imposing his Catholic interpretative framework on the text, is most probably due to the fact that the Marcionite text itself did not offer much for the point of view defended by Tertullian — see as well the forced way, already noticed by HARNACK, of Tertullian's changing (against all textual evidence) ἀνεθέμην of ἀνατίθεσθαι τι = »to expound sth. to sb.«, into *conferret* of *conferre cum aliqua re* = »to compare sth. with sth.«; see the erasion of κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, with the intention

to restrict Paul's independence —. Consequently, we have to start from the assumption that Tertullian also uses the *canonical* text for what immediately follows, contrary to his usual proceeding of having it out with Marcion on the basis of the Marcionite text. Hence it is highly questionable whether Marcion — as HARNACK thinks — read *ne in vacuum tot annis cucurrisset aut curreret* = μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἕδραμον in 2,2. More likely is the assumption, that Tertullian here looked at the canonical text and in it found the only adequate *commentary* on the (shorter) Marcionite version of Gal 2,1-2. I think, one should have this in mind when asking

Which was the Original Text?

There is indeed hardly any probability for the man, called by God through revelation, sovereign preacher of the Gospel free of the Law, whom we learnt to know in the first chapter, to have to be confirmed by those in Jerusalem in that up to that moment (14 years!), he had not run *in vacuum*.

VAN MANEN, 510: »... That fear and the fact that the man, who allegedly harboured it, had not sooner taken advantage of the opportunity to assuage his mind (1,18 [which, according to VAN MANEN, belongs to the original text]) hardly go together: he waited for as long a period of time as, would you believe it, 14 years (2,1) and even then did not go up to Jerusalem before he was forced to do so by an ἀποκάλυψις. It was the revelation that brought the trip about and not a desire to have examined there whether he might be wrong in his preaching (conscious of having received his Gospel through revelation, 1, 12, and cursing anyone who dared add something to his preaching 1, 6-9)«. VAN MANEN rightly calls the editor of the text »a worthy forefather of Tertullian's«, 510.

Together with μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἕδραμον the connected κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν hast to be removed. Actually, after the phrase οἱ δοκοῦντες, one expects an extension to make it understandable; see v.6 εἰναί τι or v.9 στῦλοι εἶναι. The fact that it is already here introduced as a *terminus technicus* shows that »the one who wrote οἱ δοκοῦντες already knew what would follow in v.6 and v.9 « and with this in mind could simply talk about τοῖς δοκοῦσιν. Yet only an editor could do so!

As already HARNACK noticed, μετὰ Βαρναβᾶ presumably does not belong to the Marcionite text either. In 2,9, Barnabas is not referred to, either. We may assume that Barnabas was added by the Catholic editor to harmonize the details in Acts to the way Galatians tells the event and in order to play down Paul's role at the Conference of the Apostles: that Paul was accompanied by Barnabas has the function of showing Paul as emissary of the Church of Antioch and not as taking part in his own right (Acts 9,27; 11,22; 11,30; 12,25; 13,1ff; 15,2.12.22.25.35). Improbable is the assumption that Barnabas was mentioned in the original text and then — lead by the opposed intent —

was *erased* by Marcion. As already HAENCHEN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 448f, noticed, the author of Galatians quite firmly speaks in 1st pers. sing. in 2,1ff: »The phrases ‘I went up to’, ‘I laid before’, ‘which I preach’, ‘lest I ...in vain’ sound as if they be about a mission achieved by Paul alone or at least with him being in the lead«.

In this context there really seems not to have been room for the Barnabas character!

Likewise COUCHOUD, 25:

„He [the Catholic editor] does not leave Paul in arrogant isolation. At his side he places Barnabas, whom he had already introduced: “gave me *and Barnabas* the right hand”. To this phrase he adds “*of fellowship, κοινωνίας*” to create a fellowship between Paul and the Apostles of Jerusalem. By the addition of Barnabas, the phrase “we’ll continue to remember” is incumbent on Paul and Barnabas, it ceases to be restricted to Paul and the notables. The passage has been utterly modified.“

11. Gal 2,4-5

#20) 2,4 Marc 5.3.3	– δὲ	cor
s. Clabeaux #3) App A cf. Clabeaux #4), App A (— Ἰησοῦ) cf. Clabeaux #5), App A: (do not add μὴ)?		
#21) 2,5 Marc 5.3.3	+ οὐδὲ	cor
s. Clabeaux #6), App A (do not delete οὐδὲ)		
#22) 2,5 Marc 5.3.3	– οἷς	cor
s. Clabeaux #7), App A (–οἷς)		

Textual Evidence

Tertullian, Marc 5.3.3: »*Cum vero nec Titum dicit circumcisum, iam incipit ostendere solam circumcisionis quaestionem ex defensione adhuc legis concussam ab eis quos propterea falsos et superinducticios fratres appellat, non aliud statuere pergentes quam perseverantiam legis, ex fide sine dubio integra creatoris, atque ita pervertentes evangelium, non interpolatione scripturae qua Christum creatoris effingerent, sed retentione veteris disciplinae ne legem creatoris excluderent. Ergo propter falsos inquit, superinducticios fratres, qui subintraverant ad speculandam libertatem*

nostram quam habemus in Christo, ut nos subigerent servituti, nec ad horam cessimus subiectioni. Intendamus enim et sensui ipsi et causae eius, et apparebit vitiatio scripturae. Cum praemittit, Sed nec Titus, qui mecum erat, cum esset Graecus, coactus est circumcidi, dehinc subiungit. Propter superinducticios falsos fratres, et reliqua, contrarii utique facti incipit reddere rationem, ostendens propter quid fecerit quod nec fecisset nec ostendisset si illud propter quod fecit non acidisset ... Necessario igitur cessit ad tempus, et sic ei ratio constat Timotheum circumcidendi et rasos introducendi in templum, quae in Actis edicuntur, adeo vera, ut apostolo consonent profitenti factum se Iudaeis Iudaeumut Iudaeos lucifaceret, et sub lege agentem propter eos qui sub lege agerent, sic et propter superinductos illos, et omnibus novissime omnia factum ut omnes lucraretur. Si haec quoque intellegi ex hoc postulant, id quoque nemo dubitabit, eius dei et Christi praedicatorem Paulum cuius legem quamvis excludens, interim tamen pro temporibus admiserat, statim amoliendam si novum deum protulisset«.

Context

Discussing 2, 1-2, Tertullian once again had put special emphasis on how much Paul desired to be examined and approved (*ab illis probari et constabiliri desiderat*) by those old-established Jerusalem Apostles, who Marcion reproached for their all too close alliance with Judaism. Now he emphatically states that Paul, by referring to the uncircumcised Titus, wanted to make clear that nothing else but the problem of circumcision (and e.g. not the question whether Christ belonged to the Creator God) was bringing about agitation, and this because of those persons that were called *falsos et superinducticios fratres* by Paul. They had not — as Marcion maintained — perverted the Gospel through faking Scripture (*interpolatione scripturae*) in a way that it classified Christ as belonging to the Creator God, but by insisting on a continuance of the *Law* of the Creator God. Tertullian quotes Marc 5.3.3 from the Marcionite version of Gal. to find Marcion himself guilty of faking Scripture: So when the Apostle (according to Marcion) continues saying: »Because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ, that they might bring us into bondage, to whom we gave place by subjection *not even* (οὐδέ) for an hour«, one should only attend to the clear sense of these words to find the perversion of the Scripture (by *Marcion*) apparent (which perversion in Tertullian's opinion, consists in Marcion's here adding οὐδέ). Tertullian refers to the context: When Paul first said: »*Sed nec Titus, qui mecum erat, cum esset Graecus, coactus est circumcidi*«, and then added: »*Propter superinducticios falsos fratres etc*« he conceded that he did that which he would not have done in other

circumstances. If there hadn't been any brought in false brethren, Paul wouldn't have had to give way to them. He gave way, because there were persons whose weak faith required consideration: as long as Paul's preaching hadn't been approved by the Jerusalem Apostles, the *libertas* of Christianity remained in danger of being again completely turned into the old *servitutum Iudaismi* by the *falsi fratres*. » He therefore made some concession, as was necessary, for a time; and this was the reason why he had Timothy circumcised, and the Nazarites introduced into the temple, which incidents are described in the Acts.«. Moreover, all this was in agreement with an Apostle who to the Jews became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews, and lived under the law to save those that were under the law (I Cor 9,20f) — to save the brought in brethren as well. So anyone had to admit that Paul preached that God and that Christ whose law he allowed, owing to the times (*interim tamen pro temporibus admiserat*), what he would not have done if he had published a new god.

The Original Version

a) #21) + οὐδὲ

Despite Tertullian's laborious argument, there can be no doubt that the version of 2,5 he provides (with οὐδὲ) is the Marcionite variant and at the same time the *original* text. The majority of those that have the quote, e.g. all of the Greek manuscripts, the Syrian translation and Jerome, here read οὐδὲ (Exception: D* d, in Irenaeus, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius), so that SEMLER, LÖFFLER, BAUR, HILGENFELD and others were certain about its being the original version. HILGENFELD, 440: »The only divergence in the Marcionite text which is seriously rebuked by Tertullian as a *vitiatio scripturae*, namely οὐδὲ v.5, provides, however, proof for the opposite, i.e. that Marcion here had preserved the unadulterated text. Though Irenäus *adv. haer.* III, 13,3 is in full agreement with Tertullian on this negation to be omitted, there is no doubt that the then Catholic variant, as opposed to the Marcionite, is entirely wrong«.

The omission of οὐδὲ undoubtably shows that there was indeed Catholic *tendentious* tampering with the text. In this case, the intention was to eliminate the differences between Paul and the other apostles concerning circumcision. This, in turn, shows – a fact often unnoticed – that the way of describing the history of Early Christianity was of the greatest importance in the doctrinal discussion of the 2nd century, especially where the conflict between Catholics and Marcionites on the correct ideas about Paul was at stake. The conflict was not a problem of the past, but of the then present time: Which of the parties involved could more rightly refer to Paul for its doctrine. As the example

shows, bot parties were very much tempted to decide the conflict not only by theological discussions or by producing their own versions of the history of the Church (Acts of the Apostles), but just as well by massively interfering in the wording of the Pauline writings.

b) #22) – οἶς (2,5); #20) – δὲ (2,3)

According to Tertullian, Marcion obviously did not read οἶς before οὐδὲ nor δὲ after διὰ in v.3. Here, too, the Marcionite text might turn out to be the more original one: actually it is not easy to understand δὲ in this context. It might be explained by the Catholic editor's tendency to give his readers the opportunity to assume that Paul *did* have Titus circumcised, yet without having been forced to do so. After in this way having separated v.4 and v.3 , the editor's task now only consisted in connecting v.4 and v.5 in such a way as to get a new coherence, which he achieved by inserting οἶς. Yet, according to VAN MANEN, only the version which had conserved οὐδὲ was modified in this way, not the one quoted by Tertullian, in which οὐδὲ had been deleted.

The passage from *Marc* 5.3 incidentally shows the importance for the Catholic party of such places like Acts 16,3 (Titus's circumcision), 21,26f (Paul and the Naziraeans) and the apparently Catholic insertion I Cor 9,20f in their discussion with the Marcionites about the correct interpretation of the Paul character.

12. Gal 2,6

#23) 2,6	+ ? (Gap?)	nlq
----------	------------	-----

Problems

According to a majority of commentators, the sentence is an anacoluthon; cf. BLAB-DEBR. — 467. LIETZMANN reconstructs the original structure of the sentence like this: ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι οὐδέν μοι προσαντετέθη· »The insertion after τι then overthrew the construction, so that he starts afresh with ἐμοὶ γὰρ«. LIETZMANN himself sees the difficulty caused by this: »The interjected phrase ὅποιοί ποτε — λαμβάνει declares the reputation of the original Apostles to be of no importance. That's actually noticeable, since the essential point in this context is that the δοκοῦντες, in opposition against the false brethren, supported Paul with their authority: how then can he declare at the same time this authority to be of no importance?« LIETZMANN explains: Paul »knows he has been called by Jesus and does not need approval of his Gospel by the original Apostles; this confirmation is — as we see — valuable

for him only in respect of human beings«. Yet this explanation does not solve the problem, it rather once more shows the decisive inadequacy of his attempted reconstruction.

Van Manen's Conjecture

In my opinion, VAN MANEN is nearer to the truth, where he interprets ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει as indicating a lasting tension between Paul and the δοκοῦντες. He assumes that this tension, which was probably caused by the δοκοῦντες demanding Titus to be circumcised (2,6, too, might have dealt with this problem, as shown by the remark ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδέν προσανέθεντο) was expressed in that (now omitted) phrase as well which possibly had contained angry and fierce remarks against the Jerusalem Apostles which the editor then deleted. Paulus might have reported that 'those who were reputed to be something', e.g. 'firmly demanded circumcision [of Titus]', maybe by enumerating their reasons and by telling how he pilloried them. With the phrase ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει Paul then had brought his attack against those of Jerusalem to an end.

VAN MANEN finds this conflict, the details of which were withheld from us by the Catholic editor, still reflected in Tertullian: obviously, to the latter, the events that occurred in Jerusalem and those in Antioch are identical. In respect to these, he says: »Nam et ipsum Petrum *ceterosque, columnas apostolatus*, a Paulo reprehensos opponunt quod non recto pede incederent ad evangelii veritatem (v. 14), ab illo certe Paulo qui adhuc in gratia rudis, trepidans denique ne in vacuum cucurrisset aut curreret (v.2), tunc *primum* cum antecessoribus apostolis

conferebat. Igitur si ferventer adhuc, ut neophytus, adversus Iudaismum aliquid in conversatione reprehendum existimavit,..«..

VAN MANEN draws attention to the fact that the conflict in Antioch was only between Paul and Peter, and that the *first* meeting with the pillars took place in Jerusalem. — Contrary to LIETZMANN, VAN MANEN so succeeds in explaining how the denigrating qualification of the Jerusalem Apostles in the short interjection ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει might have come about.

13. Gal 2,7b.8

#24) 2,7b.8

– τῆς ἀκροβυστίας καθὼς Πέτρος cor
τῆς περιτομῆς, ὃ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς
ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν

καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη

K – contra *De praescr.* 23,9

Textual Evidence

As far as I know, there is no unambiguous evidence for the Marcionite version in this place; cf. HARNACK, 71*: »6-9a (The introduction to the convention of the Apostles with the distinction of the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας and τῆς περιτομῆς and the phrase γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι) are without any evidence and, if not in an entirely disfigured way, they cannot have been extant«. καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς is missing in the (Moscow) manuscript K (cf. O'NEILL, 37: »The phrase καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς is omitted by K«); VAN MANEN, 513.

The Original Text: Problems of Form, Language and Doctrine

1. As a parenthesis, 2,7b together with 2,8, obviously does not fit in the context — on the other hand 2,7a is very well followed by 2,9 – a first indication that obviously those two lines did not belong to the original version (cf. BARNIKOL, VAN MANEN, 513f.).

»The clumsiness of style« of the insertion, which is referred to by SCHLIER 77, A. 2, as an argument for the coherence of the text (?), is rather an argument *for* than against its being a gloss.

2. The phrase ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ is untypical, as shown by BARNIKOL, 290,. The verb ἐνήργησεν is not used with the dative case in other places in the Corpus Paulinum but connected with ἐν — so e.g. in Gal 3,5 (in Gal 5,6 – though this, too, is an editorial line – it is in absolute mode). In Phil 2,13 and II Cor 4,12 the term again is connected with ἐν, as in I Thess 2,13 and Col 1,29. »The evidence could not be any clearer: Paul writes ἐνήργειν ἐν ἐμοὶ; he never wrote ἐνήργειν ἐμοι« (BARNIKOL 290).

3. The name Πέτρος is found in Paul only in this place: cf. BARNIKOL, 287ff; SCHLIER 77, Ann. 2; and especially O'NEILL, 37, though in v.8, he only wants to discard the word Πέτρῳ:

»Paul always uses the name Κηφᾶς, except in Gal 2,7-8. Κηφᾶς appears in verse 9 as the second name in the list of the pillars (according to the most probable reading), and it is very difficult to see any motive for using a Greek form in the earlier part of the sentence, or for putting the man second in the list of three after giving him such prominence before. I conjecture that the phrase καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, and the word Πέτρῳ were originally glosses to the text, designed to incorporate the view, which we find in Matthew's

Gospel, that Peter was the leader of the Jewish Church, into the picture presented by Galatians.«

4. In O'NEILL's opinion, the way Peter is pictured in the insertion is not in doctrinal agreement with the other statements of Galatians:

»The rest of Galatians does not support this picture. Not only does Cephas's name appear second in the list of the three pillars, but Cephas seems to have been subject to James in the eating with Gentiles (2.12). In the Acts of the Apostles as well, James has much more authority in the Jewish congregations than Peter«.

Likewise VAN MANEN, who additionally draws attention to 2,9 αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν. This clearly shows, that Peter actually was not entrusted with the Gospel for the circumcised *in any outstanding way*.

Moreover, Peter's pre-eminence contradicts Paul's statements in I Corinthians 1,12 ff. Typically enough, in the conflicts among the diverse parties that call upon Paul, Peter or Apollos, Peter is never mentioned as being in a pre-eminent position as the representative of the Jewish Christian minority (BARNIKOL 292).

The arguments of BARNIKOL, O'NEILL and VAN MANEN are convincing. SCHLIER, 77 A. 2, errs, where he refers to 2,9 against BARNIKOL's attempt to remove καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς as a gloss. This phrase actually reveals the contrast and not the agreement with 2, 7!

5. For the author of Galatians, there is but *one Gospel* (1,6-9) as opposed to several special gospels (BARNIKOL, 290).

Differently VAN MANEN, who thinks that at least the explanation ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας belonged to the original version (BARNIKOL 289, A. 17): »The attribute: *of the uncircumcision* can be used, just like the elsewhere occurring τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ Ἐριστοῦ, τῆς βασιλείας, without referring to a contrary gospel« (VAN MANEN. 513). In my opinion, however, that's improbable.

6. Finally, a quote from Irenaeus *Haer.* III, 13,1 may give us a clue for the decisive motivation to insert the gloss:

»With regard to those (the Marcionites) who allege that Paul alone knew the truth, and that to him the mystery was manifested by revelation (*qui dicunt, solum Paulum veritatem cognovisse, cui per revelationem manifestum est mysterium*), let Paul himself convict them, when he says, that one and the same God wrought in Peter for the apostolate of the circumcision, and in himself for the Gentiles. Peter, therefore, was an apostle of that very God whose was also Paul; and Him whom Peter preached as God among those of the circumcision, and likewise the Son of God, did Paul [declare] also among the Gentiles.«

By the insertion the Catholic party wanted to prevent the Marcionites (or the Gnostics) — they of course are the *qui dicunt* — from referring exclusively to Paul's preaching (*solus Paulus*) to justify their doctrine. If Paul and Peter had taken part in the same mission, there could be no doubt that Paul had preached *the same* God as Peter and not another one, let alone a *deus novus*. The interpolation is, as BARNIKOL, 298, put it, the »classic expression« of the orthodox doctrine of the Church, reconciling the apostles Peter and Paul, as it can be found as well in I Clem 5,3-7 or in Ignatius's Letter to the Romans 4,3.

14. Gal 2,9.10

#25) 2,9 Marc 5.3.6	– καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας	cor
#26) 2,10	– μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι	nlq
contra: Marc 5.3.6		

Textual Evidence

Marc, 5.3.6: »*Bene igitur quod et dexteras Paulo dederunt Petrus et Iacobus et Ioannes, et de officii distributione pepigerunt, ut Paulus in nationes, illi in circumcisionem, tantum ut meminissent egenorum, et hoc secundum legem creatoris, pauperes et egenos foventis, sicut in evangelii vestri retractatu probatum est*«. Same order in D G d g Hieron., Ambrosiaster, Victorin (s. HARNACK 71*.)

Reconstruction of the Text

#25) Cf. HARNACK: »The text as given, without Barnabas but with the repeated 'I' (original text ἡμεῖς, namely Paul and Barnabas) and the pl. 'meminissent', can be understood only as not containing Barnabas (just so 2,1)...«. (s. 2, 1, too).

#26) Going beyond HARNACK (and Tertullian) one will have to ask whether the Marcionite text did not also differ from the canonical one in other places. Suspect are:

a) Tertullian's *Peter* for Κηφᾶς, and

- b) the sequence he testifies : *Petrus et Iacobus et Ioannes* and finally
 c) the reference to the collection, *tantum ut meminissent egenorum*.

a) As shown by the name *Peter* (not used in other places in the Paulina) instead of Κηφᾶς, Tertullian — deliberately or not— seems to follow the in the meantime common Catholic language usage rather than the text he had on hand (in 2,11 we find again Κηφᾶς);

b) Catholic thinking seems to be discernable as well in the order of names of the apostles with Peter's *pre-eminence*. That Marcion »to honour Rome« (!), as LIETZMANN, 236, assumed, placed »Peter in front«, surely may be considered as entirely out of the question. Tertullian here seems to quote freely.

c), Concerning the reference to the *collection for the poor*, which Paul here recalls, there is –in spite of Tertullian– reasonable doubt about its originality. In VAN MANEN's opinion, it's a note in the margin by a glossator which looks like an »innocent historical piece of information« and is suspicious especially because it interrupts the connection of 2,9 with 2,11. Those that consider the phrase to be original, have to explain, as shown by STECK, 108f., how Paul in Gal already can *recall* the collection, whereas Rom 16,25ff shows that the collection was brought to an end only then. If they don't want to draw the conclusion – as done by SCHRADER, *Der Apostel Paulus* I., 219 – that the letter to the Galatians was written later than the one to the Romans, they might, together with STECK, see it as a *Prolepsis* and get results which endanger the genuineness of the letter: »The author of Galatians, who is acquainted with the other Hauptbriefe, knows from these about the collection and its delivering in Jerusalem and he knows, too, what Acts in a similar way reports about Paul's taking care of the Saints in Jerusalem (11,25.26. 12,25. 24,17). Hence he writes that sentence, which in this place appears as a prolepsis, at least if one dates Galatians before the other Hauptbriefe«.

Yet, that note was probably written not by the author, but by an editor, who even more easily can be thought of as responsible for the prolepsis.

Tertullian connects the collection for the »Poor« in Jerusalem with a commandment of the God of the OT (*et hoc secundum legem creatoris, pauperes et egenos fovendis*), but from his argumentation we surely must not draw the conclusion that this was already the editor's intent as well. The latter apparently only wanted to harmonize the details given in Galatians with those in Acts (12,25; 24,17).

15. Gal 2,12

#27) 2,12	– τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου	nlq
#28) 2,12	ἦλθεν > ἦλθον	nlq
τινας à A B C D F G Ψ 33 339 451 2492		
ἦλθεν p ⁴⁶ s B D* F G 33 330 451 2492 d g r* Orig Cels 2.1		

Textual Evidence

Origenes Cels. 2.1: ὅτι Πέτρος ἔτι θοβούμενος τους Ἰουδαίσμος παυσάμενος τοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν συνεσθίειν, ἐλθόντος Ἰακώβου πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν κτλ.

τινας s A B C D F G Ψ 33 330 451 2492 etc. τινα p⁴⁶ d g^c r*; ἦλθον A C D^c Ψ etc.; ἦλθεν p⁴⁶ s B D* F G 33 330 451 2492 d g r*

VAN MANEN” πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν ...

Instead of τινας ἀπο. Ἰακώβου VAN MANEN, 514 f conjectures Ἰακώβου, instead of ἦλθον he reads (e.g. with Cod. Vat.) ἦλθεν” »πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν ... Before James came, he [Peter] ate with the Gentiles. But when he [James] came... «To substantiate his argument, VAN MANEN refers to Origen *c. Cels.*, who mentions a visit by *James* alone. To VAN MANEN, this is the original picture, since Peter’s giving in could only be understood if the »person that had arrived in Antioch...« were » a man of great importance to whom Cephas looked up«. Consequently, VAN MANEN applies ἦλθεν, offered by some of the referents for the text (s. above) to James. The intent of this correction, had been to keep James out of the »tragedy« in Antioch. — Against VAN MANEN’S conjecture, one must object together with O’NEILL, 38,: »This reading can hardly have been correct, since then Paul would have been forced to confront James himself, or at least explain why he did not confront James«.

O’Neill: πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν...

O’NEILL, 37ff, deletes τινας and reads ἦλθεν instead of ἦλθον, which he applies to *Peter*. »Perhaps the clause πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου refers to a visit he made to James before coming to Antioch, but it is possible that it

conveys just the opposite impression and means that before he left James he used always to eat with Gentiles. James was strong enough to stand up to Jewish pressure, but Cephas was not; when he left James, Cephas succumbed«, 39. In my opinion, the reconstruction of the original text by means of historical conjectures without any piece of evidence, is here too dearly paid for.

PIERSON-NABER” πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἄθειν μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν...

For a reconstruction of the Marcionite text I consider the following criterion to be decisive: The fact that Tertullian, one of the most important witnesses for the Marcionite text, describes Peter’s conduct as motivated only by fear of the circumcised — without mentioning those that belonged to James: *timens (Petrus) eos qui erant ex circumcissione*. We should safely assume that Tertullian would not have omitted the τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου if he had known about their presence. So this makes us doubt whether τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου belongs to the original or rather to the Marcionite version. Further confirmation is given by the best pieces of evidence for the text (p⁴⁶ ✱ !) which in this place read ἦλθεν instead of ἦλθον. Obviously, not τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, but *Cephas* was the original subject of the phrase that is introduced by ὅτε.

Summarizing now all observations and assuming – as did already the Dutch classical philologist NABER, *Nuculae*, 385 and PIERSON-NABER in their *Verisimilia* 31 (see WECHSLER, 111f, too) – πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἔλθειν μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν κτλ. to be the original version, we can without difficulty explain the other variants offered:

a) ἦλθον: after the addition of τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, one could easily lose sight of the fact that *Cephas* was the original subject of the ὅτε-phrase, whence ἦλθον.

b) τινας: contrary, those that kept ἦλθεν might have attempted to apply τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου to ἦλθεν by transforming it into singular form.

Finally we have to ask, *for what reason* the phrase τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου was inserted. Possibly, the (Catholic) editor here wanted to connect Gal 2,12 with the piece of information in Acts 15,1, which says that the Acts 15:1 τινες κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας had originated the agitation in Antioch by their demand for circumcision. Those rigorous Jewish Christians (whose leader in his opinion evidently was James) he assumed to be those that had put pressure on Peter in Antioch. By inserting τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου he succeeded in making not Peter,

who had in the meantime advanced to the position of patron saint of the Catholic community, but (the for Catholics not so important) James or James's supporters responsible for the incident in Antioch.

16. Gal 2,14; 15-17

#29) 2,15-17	–2,15-17, except 16 : οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως > οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ	cor
Marc 5.3.7 a.8	διὰ πίστεως	

I. Textual Evidence

Marc 5.3.7 a. 8.: »*Sed reprehendit Petrum non recto pede incedentem ad evangelii veritatem. Plane reprehendit, non ob aliud tamen quam ob inconstantiam victus, quem pro personarum qualitate variabat, timens eos qui erant ex circumcissione, non ob aliquam divinitatis perversitatem, de qua et aliis in faciem restitisset, qui de minore causa conversationis ambiguae Petro ipsi non pepercit. Sed quomodo Marcionitae volunt credi? De cetero pergat apostolus, negans ex operibus legis iustificari hominem, sed ex fide. Eiusdem tamen dei cuius et lex. Nec enim laborasset fidem a lege discernere, quam diversitas ipsius divinitatis ultro discrevisset, si fuisset. Merito non reaedificabat quae destruxit. Destruui autem lex habuit ex quo vox Ioannis clamavit in eremo: Parate etc. ...* — After having once more emphasized the fact that the discussion at the conference of the apostles had been exclusively about *questions of the Law* (i.e. not about the question of the *God of the Law* and his relationship with the God of Jesus Christ), Tertullian mentions an objection Marcion might bring forward: But Paul had censured Peter for not walking straightforwardly according to the truth of the Gospel! Tertullian concedes, but: on this occasion, too, Paul had blamed Peter solely for his inconsistency in the matter of eating, fearing them who were of the circumcision, but not on account of any perverse opinion touching another god *aliquam divinitatis perversitatem*. If Paul had not even spared Peter on the comparatively small matter of the Jewish dietary prescriptions, he would have »resisted face to face« others as well, if the question of another god had arisen. So the apostle must be permitted to go on writing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by faith. However, — and Tertullian directly

addresses Marcion: ‘by faith’ in *the same* God to whom the law also belonged! For he [now, obviously *apostolus* is no longer subject of the sentence but *God*, cf *ipsius* divinitatis] would have bestowed no labour on severing faith from the law, when the difference in his own divinity –if there had been any– would have of itself produced such a severance. Yet, Tertullian concedes to Marcion, that of course, *he* [again, only *God* can be the intended subject of the sentence] *did not build up again what he had overthrown* (*Merito non reaedificabat quae destruxit*). The *destructio* of the law, however, could only begin with John the Baptist, whose demand *Parate vias domini* is interpreted by Tertullian as if John had demanded to change the difficulties of the law into the facilities of the gospel. Tertullian then refers to Ps 2,3 and Hab 2,4. Especially the quote from Habakkuk showed that the Apostle was in perfect unison with the prophets (and therefore with the O.T. and the God of the O.T.) just like Christ was himself. — The context shows that in his controversy with Marcion, Tertullian above all wants to refute the suspicion, Paul’s conflict with the Jerusalem apostles, especially with Peter, had been about some other problem than the question of the validity of the law concerning dietary restrictions. But that exactly seems to be with the Marcionites emphatically stated: two points can clearly be deduced from Tertullian’s polemics: 1) for the Marcionites, in Paul’s conflict with Peter in Antioch, nothing less but the essential question of the *relation Redeemer-God/Lawgiver-God* was at stake. 2) in this place of the Pauline text, the Marcionites obviously had found one of their main arguments to rebut the (Catholic-Judaist) identification of the Lawgiver/Creator-God with the Redeemer-God. From the objection [*Deus*] *non reaedificabat quae destruxit* (mentioned by Tertullian and answered by him in a very articial way –or actually, as regards content, not answered at all), we get some idea what the argument might have been, which obviously the Marcionites found supported by Paul. One thing is evident: Marcion did not apply Paul’s statement in 2,18 to Peter (or fundamentally to those Christians that were about to return to the Law), but to *God*, i.e. to that God, who was just before said by Tertullian to be not only the God of Faith but

the God of the Law as well. Now, so Marcion’s or the Marcionites’ objection fought by Tertullian, this God could not (as God of the Law) rebuild what he himself (as Redeemer-God) had overthrown. (*non reaedificabat quae destruxit*).

This objection has a parallel in *Marc* 5. 4: here Tertullian, after discussing Gal 4,3ff, cites a similar argument of Marcion’s, which obviously embarrasses Tertullian. He postpones an answer to it. The Catholic doctrine that it was the same God who first imposed the Law and later abolished it, seems to have been dealt with by Marcion in a polemical way and surely not without a certain amount of malice: *Quae ipse constituerat, inquis [Marcion], erasit?*

Did then God abolish the prescriptions he had imposed himself? — and, if so, — that's how one has of course to continue Marcion's argumentation— what a curious God this is, doing such a thing, isn't it much more reasonable to assume a division within the divine and to distinguish a Creator- and a Redeemer God? — The two arguments, obviously used by the Marcionites to embarrass the Catholics and to show them the absurdity of their opinions, are in a somewhat different line: one question reads: *Quae ipse constituerat, erasit?* i.e. did God overthrow the law he had himself imposed? the other: *Quae ipse destruxit, reaedificabat?*, i.e. did he rebuild the law he had overthrown himself? Yet the intention is the same in both cases: the Catholic »Montheism«, the identification of Lawgiver- and Redeemer God is to be rebutted; the Marcionite separation of the Demiurge and Lawgiver on the one hand and the God an Father of Jesus Christ on the other hand, is to be confirmed.

But how came that bizarre Marcionite interpretation of 2,18, which can still be deduced from the passage mentioned by Tertullian, into being? The remarkable thing is that Tertullian does not contradict Marcion's argument with a reference to the wording of the preceding text, which hardly allows such an interpretation (i.e. to apply 2,18 to God), but that he only does so with a few (quite poor) theological remarks about John the Baptist a.s.o. Consequently, we'll have to assume that Tertullian, too, all in all accepted the version of the text used by Marcion for his argument, and that he, in his (Marcionite) text of Gal read something different from what we today are used to read in the canonical text, something that fell victim to the scissors of an editor reworking Galatians. What that text was like, we can only suspect. On the other hand, the text quoted by Tertullian with its odd interpretation of 2,18, gives us some piece of information to enable us to start an attempt to at least approximately reconstruct the way of reasoning in the Marcionite text of Galatians. Obviously, the sentence quoted by Tertullian, seems to have been the last part of a *tripartite argument*, two parts of which, the last one and the first, have been conserved in the canonical text whereas only the (though decisive) one *in the middle* is lost:

We might assume that the Marcionite Paul asked Peter — in perfect agreement with the canonical text— why he, though he himself living in the way of the gentiles, forced the gentiles to live like Jews (2,14). Yet, obviously the Marcionite text differed in a crucial place from the Catholic. Except for the fundamental statement, in which Paul declared that a man cannot be justified by works of the Law, but only by faith (*negans ex operibus legis iustificari hominem, sed ex fide*), the Marcionites now did not read any longer about the law, about Christ as an agent of sin a.s.o. (2,15-17), but about the *God of the Law*. And what they actually read in their Galatians cannot have been quite

flattering to him. Paul then seems to have added a polemical question to drive Peter into a corner: If you keep acknowledging the Law –Paul might have said to Peter –, your God obviously is one who rebuilds what [the Law] he overthrew. Then, the Marcionite Paul seems to have continued the way we read it in the canonical text as well (2,18): But if I build up again those things which I tore down, then I prove myself a transgressor (of the overthrown law). [i.o.w. God then were himself a transgressor of his own law, an odd specimen of a god!].

The complete thing then, is an aporetical argument, used by the Marcionite party to revile and reduce *ad absurdum* the Judaist return to the Law and consequently to the *one and only* God of the Law, who was identical with the Father of Jesus Christ. The return to the Jewish law is nothing but a return to the god of the law and that again is: turning to a god of arbitrariness, who first overthrows the law, only to rebuild it afterwards and in doing so to prove himself a transgressor of the law. What a god: that Catholic god!

On the whole, it is quite noticeable that Tertullian, where he discusses the entire passage (chapter 3 included), deals with it only in a very summarizing way and does not quote –but at very few places– the Marcionite text. We'll have to deduce from this fact, that it obviously gave him an uneasy feeling and that he, for good reasons, here preferred to abstain from a (though announced) detailed refutation.

It's quite possible that v.16 was conserved in the Marcionite text, as HARNACK assumes based on Marc v.3 *negans ex operibus legis iustificari hominem, sed ex fide*. Though one might assume as well that this is already an (inaccurate) quote of 3,11, since Tertullian deals with chapters 2 and 3 within the same passage (so e.g. VAN MANEN, 467), the fact that immediately thereafter Tertullian continues quoting v. 18 rather suggests that it is a remnant (adopted by the editor) of the original version which was replaced by 15–17. Remarkably, instead of ἐὰν μὴ the original version had ἀλλὰ (*sed*) and ἐκ πίστεως instead of διὰ πίστεως. Here again, the difference between the exclusive concept of faith of the Marcionites and the more conciliatory one of the Catholic editor comes to light (s.b.)

II. Peculiarities of Language and Problems of Content as Arguments against the Originality of Passage 2,15-17

What –based on Tertullian 5.3.7+8– has been said in I. about the original version of passage 2,15-18 and the assumed absence of 15-17 in the original Marcionite text, seems to be confirmed by a glance at the position of lines 15-17 in context. The passage 2,15-17 differs quite clearly in form and content

from both the preceding and the following part of chapter 2: whereas Paul's speech begins and ends in 1st person singular, 15-17 have 1st person *plural*; whereas the other parts of the speech show passionate emotion, 15-18 is in the matter-of-fact rational *lecture style*, as found in the well known passages of the letter to the Romans (3,4.6.31; 6,2.15; 7,7.13; 9,14; 11,1.11). Yet, that calm exposition in 15-17 does not by any means make it all clearer, the ideas are explained in a broader and more laborious way than in 2,12-14.17-21, and the essential reasoning is rather buried than elucidated by quotes from the O.T. Actually, the connection with the O.T. in 2,16 together with the typically Jewish idea of contrast between Jews and »sinners« from among the Gentiles: ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔθνων ἁμαρτωλοί (2,15) shows the stronger *Jewish atmosphere* of the passage. All this may give some kind of clue, that it is the already well-known Judaizing Catholic editor, who speaks in 15-17 (to all of this, cf. VAN MANEN 515-519 as well).

III. Motive for the Insertion 15-17 and Doctrinal Tendency

With the results of I. in mind, an adequate explanation can be given for the decision of the Catholic editor on the one hand to shorten the original text and, on the other hand to insert his short addition.. Whatever might be assumed to have been the content of the original text which was deleted by the editor and replaced by his insertion: in any case it can't have been confined to some harsh words about Peter — as shown not only by Tertullian, but also by the well known passage in the *Kl* (Hom XVII 14-19ff, s. S.) —. If our above mentioned assumption is correct, it contained an invective against the Catholic-Judaist God from a typically Marcionite point of view, i.e. from the standpoint of the Marcionite Two-God doctrine. This, of course, hardly pleased the Catholic editor, whence he probably erased the passages that expressed Paul's (Marcionite) standpoint in the most offensive way. Maybe he thought he was doing the good work of purifying the text of Galatians from a Marcionite revision. On the other hand, these erasures naturally had caused a gap that had to be closed. This job then was dealt with by the editor in a rather poor way, surely one of the reasons why his insertion became one of the darkest and most incomprehensible phrases in Galatians (O'NEILL, 42: »The attempts to show the connection between verse 17, the preceding verses, and the following verse are legion«). Trying to directly connect verse 14 with 17 (= replace the erasure of the 2nd part of the tripartite argument. -see above), the editor seems to have been lead by two particular intentions: a) to write nothing that might still point in any way at the fact that the conflict between Paul and Peter was about something different from a quarrel about the *inconstantia Petri* (cf. Tertullian) b) to invert the point of the Pauline-

Marcionite statement, i.e. God as transgressor of his own Law, and to apply what originally was said about *God* to Peter, or to anyone returning to the Law. The question remains, however, in how far this second task has been achieved successfully: does not the original *skopos* still show through the odd way of articulating in 2,18: εἰ γὰρ ἂν κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω ? About a human being it can surely be said that he *observes* or *does not observe* the Law — but can he *tear it down* or *build it up again*? Surely, no one but God (or Christ, cf. Mt 5,17) can *annul* the Law.

Furthermore, the editor took the opportunity to explain a) that Law and Faith by no means needed to be considered as contradictory b) that the Pauline motto ‚justification through faith and not by works of the law’ had been in harmony already with the O.T. , and c) that there was no legitimation whatsoever for the reproach: Christ an agent of sin!, which was time and again brought forward by the Jewish side. Concerning a), the remarkable difference in wording between the Marcionite text of 2, 16 as given by Tertullian and the canonical text has already been drawn attention to. Instead of the (probably original) ἀλλὰ (Tertullian: *sed*), the editor writes ἐὰν μὴ, and by so doing suggests, that of course a man cannot be justified by works *alone*. (against SCHLIER, who 92, A.6 states: »Ἐὰν μὴ ... introduces an exclusive contrast «, —because then, the text would have ἀλλὰ). Instead of ἐκ πίστεως (ἐκ: 16b, 3.2.5; simply πίστεως: 3,2.5.11.12.14), he writes διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. All this, and likewise the peculiar and much discussed εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν shows the difference between the (Marcionite) exclusive doctrine of faith and the editor’s view which reconciles faith and the law. In his opinion, Christ had certainly not come to abolish, but to *fulfill* the law, cf. Mt 5,17: Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

17. Gal 2,20

#30) 2,20	ἀγοράσαντός με > ἀγαπήσαντός με	cor
Dial V,22		
#31) 2,20	– καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἑμοῦ.	nlq

#30) *Marcionite/Original Text*

Rufin offers *Dial* V,22 the elsewhere not evidenced: »qui redemit me« (cf. HARNACK, 72*; NESTLE-ALAND, in loco.). This seems to be the Marcionite variant and the original version as well. Marcion could have kept ἀγαπήσαντός με without reservation — to the Catholic editor, however, ἀγοράσαντός με was suspect since it is reminiscent of Marcionism (HARNACK 118; 132f; cf. I Cor 6,29; 7,23)): he just had to change 3 characters in order not to give the Marcionite *Theory of Redemption* any opportunity of appearing on the scene.

#31)

Possibly the editor for the same reason added καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἔμου, a phrase which in spite of the absence of the concept of sin (typical for the editor) reminds of 1,4, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν,

18. Gal 3, 6-9

#32) 3,6-9	– 6-9	cor
Jerome, CommGal (PL 26 [1845] 352A, 2-4)		

Textual Evidence

Origenes in Jer. CommGal (PL 26 [1845] 352A, 2-4): »*Ab hoc loco usque ad eum, ubi scribitur: 'Qui ex fide sunt, benedicentur cum fidei Abraham' (v.9), Marcion de suo apostolo erasit*«. Tertullian, too, omits 6-9 (cf. HILGENFELD 440; according to HARNACK, 72*, however, Tertullian had some keyword of the original text 5,9 in mind, since he wrote: »*Proinde si in lege maledictio est, in fide vero benedictio*«; s. below).

Marcionite/Original Text

The evidence for the absence of this passage in the Marcionite *Apostolus* (especially Origen) is quite strong, so that it can be considered as a fact: HILGENFELD, 440: »III, 69 was missing, as Jerome in his discussion of the passage explicitly says, and his witness cannot be refuted by any means, since it is fully confirmed by Tertullian«. Consequently, only the problem of which is the *original text* remains: did Marcion shorten it or did the Catholics enlarge it? — Usually, the former is assumed and scholars think that Marcion shortened the text for *tendentious reasons*, i.e. that its connection

with the O.T. (Abraham) didn't fit in with his doctrine. Yet, the text might just as well have been enlarged by the Catholic party for the opposite *tendentious* motives, i.e. to connect Paul's preaching of his gospel with O.T. history. As shown by VAN MANEN, the question actually can only be answered by means of *literary critical* criteria. These reveal two facts:

a) The text contains *particularities of language*: 2 hapaxlegomena προῖδοῦσα (cf. Apg 2,25.31); προεσηγγείσατο (v. 8);

b) between 3,6 and the preceding verses there is no connection: 3,6 gives no answer to the question asked in 3,5; LIETZMANN, 240: »The step from an appeal to personal experience to reasoning by means of bible texts is mediated by nothing but the embarrassed filler καθώς«; cf. SCHLIER 127; STECK 51f. 2-5 talks about, »what experience taught about faith being of greater value than works of the law«. (VAN MANEN, 469); on the other hand, not until v.10 we again have reflections about the value of faith and the worthlessness of the law; considering further that, in spite of γὰρ in v. 10 this verse does not contain anything that might be seen as substantiating the preceding verse, one will have to agree with VAN MANEN, who felt the part in between to be an alien element with its reference to Abraham and the discussion of his importance for a faithful Christian. According to VAN MANEN, the passage was inserted by an editor, who wanted to recommend Galatians to the Catholic Christians of his time. In VAN MANEN'S opinion, the passage is a concession to the Jewish-Christian reader (among the Catholics), to whom Abraham was of essential importance and who used O.T. texts as evidence for the truth of Christianity. To me this seems to be correct. There are two more noticeable points:

1) the contents of Gal 3,6-9 are to a large extent identical with the exposition about Abraham as the father of faith in Rom 4,1-25: on Gal 3,6 (Habakuk quote) cf. Rom 4,3; 4,9; on Gal 3,7 (men of faith as sons of Abraham) cf. 4,11-12 (Abraham as father of the men of faith); on Gal 3,8-9 (fulfilment of the promise) Rom 4,16-17. Obviously, here *the same editor* as in Rom 4,1-25 is at work. Since in Rom 4,1-25 he had already in great detail explained his ideas about Abraham's importance as father of the men of faith, he thought it not to be necessary to say more here. He considers it to be sufficient to remind his Jewish-Christian readers of the essential ideas of the passage by means of a few key words;

2) apart from Rom 4,1-25, Gal 3,6-9 reminds of corresponding expositions in the work of Justin. In Dial 119,4 the Catholic Christian Justin tells his Jewish interlocutor why the *Christians* must be considered to be the very people of the promise:

»For this (Christianity) is that nation which God of old promised to Abraham ... For as he believed the voice of God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, in like manner we having believed God's voice spoken by the apostles of Christ, and promulgated to us by the prophets, have renounced even to death all the things of the world. Accordingly, He *promises to him a nation of similar faith* (cf. Gal 3,7: ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ), *God-fearing, righteous, and delighting the Father*; but it is not you, `in whom is no faith.'«

This passage in Justin shows two things

1. that the Abraham typology is a genuine *Catholic* theologumenon, and
2. that this theologumenon was of outstanding importance for the nascent Church that began to emancipate herself from the Jewish synagogue in which it was rooted. By using it to make herself the legitimate successor of God's people in the O.T. to which the old promise applied, she acquired the rich spiritual and literary heritage of Israel which she (unlike Marcion) did not want to do without. By holding to the O.T. heritage, she surely made it possible for many believers coming from the synagogue to keep to a large extent their previous identity. On the other hand, however, this was a clear rejection of the old Israel, which now would be considered to be repudiated by God («... so... it is not you») for as long as it kept to its old traditions or was not prepared to go the way offered by the Church. What is said by SCHOEPS in his book on Paul, 258, about the outline of Sacred History in Rom 9-11 applies to the Abraham typology as well, namely that here, too »in a quite arbitrary way and to the detriment of the Jewish people, Israel's history is typologized as prefiguring the nascent Church« (cf. especially SCHOEPS 247f).

The close doctrinal relationship between the Abraham typology in Gal 3,6-9 and Justin's statements quoted above tells us where we have to look for the editor of 6-9: in the same mental milieu of mid 2nd century to which also the Catholic Christian Justin belongs. Perhaps the remark of the radical theologian RASCHKE in his *Der Römerbrief des Markion nach Epiphanius*, 129, will be confirmed one

day: that we have to take into account the possibility that it was »a mind cast in the same mould as Justin's«, maybe even Justin himself who «out of the Gnostic [better: Marcionite] Paul produced the Catholic Paul of the Epistles «.

19. Gal 3,10-12

#33) 3,10-12

Μάθετε ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ

cor

πίστεως ζήσεται· ὅσοι γὰρ ὑπο

νόμον, ὑπο κατάραν εἰσιν· 12. Ὁ δὲ

ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά· ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦτα Ὁ δὲ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Contrary to HARNACK, VAN MANEN considers not only 11a, but 10b, too, to be Marcionite. Yet he thinks the quote from Dtn 27,26 had not been introduced with γέγραπται (corresponding to the quote from Hab 2,4 which wasn't introduced with γέγραπται either).

Surely, all attempts to reconstruct which include more than the Epiphanius quote (HILGENFELD, VOLKMAR, VAN MANEN) may be methodically justified in as far as they are based on the observation that Epiphanius often quotes the Marcionite text but partially. On the other hand, all concepts of a longer Marcionite text can't of course be but quite hypothetical. In my opinion, it is improbable to the highest degree that the Marcionite text –as thought VAN MANEN– should have contained two quotes from the OT (Hab 2,4 and Dtn 27,26) in *one and the same* verse (v.10). Best of all, one would side with HARNACK who for his reconstruction only used Epiphanius (but was prepared to follow Tertullian in not discarding v. 11a).

The Original Text

Of course, the question whether the Marcionite or the canonical text is the original one, gets different answers from the above mentioned scholars. While HARNACK, HILGENFELD and VOLKMAR share the traditional view and favour the canonical text, VAN MANEN tried to demonstrate that Marcion had kept the original text and that the canonical text be the work of a Catholic editor enlarging the Marcionite text. As one of his pieces of evidence he draws attention to the sentence 3, 10, which is introduced with μάθετε, and, concerning contents and form, is connected very well with the exposition that was interrupted in 3,5:

a) the *correspondence* of μάθειν and μάθετε κτλ. shows that 3,10 is the *immediate continuation* of the exposition started in 3,1-5 and interrupted by 6-9;

b) on the other hand it is comprehensible that the Catholic editor had to erase μάθετε κτλ., since the original coherence of thought had been destroyed by the inserted lines;

c) likewise comprehensible from the viewpoint of a Catholic editor is the reason why the canonical text in 3,10 is about those that live ἐξ ἔργων νόμου and the Marcionite passage, as given by Epiphanius, talks about those that are ὑπὸ νόμου. That Catholic editor by this modification wanted to mitigate the rigidity of the original ὑπὸ νόμου in 3,10a.

So, according to VAN MANEN, 473, »the development of the canonical text out of Marcion's ... can be explained quite well, the reverse not at all«.

Though VAN MANEN'S attempt to reconstruct the Marcionite text has to be evaluated critically –as shown above–, his arguments for the originality of the Marcionite or against the canonical text should be considered. In my opinion, there is *one* decisive argument in favour of the greater originality of the Marcionite text. Since already 3,6-9 has been found out to be a disrupting *addition* which interrupts an otherwise coherent context, the Marcionite text given by Epiphanius offers a much more sensible continuation of the line of thought as established in 3,1-5 than does the canonical text. This is true, as shown by VAN MANEN, for both contents and form (s. the correspondence of 3,2: τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν and μάθετε, 3,10).

HILGENFELD'S assumption, Marcion had in so doing (i.e. by modifying the original text) made an effort to construct a »tolerable connection with v.5« is at least correct in as far as the Marcionite text actually is coherent, whereas the canonical text of 3,1-10 in its present form, distorted by 6-9, is totally devoid of coherence —and for this very reason can hardly be original.

20. Gal 3,13

#34) 3,13

– γέγραπται

nlq

Marc 5.3.10; Epiph. Pan 42,11,8 (120,9)

Textual Evidence

Tertullian, Marc 5.3.10: »*Neque enim quia creator pronuntiavit: Maledictus omnis in ligno suspensus, ideo videbitur alterius dei esse Christus et idcirco a creatore iam tunc in lege maledictus*«. Pan 42.8.1 (103,26-28): διαστρέφων τὸ τοῦ ἀποστολοῦ ῥητόν, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρρα, καὶ φησιν· εἰ ἡμεν αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἂν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἡγόρασεν Pan 42.11.8 (120,9) = 42.12.3 (156,13): ἐπικατάρρατος πᾶς ο κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. — Megeth (Dial I,27): Παῦλος λέγει, Ὅτι Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασε' — Jerome on 3,13: »*Subrepat in hoc loco Marcion de potestate creatoris, quem sanguinarium, crudelem infamat et iudicem, asserens nos redemptos esse per Christum, qui alterius boni dei filius sit*«.

VAN MANEN, 473, has drawn attention to the remarkable fact that neither by Tertullian nor by Epiphanius the quote from the OT was introduced with γέγραπται. From this he rightly concluded that the term was absent in the Marcionite text — corresponding to the absence of the same word in Gal

3,10. Moreover, Tertullian's context shows that in Marcion's opinion, the statement *Maledictus omnis in ligno suspensus* was uttered by the Creator God (thought of little by Marcion) — and consequently was hardly considered to be taken from authoritative Scripture.

There is no way to decide which of the variants is the more original one, since both Marcion and some Catholic editor might have been tendentiously interested in either the erasure or the addition of γέγραπται.

21. Gal 3,14

#35) 3,14	ἐλάβομεν οὖν τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τῆς πίστεως > ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.	cor
Marc 5.3.11		
Cf. Clabeaux #8) App A:	εὐλογίαν for ἐπαγγελίαν	

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.3.11: »*Accepimus (oder: accipimus, M) igitur benedictionem spiritalem per fidem, inquit, ex qua scilicet vivit iustus, secundum creatorem*«.; εὐλογίαν instead of ἐπαγγελίαν is further given evidence by Ambst, s. NESTLE-ALAND to 3,24

Reconstructing the Marcionite Text,

most scholars rightly assume that Tertullian cites the Marcionite text accurately. HILGENFELD bemerkt, 441: »Surely, he did not omit either Abraham's benediction or the prophecy (ἐπαγγελία) on the coming of the Spirit accidentally, since he would not by any means have done without such weapons against the enemy of the patriarchs and the prophets. We can only assume that Marcion had really erased the topics mentioned (as in 3,6-9 the righteousness by faith and the benediction Abraham's) and consequently the complete verse had read: ἐλάβομεν οὖν τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τῆς πίστεως«. By the way, the absence Abraham's and consequently of the first half of 3,14 is confirmed (and the absence of 3,6-9) indirectly by the fact

that Tertullian has knowledge of *only one* mentioning of the OT archpatriarch by Marcion; s. the commentary to Gal 4,22, where, according to Tertullian V,4 Marcion through dropping his prey (= mentioning Abraham) had removed his mask and shown himself to be a thief.

The Question: Which is the Original Text?

is often much too rashly answered in favour of the canonical version. Thereagainst, the Dutch radical critic VAN MANEN has shown that quite a few arguments rather speak for the greater originality of the Marcionite variant VAN MANEN, in support of his thesis, points out that the exposition opened with μάθετε is succinctly brought to its end in the Marcionite text whereas the canonical text, with its twofold ἵνα and a sudden change from 3^d p. sing. γένηται to 1st p. plur. λάβωμων contains problems of style. According to VAN MANEN, though Marcion might have had a plausible reason to omit 14a because Abraham is mentioned there, and to change ἐπαγγελίαν into εὐλογίαν because of its OT reminiscence, but, why would he at the same time have changed ἵνα λάβωμων into ἐλάβομεν οὖν? And why did some orthodox referents (Ambst) keep reading εὐλογίαν instead of ἐπαγγελίαν? According to VAN MANEN, the same Catholic editor may be responsible for both the insertions 3,14 a and 3,6-9.

VAN MANEN'S argumentation for the greater originality of the Marcionite text is plausible. Apart from the stylistic problems, drawn attention to by VAN MANEN, it's above all an analysis of contents that shows that the first half of 3,14 can hardly have belonged to the the original text. The chain of proof that takes up the question of 3,5 (The Spirit supplied by the Law or by Faith?) ends with the statement that the Christian receives the gift of the Spirit through faith. A repeated linking of this idea with the topic of Abraham –which already in 3,6-9 interrupted the context–, seems put on. Up to then, the important thing was to prevent a return to the Law by emphasizing faith and not the Law as the condition sine qua non to receive the Spirit. Hence the linkage of this idea to the topic of Abraham is undoubtedly of secondary interest and obviously intended i.a. to produce a connexion to the now following digression on Abraham (3,15-3,25).

To these careful considerations of VAN MANEN'S, ZAHN, 500 writes: » D* G d g Ambst, too, have εὐλογίαν instead of ἐπαγγελίαν. This means that Marc. did not create this variant but had found it. Consequently, Van Manen's considerations S. 474 are unfounded.« Theoretically it's not impossible that Marcion had found the variant εὐλογίαν for ἐπαγγελίαν. Against it, in my opinion, is the fact that Marcion's variant shows a clear contrast to the

Catholic doctrine of the promise (based on the OT). The reason for the broad spreading of Marcionite variants in Latin manuscripts, recently observed by CLABEAUX as well, might be that this group of manuscripts was closer to the original Marcionite text than to the later Catholic one..

22. Gal 3,15-25

#36) 3,15-25
Marc 5.3.11

– 15-25

cor

Textual Evidence

Tertullian, Marc 5.3.11: »*Sed et cum adicit: Omnes enim filii estis fidei, ostenditur quid supra haeretica industria eraserit, mentionem scilicet Abrahae, qua nos apostolus filios Abrahae per fidem affirmat, secundum quam mentionem hic quoque filios fidei notavit*«.

Context of Marc 5.3.11

Discussing v. 26, Tertullian seems to defend the thesis that Marcion had dealt with it very carelessly, since otherwise he wouldn't have kept the $\nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, applied by Tertullian to the sons of Abraham, who are mentioned before. Tertullian, starting from the extant 3,26 combined with the absence of 3,15-25, thinks he now can draw the conclusion that the preceding passage had been a victim of Marcion's scissors or, i.o.w. of the *spongia Marcionis*. — On principle, Tertullian's methodical way is correct, as VAN MANEN noticed. Questionable though is, whether the premises his argument is based on are correct. That the »sons of faith« (v. 26) have to be applied to the »sons of Abraham's faith« is by no means self-evident to the degree Tertullian supposes it to be. Moreover, we have to take into account that there is no coherence of thought between 3,15-25 and 3,26, neither is there a »development« of thought (LIETZMANN, 241), but — as shown below — a discontinuity of form and content.

The Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text

is relatively easy. Without doubt, the Marcionite edition of Paul's epistles did not contain the passage.. HARNACK, 73*: »The longish exposition about the covenant, Abraham and the Law were absent«. As we have seen, the evidence is clearly provided by Tertullian who switches immediately over from 3,14 to

3,26 (s.above) and ironically refers to the *haeretica industria* which he blames for the omission of the passage 3,15-25. A little later, Tertullian comes back to it where he quotes verses 3,15-16 from his non-Marcionite edition of Galatians and exclaims (V,4): »Erubescat spongia Marcionis! Nisi quod es abundanti retracto quae abstulit, cum validius sit illum ex his revinci quae servavit«.

Which is the Original Text?

Though a majority of scholars agree with Tertullian that for the absence of 3,15-25 the *spongia Marcionis* be responsible, an accurate literary critical examination of the passage shows that all clues hint at a later interpolation of the Abraham-passage. The following arguments should be taken into account for a decision on the question, which one is the original text:

1. The context is disrupted between 3,25 and 26. *Form*, i.e. grammar, shows the gap 25-26 by the sudden change from 1st p. plural (»But now that faith has come, *we are* no longer under a custodian «) to the 2nd p. pl. (»for in Christ Jesus *you are* all sons of God, through faith«). A *difficulty of content*, so far hardly noticed, follows from the fact that being sons through faith (v. 26) not necessarily needs to be seen as contradictory to being *under a custodian* (s. B.BAUER, Gal 47, as well: »there is no interrelation, not a word about immature heirs before, no deduction, that only needed a finishing touch«). SCHLIER, 171, sees it as a dislocation of the metaphor: »One sees how the metaphor gets dislocated because of the topic. For it is precisely the sons who are under the pedagogue they are entrusted to by their fathers«. Some exegetes try to dissolve the tension by making the sons into »mature« sons (ALTHAUS, 31). Yet, nothing like that is in the text. On the contrary, the interrelation gets clearer by far, if, together with Marcion we read v.26 subsequent to v. 14, where the topic of receiving the Spirit through faith is dealt with. As shown by comparing with Rom 8,14, v. 14.26 is a genuine Pauline idea: those with faith are made into sons by *receiving the Spirit*.

2. The passage 3,15-25 contains a series of *particularities of language*:

Hapaxlegomena, terms and grammar constructions that occur only here:

ὄμως, v. 15, put in front (s. BL.-D. 450,2; SCHLIER, 143; JEREMIAS, ZNW 52, 1961, 127f), elsewhere only in the likewise interpolated passage I Cor 14,7;

κυροῦν, v.15, (= to make legally valid, to ratify) elsewhere only in II Cor 2,8, where, however, it is not used in this particular sense (= decide);

ἐπιδιατάσσεισθαι, v. 15, (= to add a clause to a testament, jur. *term. tech.* cf. O. EGER, ZNW 18, 1918, 92f.) hapaxlegomenon;

ἐρρέθησαν, v.16, aor. pass. of λέγω elsewhere only in the interpolated passage Rom 9,12 and 26;

προκυροῦν, v.17, (confirm before) and ἀκυροῦν v. 17, (to invalidate) only here (cf. Mt 15,6; Mk 7,13)

παράβασις, v. 19, (= transgression) elsewhere only in the interpolated passages Rom 2,23; 4,15; 5,14 (cf. I Tim 2,14; Hebr 2,2; 9,15).

χάρις + gen., v. 19, in a particular sense (= because of) elsewhere only Eph 3,1.14 (I Tim 5,14; Tit 1,5.11).

μεσίτης, v. 19.20, (= mediator) only here (cf. Tit 2,5; Hebr 8,6; 9,15; 12,24);

συγκλείειν, v.22.23, elsewhere only in the interpolated passage Rom 11,23;

φρουρεῖν, v. 23, elsewhere only in the interpolated passages II Cor 11,32 and Phil 4,7;

3. Between 3,15-25 and both the preceding and the subsequent text (apart from what has been discarded as an interpolation) there is a great *difference of style*. The author of 15-25 constructs his argumentation in a very diffuse way, a fact that caused great problems of how to interpret it; s. the relevant commentaries. In this context, LIETZMANN, 242, talks about Paul's »mental leaps« and draws attention to the missing connection of ideas between v. 15 und v. 16. Then again, in v.17, follows »another secondary idea – though one leading away from the following context – which appears in the construction of the sentence as the main idea and thusly makes it more difficult to grasp the development of the argument« (LIETZMANN 243). With v. 19 LIETZMANN, 244, feels compelled to either »assume a rather complicated thought, expressed in highly vague manner, as proved by the plethora of constrained attempts to explain it (SIEFFERT S. 209ff.) or an »error or a careless mistake by Paul«. In respect of content, too, v. 15ff., the so clumsily developed allegory appears to fail. Following LIETZMANN, SCHOEPS, 189, Ann. 5 remarks: »That this entire allegory, taken from rabbinic legal terminology, is misleading, because God has been made into a legator and the promise to Abraham into a legal testament, has already often been noticed«. As a whole, the entire argumentation in the passage 3,15-25 gives the impression of great clumsiness of style and thought, something we would hardly put in charge of the -where language is at stake- highly competent author of the letter, who, e.g. in the passage 3,1-14 of the original letter, gives proof of the fact that he writes in a brilliant style, and is able to argue in a clear and trenchant way.

4. Doctrinal Tensions

The passage 15-25 clearly shows a tendency to relativize or revoke the so trenchantly expressed exposition about justification through faith *alone* (10-14). The author of 15-25 tries to show that the *Law*, too, which in 10-14 was

only seen as a *curse* (3,10.13), were of some value in the History of Salvation.

In principle, this attempt to water down the original statements might have come from the author of 10-14. On the other hand, VAN MANEN, 476f, remarks that 15-25 cannot be seen by any criterion as only a supplementation or an explanation of 10-14, but that it rather *contradicts* that passage to some degree:

»First, without any reserve, the doctrine is that faith alone at all times is the basis of justification ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται«. Concerning the Law it said said: »ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται, v. 11 ... it's impossible to fulfill all its [the law's] commandments. Nevertheless, by its nature it has to demand absolute obedience from all those who want to live up to its commandments. It has to curse anybody who does not observe what it has stipulated, v.10. It can neither give nor lend life, except if what cannot be fulfilled be fulfilled, ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, v. 12. So, to be *under the Law* is to live under the curse v.10; whence we can rightly speak of the *curse of the Law*, from which Christ has redeemed us, Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρρας τοῦ νόμου, v. 13. — On the other hand, in 15-25 we learn, ... that faith had not been at all times the only basis of justification. Though not explicitly expressed, it is tacitly given to understand that before the appearance of faith, πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, v. 23, progress had been possible through the Law. It had the function of a pedagogue ... Though it could not offer mankind the best, *Life and righteousness*, εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη, v.21; it neither was a hostile power, but rather a kind helper, who, until the coming of Christ helped them to domesticate their desires and prevented them from transgressing, παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη, v.19«. According to VAN MANEN, we here once more hear the »Catholic editor pouring water into the pure wine, which was too strong in the opinion of many Jewish thinking people. He complies with their reservations as best he can. He annulates the crass contrast of Law and Faith which sees the former as a curse and the latter as a benediction«.

Whereas in VAN MANEN'S opinion, the doctrinal bias of the passage 15-25 were a *catholisizing one*, addressing Christians of Jewish origin, quite a few scholars think differently. Based on προσετέθη in Gal 3,19 ZAHN thought himself able to »sense a taste of Marcion's, or at least Valentine's doctrine« (cf. SCHLIER, 151, A. 4). Similarly, the idea of *Angels* as mediators of the Law, expressed in 19-20, is suspected by many exegetes to show a spiritual closeness to Gnosis and Marcionism. SCHOEPS, 190: »Admittedly this theory is not unknown elsewhere in the NT (Acts 7,38; Hebr 2,2). But the inferences, that were later taken from it in a Pauline spirit, are egregious: ... Simon Magus (Iren. adv. haer. I,23,3), then Cerinth (according to Pseudo-Dionysius), Cerdo and most blatantly Marcion simply put the Creator-God among the angels of Gal 3,19... As is generally known, one of these lawgiving angels was then identified by Marcion as *Jahwe*, the God of Israel, degraded to the status of a

demiurge«. While SCHOEPS obviously starts from the assumption that Paul's ideas might have affected Gnostics and Marcionites SCHLIER, 158, sees Paul himself already »on the way to a Gnostic understanding of the Law«. With a great many examples SCHLIER shows that there is a series of parallels to 19-20 in Gnosis. Eventually, the English O'NEILL, 52, goes even further than SCHLIER: in his opinion, Paul in that passage does not take up Gnostic ideas, but, on the contrary, lines 19.20 are a *Gloss*, inserted by an editor with a close affinity to Marcionism or Gnosis.

The scholars mentioned above mostly overlook that Gal 3,19-20, in spite of its quite obvious relationship with Gnosis or Marcionism, differs from them in one decisive point. Impossibly the sentence ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν, 3,20, which presupposes a clear declaration of adherence to (Jewish/Jewish-Christian/Catholic) *monotheism*, could have been spoken by a Gnostic or Marcionite. Yet, therewith the entire reasoning of 3,19-20, based on the presupposition that God is *one only*, is not possible in a gnostic/marcionite sense. All in all, we can draw the conclusion that VAN MANEN has quite rightly described the doctrinal bias in passage 15-25. The tendency is not — in spite of 19-20 — one of polemical intensified emphasis on the theses of 10-14, but of their attenuation and moderation.

Conclusion: for the reasons mentioned above, we can say that the question which is the original text, can definitely be answered in favour of the Marcionite text.

23. Gal 3,26

#37) 3,26	– θεοῦ	cor
Marc 5.3.11		
Cf. Clabeaux #9) App A (υἱοὶ ἐστε τῆς πίστεως > υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως)		
#38) 3,26	– διὰ	cor
Marc 5.3.11		
#39) 3,26	– ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ	cor
Marc 5.3.11 Clem Alex		

Textual Evidence

Tertullian V,3: »*Sed cum adicit: Omnes enim filii estis fidei, ostenditur quid supra haeretica industria eraserit, mentionem scilicet Abrahae, qua nos apostolus filios Abrahae per fidem affirmat, secundum quam mentionem hic quoque filios fidei notavit ..*«. (to the entire context s. the preceding note);

Hilarius, Hom. in Psalm 91, p. 345 of the Vienna edition; possibly Clemens Alex.: πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (s. below).

Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text:

Though the variant: πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε τῆς πίστεως is unambiguously testified by Tertullian as being Marcionite and is considered as such by the majority of critics, HARNACK, 51*, 73*, refuses to acknowledge the fact: he declares Tertullian's text to be »incorrect«: »... it is quite out of the question that Marcion should have modified the original text arbitrarily, for it is one of his main doctrines that we have become 'sons of the Good God' through faith. Why then would he have replaced it by 'sons of faith'? On the other hand, the variant can quite easily be explained as a slip of the pen (dittography) in Latin: 'filii fidei' instead of filii dei'; after that, of course, 'per fidem' got lost. Consequently, the text used by Tertullian was a Latin translation; this conclusion is inevitable«. HARNACK assumes πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως to be the Marcionite variant. — Against HARNACK, the reliability of the Marcionite text quoted by Tertullian need not be doubted at all, for the very fact alone that still in *the same* sentence (no more quoted by HARNACK, 73*) the expression *filii fidei* comes back (and cf. the following sentence: »et hic filios fidei«; HILGENFELD, 441)! Moreover, the explanation for Tertullian's error given by HARNACK (dittographie) is based on the contestable assumption, that Tertullian quote from a *Latin translation* of the Marcionite *Apostolus*. Though HARNACK'S question, for what doctrinal motive Marcion would have changed »sons of God« in »sons of faith« is a legitimate one, his conclusion, however, (since Marcion had no doctrinal reasons to change, *Tertullian must have quoted erroneously*) is not compelling, since it is not the only possible one. Even if Marcion had not modified the text — because, as nicely shown by HARNACK, he had no reasons for a correction —, Tertullian *need not necessarily have read him (Marcion) erroneously*, the more so as the repeated *filii fidei* shows, that he had read and understood him perfectly well. If so, we have to expect that the text was modified by the Catholic party (s. below). Consequently, one will have to side with the majority of critics and acknowledge πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε τῆς πίστεως to be the Marcionite text of 3,26. Finally, against HARNACK, there is the evidence in Hilarius and Clement of Alexandria. Both of them seem to unintentionally quote the Marcionite text, the former word for word, the latter in a way that there is an unmistakable reminiscence of the Marcionite text in his quote (the absence of the word θεοῦ).

In his search for the original version of the text of Galatians, O'NEILL, 54, comes very close to the Marcionite variant by erasing θεοῦ, τῆς and ἐν

Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: »I can see no reason why either θεοῦ or ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ would be omitted by Marcion or the other referents, but every reason why they would, almost inevitably, have been added to an original text which read πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως«. To be consistent, O'NEILL should have omitted διὰ, too, since Marcion had no more reason for its erasure than he had for the other parts. Thusly, O'NEILL stops halfway with his method of resolution.

Which is the Original Text?

After careful consideration, the Marcionite text given by Tertullian turns out to be the original one. As already shown in the preceding annotation, 3,26 is linked extremely well to (the likewise original) passage 10-14 in respect of *function* and *content*.

Cf. Van Manen, 480: »The argumentation [10-14] ended with the statement: 'therefore, we (redeemed from the curse of the Law by Christ) have received the blessing of the Spirit through faith.' The development of a new chain of thought, which at the same time has to secure the correctness of the last given statement, takes it up and starts with the affirmation: 'you are all (free from the curse of the Law and having received the blessing of the Spirit) sons of faith.'«

Moreover, VAN MANEN (as well as HARNACK, s. above) rightly asks the question why Marcion — provided the forgery of the text of the Pauline epistles was *his* work, as the majority of scholars suppose — should have changed the text in this place, since there is no (doctrinal) explanation for his doing so. That's why for VAN MANEN the conclusion is inevitable, that for this modification not Marcion, but the often mentioned Catholic editor is responsible. He felt uneasy about the sharp contrast of »sons of faith« and »sons of the Law« and therefore changed the former into »sons of God«, skilfully abrogating that way the antagonism –abhorred by Catholics- of νόμος and πίστις. — In my opinion, VAN MANEN'S arguments for the greater originality of the Marcionite text are convincing.

24. Gal 3,27-4,2

#40) 3,27-4,2 Marc 5.3.12 u. 5.4.1	– 3,27-28	nlq
#41) 3,27-4,2 Marc 5.3.12 u. 5.4.1	– 3,29-4,2	cor

#42) 3,27-4,2	[ἔτι] κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω· > οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς	cor
Marc 5.3.12 u. 5.4.1		

Textual Evidence

After quoting and commenting 3,26 (5.3.12), Tertullian follows up 5.4.1 with 4,2: »*Sub eadem Abrahae mentione, dum ipso sensu revincatur, Adhuc, inquit, secundum hominem dico; dum essemus parvuli, sub elementis mundi eramus positi, ad deservendum eis*«; in Marc 3.4 and 12 Tertullian quotes Gal 3,27: »*Quodsi Emmanuel Nobiscum deus est, deus autem nobiscum Christus est, qui etiam in nobis est (quotquot enim in Christum tincti estis, Christum induistis), tam proprius es Christus in significatione nominis, quod est Nobiscum deus, quam in sono nominis, quod est Emmanuel*«.

The Context of Marc 3.12.4

Starting point of the passage is the Emmanuel-prophecy of Isa. 7,14. According to Marcion, the OT place shows that the Christ prophesied by Isaiah, cannot be identical with the Christ whose arrival the Christians looked back on, since the latter had born another name and had never been engaged in warlike enterprises, either. Thereagainst Tertullian tries to show that in Hebrew the name Emmanuel meant »God with us« (*Nobiscum deus*); yet, since Christ, too, = »God with us« (*nobiscum Christus est, even in nobis* (follows a reference to Gal 3,27), Isaiah's OT Emmanuel needs must be a prophecy of (the NT) Christ. — Another interesting remark of Tertullian's is that even among the Marcionites there be Jews (invenies apud Hebraeos Christianos, immo et Marcionitas, Emmanuelem nominare, cum volunt dicere Nobiscum deus;)!

Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text

The Discussion (HARNACK, HAHN, HILGENFELD, VAN MANEN): Tertullian's quote (5.4.1) seems to show that there was a gap between 4,2 and 3,26 and that 4,2 immediately followed 3,26. Nevertheless HARNACK, 73* assumes: »for 27-29 ... there is no evidence, yet they'll hardly have been absent«; for ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, though, the argument seems not to be seen as valid; no more than HARNACK, 74*, wants to put up with the absence of 4,1-2: »1.2 ... are not testified to, but surely they were not missing and there was no reason for a correction «. In a remark he substantiates: »IV 1.2 cannot have been absent, since the Marcionite variant of v. 3 requires them«. Likewise

ZAHN, 500: » ετι κατα αυτωπον λεγω imperatively requires that already before, even immediately before, he had given an example or allegory, taken from natural human conditions, which is 4,1ff.« ZAHN thusly opposes HAHN (HILGENFELDT, Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1885, p. 442) and VAN MANEN, s. below. HILGENFELD, 442, too, notices that Tertullian skates over v.27.28, but at the same time he draws attention to the fact that Tertullian »had already (adv. M. III 17 [sic! but he probably meant 12]) dealt with« v. 27, and concludes that one »can assume the absence of v. 29 only because Tertullian, who had just reprimanded the omission of a mentio Abrahae, impossibly could have overlooked this one«. Subsequently, HILGENFELD opposes HAHN, 142, who doubted the presence of 4,1-2, too. In HILGENFELD'S opinion *adhuc* = ετι, quoted by Tertullian, imperatively presupposes the preceding verses, »because ετι refers to something preceding which was described in a figurative way only«, 442. — For the same reason as HILGENFELD'S, VAN MANEN, 481ff, thinks that v. 29 (reference to Abraham) did not occur in the Marcionite canon and was added by the same hand, that inserted the passage 15-25. — Against HILGENFELD, VAN MANEN gave an affirmative answer to the question asked by HAHN, whether 4,3 immediately followed 3,26. VAN MANEN in principle agrees with HILGENFELD in as far as indeed not everything that is not discussed by Tertullian needs must have been absent in Marcion (s. ALAND, *Text*, 180, too: »bewildered one sees in quite a few apparati critici Marcion mentioned as evidence, e.g. for an omission, for the only reason that Harnack does not mention evidence for the place in question«). Against HILGENFELD'S reference to *adhuc*, quoted by Tertullian, which »refers to something preceding «, namely 4,1-2, VAN MANEN has two objections: 1. *adhuc* need not be a quote, it might have ensued from the context of Marc 5.4.1; it neednot mean anything else but: »Moreover, he [Marcion] said«;⁷ 2.

⁷ ZAHN, 500, declares this to be an erroneous translation: » Manen' s desperate attempts to escape here are exhilarating. Ascribing to the powerful rhetor Tertullian the linguistic competence of a 1st grade grammar school pupil, Manen S. 482 verbatim declares, the words *adhuc* inquit may mean: still (i.e. he keeps on) he says (i.e. Marcion in his Apostolos) ‚I speak‘ etc. Those that might think this blooper a bit much are conciliated by the remark that, if *adhuc* (ετι) actually belonged to Mrc. “text of the apostle, it referred to the ‘sons of faith’ in 3,26”; this were a ‚figurative‘ expression

yet, should Tertullian have read it nevertheless, it does not necessarily refer to 4,1-2, but might just as well to 3,26 and the υἱοὶ τῆς πίστεως there mentioned, who were to be seen not less figuratively than the κληρονόμος ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους.

In VAN MANEN'S opinion, 27-29, too, is supposed to have been absent in Marcion. He does not see HILGENFELD'S reference to Marc 3.12 as evidential, since in this place Tertullian might be quoting from the Catholic edition of the Pauline epistles. Moreover, 3,29 contained the typical doctrine of the Catholic editor. The mention of κληρονόμος, referring back to — the undisputably interpolated — v. 3,29, be another argument against the originality of 4,1. Concerning 3,27-28, the reference to baptism in 3,27 be a much better substantiation for the υἱοὶ θεοῦ than for the υἱοὶ τῆς πίστεως. »The latter have not become so because they were baptized and had put on Christ, but because they, redeemed from the Law by Christ, had received the blessing of the Spirit from God; s. 3,13.14; 4,5.6«, 483.

Gal 3, 29: A survey of the discussion on passage 3,27-4,2 shows that an overall consensus is limited to v. 29: al scholars acknowledge that because of the mention of Abraham (cf. Tertullian V,4), this verse cannot have occurred in the Marcionite Apostolikon. There can indeed be no doubt that this verse was missing in the Marcionite version of the epistle to the Galatians. This insight is something like an »Archimedian crucial point« which will help us – as can be seen below– solve the problem of the existence of 4,1-2 in the Marcionite text .

just like the one in 4,1f. As if *κατα* *ανθρωπον* meant 'figurative' or as if 'sons of faith' were a concept taken from natural human conditions!«

- 1) For the use of *adhuc* as »moreover « or »in addition«, there are a lot of instances in Latin (s. Georges, Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch, 14. Aufl. Bd. I. 119.) — 2) The statement that ἔτι »refers to something preceding expressed figuratively«, is not VAN MANEN'S, but HILGENFELDT'S. 3) »sons of faith« can just as well be interpreted as »an expression taken from natural human conditions« as the figure: μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργὴν used *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* in Rom 3,5. By the way, form and atmosphere of ZAHN'S »refutation« may then speak for themselves.

Was 3,27-28 extant in the Marcionite Text? Against HAHN's and VAN MANEN's erasure of 27-28, v. 27 is quoted in Tertullian's Marc 3.1.2,4. There is reasonable doubt, however, whether the quote is actually taken from the Marcionite text, since Tertullian here has not yet engaged in the controversy with Marcion (=> in Marc 4.6.) about the correct interpretation of the Pauline letters (and the Gospel). Not until then the basic assumption will be that he is going to defeat Marcion with the latter's own weapons, i.e. with *his own* texts of the Pauline epistles (or of the Gospel) (Marc 4.6). Because there is no textual evidence, the question can be settled only by *literary-critical* means. Such a critical investigation shows that 27-28 and 3,26 are but extremely loosely connected. The entire thought has »only an external and accidental connection with those of the context«, and one does not really understand, »how Paul comes to it here«; see as well VAN MANEN's reasoning, who took 27-28 for an explication of (editorial) υἱοὶ θεοῦ. Concerning contents, 27-28 shows, as has often been noticed, unmistakable reminiscence of Rom und I Cor: v. 27 »straight out seems to be composed out of 2 verses of the epistle to the Romans «, namely Rom 6,3 (ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν = ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε) and Rom 13,14 (ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν), STECK 62; likewise v. 28 has a manifest reminiscence of I Cor 12,13 (καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι) —the three places were extant in Marcion, too. Taking together both observations, all this might be an argument for 27-28 not being extant in the original (= Marcionite) text but instead being an enlargement by a later editor (orientated towards Rom 6,3, Rom 13,14 and I Cor 13,12). Admittedly, the possibility of 27-28 occurring nevertheless in the Marcionite apostolicon (because of Tertullian Marc 3.12) cannot be excluded completely.

Was 4,1-2 extant in the Marcionite Text? That 4,1 is connected to the κληρονόμοι of v. 3,29 (missing in Marcion, s. above) by the keyword κληρονόμος, might be considered as a first indication that 4,1 (and the connected verse 4,2), too, were missing in the Marcionite text of the letter to the Galatians. Not only are lines 4,1-2 dispensable for an understanding of 4,3ff (against HILGENFELD); quite a few contradictions and problems of coherence caused by 4,1-2 now preceding 4,3ff, even disappear:

Often e.g. the fact remains unnoticed that lines 4,1.2 differ from 4,3 ff *in contents* and that the idea developed in 4,1-2 changes to a considerable degree from 4,3.4 on. While in 4,1-2 the entire chain of thought is determined by the concepts of the κληρονόμος and the contrast: *immature* — *mature*, from 4,3 on the central thought is quite a different one: now it's no longer about the *heir*,

but now the focus is on the subjection of humankind under the power of the elements and its liberation by Christ; the resulting contrast is not: *immature* — *mature*, but *slave* — *son* (by receiving the quality of being son). The decisive *difference* —already drawn attention to by B. BAUER, 48,— between those two chains of thought is— above all

- that in 4,1-2 »the heirs are acknowledged to be children even while still minors«, whereas in 4,3ff they only *become children* and receive the quality of being children through Christ.⁸

Another point of difference is

- that the heir as a child only has the *appearance* of a slave in Gal 4,1-2, while the *υἱπιοι*, of 4,3, *are* in fact slaves.

O'NEILL, 56, too, draws attention to this difference — obviously following BAUER,: »In verses 1-3 [O'NEILL considers 4,1-2 and v. 3 — wrongly — as

⁸ Looking at the context, Bauer rightly remarks: „... there is no coherence, nothing had been said about minors as heirs; no deduction before to bring into focus... We won't ask him [the compiler] to deal with the fact —but rather forget it as he does- that up to here being child as a *benefit* was opposed to the subordinate status that preceded faith— i.e. we'll allow him to pretend and think as if up to here, too, the antagonism had only been about a *different value of the children*. We will further forgive, that the metaphor of the heir, who as a minor is under a custodian, is quite inappropriate, since God is the Father who does not pass away. Finally though, the compiler gets confused and gives himself away to a degree that we can't help him any more and his work crashes entirely. Whereas namely this new deduction begins *presupposing* the heirs, even when still minors, to be children, at the end of the argument (v.5 – 7), they only *become* children and *receive* the status of being children through Christ.“ And when at the end of this deduction they become *children*, *receive* that status, the antagonism of maturity and minority is no longer thought of, — what's even more: their elevation to the status of *heirs* in v.7 is said to be but an aftereffect of the elevation to their new status as children. In short, the conclusion of this deduction denies its introduction, doesn't know anything about it and the entire thing has long ago decomposed while the compiler still believes himself to be fully coherent. His confusion even grows to a degree that, the very moment he has declared the status of children (v.5) to be a present, he declares this *present* (v.6), which moreover he describes in changing unclear ways, to be the *necessary aftereffect* of the fact that the receivers of the present *be children from the outset*.“

belonging together; but this can be dispensed with here] the heir is held in subjection while he is a minor and is little different from a slave although lord of all. On the appointed day he becomes free. In verses 4-7 a slave is ransomed and adopted as a son. He is really a slave, not as good as a slave, because verse 7 explicitly states that only after adoption does he become heir. In verses 1-3 the enslaved man was always heir, despite his bondage«. — To illustrate:

*As long as the heir
is a child,
he is no better than a slave
until the date set by the father.*

*As long as we
were children,
we were slaves of the elements
until our adoption as sons.*

All this said, it has become clear that verses 4,1-2 cannot belong to the following passage 4,3ff and therefore will certainly not have been part of the Marcionite version, in which 3,29 was missing anyway. The entire passage 4,1-2 obviously seems not to have had any other function than to introduce 4,3ff, rather badly used by the editor to lead from his starting-point, the keyword κληρονόμοι in 3,29, to 4,3. He overlooked the fact that his expositions, intended to lead to 4,3ff, were hardly compatible with the metaphor used there and in principle belonged to a completely different context. By the inserted οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς a context is but very forcibly established — and it misses the mark i.a. because after such an introduction, a reader generally expects not another allegory but its *explanation* or *application*.

25. Gal 4,4

#43) Gal 4,4	– γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον	cor
Marc 5.4.2		

Textual Evidence

Tertullian 5.4.2: »*Cum autem evenit impleri tempus misit deus filium suum*«.

The Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text

is relatively simple for Gal 4,4. There is a consensus of all scholars that the words γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον were missing in

Marcion's edition. The fact is unambiguously confirmed by Tertullian. He surely would not have omitted the words that showed Christ's *genuine human nature* to be true and that therefore could be used as an excellent argument against Marcion's docetism, *if* then he had found them in Marcion. HILGENFELD, 442: »This omission allows us to draw with absolute certainty the conclusion that those words were missing in Marcion«. — More difficult than the question for the content of the Marcionite text is the question:

Which of the two Texts is the Original one?

A great majority of scholars generally contented themselves in this context with a reference to Marcion's *docetism* and *antinomism*. Marcion was a docetist, consequently it was in *his* interest to shorten the Catholic text and to delete the being born of woman and likewise Christ being under the Law, which to him as an antinomist wasn't convenient either. That it might have been in the equally great interest of a 2nd century Catholic Christian to »catholize« controversial and disputed Paul by modifications of texts and doctrinal additions or corrections and in so doing to take him away from the grasp of the detested heretics, was generally completely left out of consideration. Not so, however, VAN MANEN, who –as we have seen time and again– in his thoroughgoing work on Marcion's Galatians, made quite a number of observations that give good reasons for a revision of the conventional opinion. According to VAN MANEN, the following speak for Marcion as the one having conserved the original text:

1) the *doctrinal* aspect of these statements which by no means intended to accidentally mention some historical facts, but were used to refute two widely spread opinions: 1. that Jesus had not *really* been a human being 2. that he had not been under the Law as a Jew by birth. Since –so VAN MANEN– one can hardly assume Paul having fought heresies — e.g. docetism — which came up only much later, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός needs must have been inserted later, and at that by a 2nd century Catholic editor;

2) for reasons of content it is, according to VAN MANEN, equally hardly possible that *after* 3,10–14 the author still could have considered Christ as γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, for: »There he had stated: *to be under the Law is to be under the curse*, v.10; Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law by becoming a curse for us which did not occur by his being born under the Law but by hanging from a tree, v.15 [sic! but here v.14 will have been intended] I.o.w., Christ, when dying on the cross, was not under the Law. Had he then still been under the Law, he –already under the curse or cursed himself before becoming a curse on the cross– wouldn't have been able to redeem others

from the curse of the Law«. Finally, according to VAN MANEN, the editor gives himself away

3) by the form of his statement. Already Theodoretos remarked to 4,4: οὐκ εἶπεν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν γένεσθαι ἐκ γυναικός, ἀλλὰ· γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός ἀπέστειλεν. Referring to the aorist of γενόμενον, VAN MANEN asks to the point: »Was Christ then there, in heaven, ‘born of woman, born under the law’? That’s how it reads there,..«.. And that’s why for VAN MANEN, the form is explicable only if one assumes it to be a later insertion.

Among VAN MANEN’S observations, especially the last one mentioned is worth to be taken into account, since 1) — because of today’s general early dating of Gnosis —, and 2) — because of the problems with Pauline Christology and with his interpretation of the Law — will hardly be acknowledged generally. 3), on the other hand, clearly shows how the later interpolater gives himself away by a clumsy construction in respect of language: by the addition of γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον (participle aor.; added for practical reasons with the intention of doctrinal clarification), he gives the impression (surely not intended) as if Christ had been born *before* he was sent on his mission by God. One can keep to this nonsense if, a priori excluding the possibility of an interpolation, one states against grammar rule, »that *part. aor.* does not here designate occurrences that precede the main action but concomitant ones, follows from the meaning of ἐξαπέστειλεν, which forbids to understand it as a mission or task given only after the entrance into the world and the subordination under the Law « (RIENECKER, 201).

26. Gal 4,6

#44) Gal 4,6 Marc 5.4.4	ἐσμεν > ἐστε	incor
#45) Gal 4,6	ἀπέστειλεν > ἐξαπεστειλεν	nlq
#46) Gal 4,6 Marc 5.4.4; B, 1739 sa	– ὁ θεος	cor
#47) Gal 4,6 Marc 5.4.4, P 46	– τοῦ υἱοῦ	cor

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.4: »Itaque ut certum esset nos filios dei esse, misit spiritum suum in corda nostra, clamantem: Abba pater«.

Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text

HILGENFELD and HARNACK doubted whether Tertullian in this place quoted the Marcionite text correctly; HARNACK, 74*: »obviously at the beginning quoting in a free way«; accordingly HARNACK reconstructs: ὅτε (?) δὲ ἔστε υἱοὶ, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον· αββα ὁ πατήρ. Concerning the absent τοῦ υἱοῦ HILGENFELD, says 442: » in v. 6 Tertullian omits τοῦ υἱοῦ: and it will be difficult to decide whether he just shortens the quote or whether these words were really absent«. — For the first part of the quote (*Itaque ut certum esset nos filios dei esse*), one will certainly have to assume a less accurate way of quoting. Questionable however is whether this assumption is valid for the second part as well, and, if so, whether Marcion in agreement with the Catholic text read ὁ θεὸς and τοῦ υἱοῦ. We have to take into account that ὁ θεὸς, missing in Marcion, is absent in *Vaticanus*, in 1739, and in the Sahidic translation as well. Additionally, VAN MANEN draws attention to the fact that the idea of the *Spirit of the Son of God* (i.e. not of God himself) is unique in Galatians; VAN MANEN refers to 3,2.5.14; 5,18.22.25 and asks, 486: »Does it make sense that God first sends his Son and then the Spirit of his Son?«. — Since in my opinion the references mentioned give no proof we'll not see VAN MANEN'S hint as a decisive argument. We might, however, take into account Rom 8,14, too, where the quality of being son is closely connected to receiving the *Spirit of God* (»For all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God «), but in Romans, too, there is the identification: God's Spirit = Christ's Spirit (8,9). — All in all, based on the textual evidence I'm inclined to assume that the Marcionite text did neither contain ὁ θεὸς nor τοῦ υἱοῦ. In my opinion, in 3,6 there is no evidence to be found for the Marcionite text to be more original than the Catholic version.

27. Gal 4,7

#48) Gal 4,7

– ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος ἀλλὰ υἱός· cor
εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ.

Textual Evidence

4,7 is not quoted in any place, be it by Tertullian or another referent to the Marcionite text.

Reconstruction of the Marcionite Text

Though HARNACK, 75*, notices that there is no evidence for v. 7 he presupposes –without substantiation– its presence in the Marcionite version: »will not have been missing«. Anybody wishing to get more than just assumptions has to decide according to criteria of *textual criticism*. Its results are the following:

1. Contrary to the preceding verse, the author of 4,7 no longer uses 2nd pers. plur. (Ὅτι δὲ ἐστε υἱοί), but 2nd p. sing. (εἶ); cf. VAN MANEN 486. SCHLIER, 199, too, notices: »Surprisingly, the conclusion is again expressed in 2nd p. sing....« According to SCHLIER, by this the conclusion gets »more personal importance. The matter is of great concern to everybody individually«. Taking into account criteria of textual criticism, one will, however, get at conclusions quite different from SCHLIER'S.

2. There is a close connection with passage 4, 1-2, identified above as the work of an editor (and with the *Abraham*-passages, 3,6-9. 15-25, that concerning contents have a strong affinity to the κληρονόμος-topic and are secondary interpolations as well); cf. VAN MANEN 486.

Those two observations necessarily result in 4,7, too, being an editorial interpolation. Obviously in this place, the editor intends to connect 4,3-6 with 4,1-2 and consequently with his favourite topic, the κληρονόμος -question.

28. Gal 4,8

#49) Gal 4,8	Εἰ οὖν τοῖς τῆ φύσει οὔσιν θεοῖς δουλεύετε > ἀλλὰ τότε μὲν οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὔσιν θεοῖς·	cor
Marc 5.4.5		
Cf. Clabeaux, #4), App B (– θεοῖς ἐδουλεύσατε)		

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.5: »*Post has itaque divitias non erat revertendum ad infirma et mendica elementa. Elementa autem apud Romanos quoque etiam primae litterae solent dici. Non ergo per mundialium elementorum derogationem a deo eorum avertere cupiebat, etsi dicendo supra, Si ergo his qui non natura sunt dei servitis, physicae, id est naturalis, superstitionis elementa pro deo habentis suggillabat errorem, nec sic tamen elementorum deum taxans*«.

The Context of the Quote in Tertullian

Against Marcion, Tertullian first had brought together Gal 4,7: *misit spiritum suum in corda nostra, clamantem: Abba pater*, with the OT prophecy of the Spirit by the prophet Joel 2,28, in order to demonstrate that for Paul, too, the God of the OT (the Marcionite demiurge) is identical with the one of the New Covenant. »Now, from whom comes this grace, «he asks,» but from Him who proclaimed the *promise* thereof? Who is (our) Father, but He who is also our Maker? *Cuius gratia, nisi cuius et promissio gratiae? Quis pater, nisi qui et factor?*« — Therefore, after such affluence (of grace of the NT), Tertullian goes on, they should not have returned to weak and beggarly elements: *Post has itaque divitias non erat revertendum ad infirma et mendica elementa*. To understand the term *elementa* as here used, Tertullian reminds of the usage in Latin, where *elementa* can stand for *primae litterae*, i.e. for the rudiments of learning: *elementa autem apud Romanos quoque etiam primae litterae solent dici*. Later then he — and even some of our modern exegetes — correspondingly applies this to the *Jewish Religion of the Law* being the *elementary basis* of the New Covenant. He thus opposes explicitly the Marcionite interpretation of this place, as shown by the following sentence: Obviously, the Marcionites had asserted that the term ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα had been chosen by Paul as a *disparaging way of designating* creation or the power of the Creator-God to be στοιχεῖα with the only intention to turn humanity away from the God of these elements: *Non ergo per mundialium elementorum derogationem a deo eorum avertere cupiebat*. This means, the Marcionites had not interpreted the Galatians' turning to the στοιχεῖα — as did Tertullian — as a return to the origins of Jewish observance of the Law, but as a return to the detested Creator-God and his powers. Tertullian concedes some plausibility for this opinion, since “the apostle had said just before: Howbeit, then, ye serve them which *by nature are no gods*, he censured the error of that physical or natural superstition which holds the elements to be god; but at the *God of those elements* [the Creator-God] he aimed not in this censure.: *etsi dicendo supra, Si ergo his qui natura sunt dei*

servitis, physicae, id est naturalis, superstitionis elementa pro deo habentis suggillabat errorem, nec sic tamen elementorum deum taxans.

Reconstruction

HARNACK reconstructs: »Εἰ οὖν (γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ), τοῖς τῆ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς δουλεύετε, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; (beginning not certain, the end not explicitly evidenced)«. — Though there further is evidence for *his qui non natura sunt dei* as v.l., HARNACK's conclusion is correct. Most probably τοῖς φύσει οὖσιν θεοῖς was in the Marcionite text (against HILGENFELD, 442, VAN MANEN, 486). While the existence of other gods is implicitly presupposed in the Marcionite text, the Catholic editor apparently intends to exclude this entirely.

COUCHOUD, 17f, about the Catholic editor: „In respect of doctrine he is a monotheist of the Jewish variety and in strict opposition to Marcion's theses, that distinguish the Creator-God from the Stranger-God. He asserts that the Creator-God, the God of the OT, the God of the Christians is one and the same God and that there is no other one in the entire universe.

Admittedly, he has overlooked –maybe negligently– some places, as there are: *2 Cor.* IV, 4: ‚the god of this world‘, who is another god than God, and *1 Cor.* VIII, 5: ‚as indeed there are many gods‘. But he does not bear Paul to say to the Galatians (IV, 8): ‚if you are in bondage to the gods that are in nature, τοῖς ἐν τῆ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς‘. He corrects: ‚Formerly you were in bondage to gods that by nature are no gods, τοῖς φύσει [18] μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς‘, a very awkward trick where φύσει is almost bare of meaning.“⁹

When searching for the *original text*, the greater clarity and precision of the Marcionite text attracts attention. Because of ἀλλὰ at the beginning of the sentence, the Catholic text is more difficult to understand, for it is not quite clear what ἀλλὰ refers to. SCHLIER, 201, applies it »to διὰ θεοῦ, put at the end for emphasis: ‚But then you did not know *God*‘«. There is, however, a much simpler and less forcible explanation for this peculiar ἀλλὰ, if one assumes that we have here an interpolation of an editor looking back at his own insertion of

⁹ PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD: *The First Edition of the Paulina*, 1930. (= *La première édition de Saint Paul*) – translated by Frans-Joris Fabri, www.radikalkritik.de

v. 7 and wanting to avoid a repetition of εἰ δὲ. The conclusion then would be that in this place, too, the Marcionite variant be the more original one.

29. Gal 4,10

#50) Gal 4,10	+ καὶ σάββατά, ὡς οἶμαι, καὶ δεῖπνα καθαρὰ καὶ νηστείας καὶ ἡμέρας μεγάλας	nlq
Marc 5.4.6		

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.6: »*Sed quae velit intellegi elementa, primas scilicet litteras legis, ipse declarat. Dies observatis et menses et tempora et annos, et sabbata ut opinor et coenas puras et ieiunia et dies magnos. Cessare enim ab his quoque, sicut et circumcissione, oportebat ex decretis creatoris, qui et per Esaiam, Neomenias vestras et sabbata et diem magnum non sustinebo, ieiunium et ferias et cerimonias vestras odit anima mea; et per Amos, Odi, reieci cerimonias vestras, et non odorabor in frequentis vestris; item per Osee, Avertam universas iocunditates eius et cerimonias eius et sabbata et neomenias eius et omnes frequentias eius*«.

Reconstruction

The phrase introduced by Tertullian with *et sabbata*, is -by a majority of scholars- seen as an addition of Tertullian's. The inserted *ut opinor* might indeed suggest this. Against this, VAN MANEN, 487, following RÖNSCH, 445, tried to show that we here have the wording of the Marcionite version of Galatians. As pieces of evidence, he mentions the emphasized *ipse declarat* and the fact that Tertullian eagerly uses references to Isa. 1,14; Amos 5,21 and Hos 2,11 to prove that not only Marcion's God, but the God of the OT, too, condemned the observance of the special religious dates. The argument is plausible and — if correct — would be another piece of circumstantial evidence for the Marcionite text to be older than the Catholic version. It will hardly be assumed that it was Marcion who enlarged the text, since there are no reasons for his doing so. One may assume, though, that a Catholic editor shortened the text, because he was disgusted by the polemics it contained against the Sabbath and other Jewish dates.

30. Gal 4,23

#51) Gal 4,23 Marc 5.4.8 Clabeaux #10) App A	– μὲν	cor
#52) Gal 4,23 Harnack	+ τῆς	cor

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.8: »*sed qui ex ancilla carnaliter natus est, qui vero ex libera per repromissionem*«. Moreover: p⁴⁶ B f vg Pel.

CLABEAUX has the variant without μὲν in his list of *secure pre-Marcionite readings* and rightly marks it *correct*: »The word μὲν should be stricken from this verse in any modern edition of the Greek New Testament. The reading without is the *lectio difficilior (sed non sine sensu)*. The lack of μὲν presents a striking *asyndeton*, especially since δέ is present in the second half of the verse. A *horror asyndeti* would be the motive for the addition of μὲν« (86). Before CLABEAUX, VAN MANEN in his reconstruction of the original text of Galatians had already deleted μὲν as not belonging to it, VAN MANEN, 488, 531.

31. Gal 4,25-30

#53) Gal 4,24	+ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κατὰ [τὸν] νόμον γεννώσα εἰς δουλείαν, μιὰ δὲ ὑπεράνω πάσης αρχῆς γεννώσα, [καὶ] δυνάμεως, [καὶ] ἐξουσίας καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι· ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν· > εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἀγάρ.	cor
Marc 5.4.8 Epiph Schol 2 Orig in Jerome on 4,24 cf. Clabeaux #11) App B + Eph 1,21		
#54) Gal 4,25-30	– 25-30 (except ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν·V.26)	cor

Marc 5.4.8 Epiph Schol 2 Orig in Jerome on 4,24
cf. Clabeaux #12) App A (*do not add, V. 26*)

Textual Evidence

Tertullian, 5.4.8: »*Sed ut furibus solet aliquid excidere de praeda in indicium, ita credo et Marcionem novissimam Abrahae mentionem dereliquisse, nulla magis auferenda, etsi ex parte convertit. Si enim Abraham duos liberos habuit, unum ex ancilla et alium ex libera, sed qui ex ancilla carnaliter natus est, qui vero ex libera per repromissionem: quae sunt allegorica, id est aliud portendentia: haec sunt enim duo testamenta, sive duae ostensiones, sicut invenimus interpretatum, unum a monte Sina in synagogam Iudaeorum secundum legem generans in servitutem, aliud super omnem principatum generans, vim, dominationem, et omne nomen quod nominatur, non tantum in hoc aevo sed in futuro, quae est mater nostra, in quam repromisimus sanctam ecclesiam; ideoque adicit, Propter quod, fratres, non sumus ancillae filii sed liberae, utique manifestavit et Christianismi generositatem in filio Abrahae ex libera nato allegoriae habere sacramentum, sicut et Iudaismi servitutem legalem in filio ancillae, atque ita eius dei esse utramque dispositionem apud quem invenimus utriusque dispositionis delineationem*«. Epiphanius, Schol 2; ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δια τῆς ἐπαγγελίας; Origenes in Jerome on 4,24: »*Marcion (et Manichaeus) hunc locum, in quo dixit apostolus 'Quae sunt allegorica' et cetera quae secuntur, de codice suo tollere noluerunt, putantes adversus nos relinqui, quod scilicet lex aliter sit intelligenda, quam scripta sit*«.

CLABEAUX, 3: Ephrem Syrus, Commentarii in Epistolas d. Pauli; cf. ZAHN, Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater, 298.

Harnack's Attempt at Reconstruction

In his reconstruction of the Marcionite text HARNACK 76* first follows the version given by Tertullian and translates:

24 ἄτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα·
αὗται γάρ εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐπιδείξεις,
(ἐνδείξεις), μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους
Σινᾶ, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν
Ἰουδαίων κατὰ τὸν νόμον γεννωσα

*quae sunt allegorica, [id est aliud
portendentia:] haec sunt enim duo
testamenta, [sive duae
ostensiones, sicut invenimus
interpretatum,] unum a monte*

εἰς δουλεία,

*Sina in synagogam Iudaeorum
secundum legem generans in
servitute,*

26 ἄλλη δὲ ὑπεράνω πάσης αρχῆς
γεννώσα, καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ
ἐξουσίας καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος
ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ
αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ
μέλλοντι εἰς ἣν (ἄν?)
ἐπηγγειλάμεθα ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν,
ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν.

*aliud super omnem principatum
generans, vim, dominationem, et
omne nomen quod nominatur, non
tantum in hoc aevo sed in futuro,
quae est mater nostra, in quam
repromisimus sanctam ecclesiam;*

Yet, HARNACK is sceptical about the wording of the Marcionite text as given by Tertullian; his scepticism particularly arises from the passage in which there seems to be a quote of Eph 1,21; since according to HARNACK, Marcion nowhere else had taken the liberty »of such a modification of the text with a transfer of a place in one letter to another one (Ephes. 1,21),« HARNACK cannot »free himself from the suspicion..., that the ... text given as in Tert. after all is not to be ascribed to M. himself«. HILGENFELD, too, thinks that v. 24 in Marcion did not read differently from our canonical text. Especially εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων were nothing but an explanatory comment of Tertullian's.

Van Manen's Attempt at Reconstruction

Like HILGENFELD and HARNACK, VAN MANEN, 489ff, states that the phrases *id est aliud portenda* and consequently *sive duae ostensiones, sicut invenimus interpretatum* -connected with the former- are Tertullian's. Contrary to HARNACK, however, VAN MANEN considers *in quam repromisimus sanctam ecclesiam* to be an addition by Tertullian as well. Concerning the wording of the other citations from Marcion's text by Tertullian, especially the quote from Ephesians, VAN MANEN thinks that HARNACK's and HILGENFELD's skepticism against the Marcionite text as given by Tertullian be groundless. VAN MANEN points out that as a rule, Tertullian's comments and explanations are indicated as such. Thusly, in VAN MANEN's opinion, the Marcionite text immediately after Σινῶ in agreement with the quote in Tertullian read εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κτλ..

ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὐταὶ γάρ
εἰσιν δύο διαθήκαι, μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους

*quae sunt allegorica, [id est aliud
portendentia:] haec sunt enim*

Σινᾶ, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν
 Ἰουδαίων κατὰ νόμον εἰς δουλείαν
 γεννώσα,
 μιὰ δὲ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δυναστείαν
 (δύναμιν, κυριότητα καὶ πᾶν ὄνομα
 ὀνομαζομένου, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι
 τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι)
 γεννώσα, ἣτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν·

*duo testamenta, [sive duae
 ostensiones, sicut invenimus
 interpretatum,]
 unum a monte Sina in synagoga
 Iudaeorum secundum legem
 generans in servitutum, aliud
 super omnem principatum
 generans, vim,*

*dominationem, et omne nomen
 quod nominatur, non tantum in
 hoc aevo sed in futuro, quae est
 mater nostra, [in quam
 repromisimus sanctam
 ecclesiam;]*

Presumptive Wording

In my opinion, HARNACK's translation — in addition to his sticking to *in quam repromisimus sanctam ecclesiam*, which surely is an addition or a comment of Tertullian's — is not convincing in the following places:

1. Instead of translating *testamenta* by ἐπιδείξεις or ἐμδείξεις (s. Rom 3,25; Phl 1,28), the term διαθήκαι, better corresponding to the NT linguistic usage, should have been used (cf. Rom. 9:4; 11:27; I Cor 11:25; II Cor 3,6.14; Gal. 3,15.17; Eph. 2:12 Heb. 7:22; 8,6 etc.)¹⁰.

¹⁰ HARNACK has explained his argument in great detail, 52f*: Marcion had altered the text, „because he didn't want to allow two Covenants being mentioned here, as if there be a formal relationship between the acts of the Creator-God and those of the Good God, (in Luk. 22,20, too, M. erased the word ‚new' with ‚Covenant' because he did not know two Covenants), but only two ‚verifications'“. HARNACK's explanation is attractive. But, – independent of the question whether it was Marcion or the Catholic editor who changed the text – we have to draw attention to II Cor 3,6: καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος, where Marcion's version, even according to HARNACK, is identical with the Catholic one. Should we not here as well – if we accept HARNACK'S argument – expect a modification or an erasure (likewise II Cor 3,14)? On the other hand, it's a striking feature that an accumulation of the διαθήκης–notion occurs in the very passages which in our view belong to a Catholic edition: Rom 9,4; 11,27; Gal 3,15.17; probably I Cor 11,25 as well (Eph 2,12 is a particularly difficult problem). All in all, it's quite difficult here to arrive at a conclusion.

2. Instead of ἄλλη δὲ (in HARNACK's numeration v. 26) μιὰ δὲ should have been chosen to get a correct connection with μία μὲν of the first half of the phrase.

VAN MANEN's translation, in my opinion, is not quite correct in the following places: 1. He does not keep the order of words of *secundum legem generans in servitute*: instead of κατὰ [τόν] νόμον γεννώσα εἰς δουλείαν VAN MANEN translates κατὰ νόμον εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα. The question, whether before νόμον there was a definite article (HARNACK) or whether there was not (VAN MANEN), can, in my opinion, not be settled, since Latin has no definite articles. — Likewise the order of words in *aliud super omnem principatum generans* should have been kept: s. correctly HARNACK. — Whether in the Greek translation of *super omnem principatum generans, vim, dominationem* the first two terms — as in Eph 1,21 — should be connected by καὶ (see HARNACK) can i.m.o. not be decided on.

2. The translation of the quote 1,21 from Ephesians does not accurately take into account the wording of its corresponding place: therefore ὑπεράνω instead of ὑπὲρ.

I.m.o., the Marcionite text might have read:

ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ
εἰσιν δύο διαθήκαι, μία μὲν ἀπὸ
ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν
Ἰουδαίων κατὰ [τόν] νόμον γεννώσα
εἰς δουλείαν,

μιὰ δὲ ὑπεράνω πάσης αρχῆς γεννώσα,
[καὶ] δυνάμεως, [καὶ] ἐξουσίας καὶ
παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, οὐ
μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν
τῷ μέλλοντι·
ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν·

*quae sunt allegorica, [id est aliud
portendunt:] haec sunt enim duo
testamenta, [sive duae stensiones,
sicut invenimus interpretatum,]
unum a monte Sina in synagogam
Iudaeorum secundum legem
generans in servitute,
aliud super omnem principatum
generans, vim, dominationem, et
omne nomen quod nominatur, non
tantum in hoc aevo sed in futuro,
quae est mater nostra, [in quam
repromissimus sanctam
ecclesiam;]*

Discussing the question: Which is the Original Version?

one will with great certainty have to favour the Marcionite variant when taking into account the following criteria:

1. In v. 24 there is a *rupture of syntax*: As noticed already by LIETZMANN in his commentary, 251, »the interpretation beginning with *μιὰ* is not continued in this form« (cf. VAN MANEN, too). Corresponding to 4,24 *μιὰ* *μεν*, one would expect *μιὰ* *δὲ*. Yet only the *Marcionite* variant (if only Tertullian's *unum-aliud* is translated correctly) has a logical link with that *μιὰ* *μεν*.

2. Between passage 25-30 (suspect of being an insertion) and the other parts of the letter *differences and particularities of language* can be found: in 4,25 and 26 the author talks about *ἡ νῦν* (25) or *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ* (26). Instead, in 1,17.18, 2,1 the original author uses the term — predominant in LXX (s. BAUER, Wörterbuch, Sp. 737) — *Ἱεροσόλυμα*. *Συστοιχῆν* (= »to have the same cipher - character« (LIETZMANN, at the place), or »to be in the same sequence«, ThW VII, 669); 4,25, is a hapaxlegomenon.

3. IN v. 25.26 there is a *rupture of thought*. In v. 26; the Jerusalem above, *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, is called 'our Mother'. This is uncomprehensible, because the context is just not about a *present institution* we already belong to. The contrast developed in 25.26 is between *ἡ νῦν* and *ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, the former indicating a present, the latter a *future* (eschatological) institution. But so the latter hardly can be said to be the »Mother« of those in faith. Obviously the editor in a further *eschatological* interpretation of the Sara-Hagar typos (4,22) (attached to 4,24) lost touch with the original *skopos* of 4,22ff and is now hardly able to connect these lines with the original *ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν*. Faith alone, *πίστις*, (which after all that has been discussed, is the only possible referent), can be said to be — now — and not only in a future world — »our Mother«.

4. Whereas the author in 4,26 uses *1. pers. pl.* (*ἥτις ἐστὶν μήτηρ ἡμῶν*), in 4,28 *2. pers. pl.* is used (*ὁμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐστέ*); in 4,31 symptomatically *1. pers. pl.* reappears (*διό, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκες τέκνα ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρως*). Cf. O'NEILL 63.

5. In respect of the quoted phrase, the conclusion 4,31 does not appear to be compelling and rather seems to refer backwards to 4,26. From the O.T. quotes neither follows that the »Jerusalem above« be free, nor that it be our Mother. Cf. VAN MANEN, who – in contrast to the canonical text, in which a series of problems arise – cannot detect contradictions in the *Marcionite* version:

»One after the other the two metaphors are explained and then the conclusion from the reference to the Law, beginning in v.22, is summarized in short form. What Scripture says about Ismael and Isaac, must be explained allegorically. We have two metaphors, of which one refers to the Law, the other to Faith, in this letter opposed to the Law. The latter begins on mount Sinai and ends with the synagogue of the Jews. It produces slavery. Faith, on the contrary, elevates its sons above all imaginable powers; it allows them to be entirely free, not only in the present time, but in the future as well. Faith, *πίστις*, is our Mother. That's

why we, finally returning to the word of the Law, -which the argument was all about- are not sons of the slave, but of the free woman«. Van Manen therefore considers it a reasonable conclusion, »that the frequently mentioned Catholic editor of our letter thought the praise of faith at the expense of the Law too anti-Jewish for his intended readers; that he therefore shortened it considerably; that he tried to turn the metaphors to the fore to another direction, v.25,26; that he tried to support what he thought to have said well by means of a few quotes, v.27, 30; that he carefully enabled Jewish minded Christians to find consolation in the idea that they were and remained children of the promise, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ, v.28«.

32. Gal 5,1

#55) Gal 5,1	ἡ ἐλευθερία > τῆ ἐλευθερία	cor
Marc 5.4.9		
#5), Appendix B, Clabeaux: ἡ for τῆ		

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.9: »*Qua libertate Christus nos manumisit, nonne eum constituit manumissorem qui fuit dominus?*« Tert Marc 5.4.9: »Et merito. Non decebat manumissos rursus iugo servitutis, id est legis adstringi, iam psalmo adimpeto...«

All scholars acknowledge that here Tertullian correctly gives the wording of the Marcionite text.

The question, however, whether the Marcionite text is the more original one, gets different answers. While HILGENFELD, HARNACK i.a. don't even deal with the problem, VAN MANEN, 492-493, after thoroughly comparing the variants, arrives at an answer to the positive: in his opinion, the Marcionite variant fits the context of the entire letter better, consequently the canonical text is easier to be explained out of the Marcionite than the other way round. »'For freedom Christ has set us free; stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery' is perfectly compatible with the ideas that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, 3,11; that Christians are called sons of the free woman, in contrast to the sons of the slave, that are under the Law and were born κατὰ σάρκα i.e. κατὰ νόμον εἰς δουλείαν, and are in the slavery of the Law, 4,23-31; and that therefore there is a sharp antagonism between on the one hand the Law and on the other hand the Gospel or Faith or Freedom. Stand fast for freedom, that consequently means as well: turn your back on the Law«.

According to VAN MANEN, the sharp opposition of *Law and Freedom*, indicated in 5,1, could easily be weakened by splitting up the verse in two parts: that way the importance of redemption through Christ was to be reduced and antinomist consequences excluded.

In my opinion, there is another piece of circumstantial evidence for VAN MANEN'S assumption to be correct: the peculiar use of the word *στήκειν*, elsewhere in Paul's letters only occurring in II Thess 2,15 (an interpolated passage as well). Whereas *στήκειν* in Rom 5,2; 14,4; [I Cor 15,1] 16,13; II Cor 1,24; Phil 1,27; 4,1; I Thess 3,8 appears as *στήκειν ἐν*, it is here, as in II Thess 2,15, used in the absolute (SCHLIER 230). Such a use of the word seems to be derived from the language of the Septuagint, which usually translates the (likewise absolute) Hebraic *צָיַן* (= to stand, e.g. before God; cf. Ex 14,13: »Fear not, stand firm, and see the salvation of the LORD, which he will work for you today«) by *στήκειν*. Since we have frequently noticed a Jewish-synagogal tint in the language of the Catholic editor, (LXX-influx), the peculiar use of the term *στήκειν* seems to give away his hand.

33. Gal 5,3.4

#56) Gal 5,3	μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν ὅτι ἄνθρωπος περιτετμημένος ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον πληρῶσαι. > μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι.	cor
Marc 5.4.9; Epiphanius Pan 42.11.8 (120,11f) = Pan 42.12.3 (156,21f)		
#57) Gal 5,4	καταργεῖτε τὸ σημεῖον τῆς δουλείας > κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ	incor

Textual Evidence

Epiphanius Pan 42.11.8 (120,11f) = Pan 42.12.3 (156,21f); at the second place *περιτετμημένος*; (HARNACK 77*): *μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν ὅτι ἄνθρωπος περιτετμημένος ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον πληρῶσαι.*

HARNACK, 77*, HILGENFELD, 443, and VAN MANEN, 493f, consider the text as quoted by Epiphanius the authentic Marcionite variant..

VAN MANEN is the only one to discuss the question, whether the Marcionite text or the canonical, i.e. the Catholic text is the original one. In his opinion, the Marcionite text, in which we have a *perfect tense* (περιτετημημένος) instead of a *present* (περιτεμνόμενος) and a *nominative* (ἄνθρωπος) instead of the *dative* (παντὶ ἄνθρωπῳ) is the older one. According to VAN MANEN, the reason for a modification probably was that later the Catholic side transferred what Paul had said concerning those that *had been circumcised* (perfect), to those, who were *going to have themselves circumcised* (the then present). Yet, originally only the *already circumcised* could have been intended. VAN MANEN, 493: »The surgery [i.e. circumcision] then did not take so much time as to enable people to fulfill the entire Law in the meantime«.

Another noteworthy peculiarity of the Catholic text is μαρτύρομαι with personal dative. This form is not found elsewhere in »Paul«; (δια-)μαρτύρομαι with dative, on the contrary, sometimes occurs in Luke, e.g. in Acts (15,8; 20,26). This again, i.e. the *style of the Septuaginta*, reminds us of the Catholic editor .

Finally, VAN MANEN draws attention to a statement of Tertullian's, which might suggest that Marcion's Paul had said something else which then fell victim to the editor's scissors: 5.4 reads: »De servitute igitur exemptos ipsam servitutis notam eradere perseverabat, circumcissionem«. Based on this quote in this context, VAN MANEN assumes that Marcion's Paul required those that had been circumcised to reverse the mark of circumcision. VAN MANEN thinks, the original text might have read κατηργεῖτε τὸ σημεῖον τῆς δουλείας instead of κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ. That's an appealing — though highly insecure!— assumption.

34. Gal 5,6

#58) Gal 5,6	– ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει οὔτε ἀκροβυστία	nlq
VAN MANEN	ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.	

VAN MANEN, 523, had assumed 5,6 to be a Catholic insertion. His argument for that assumption is quite comprehensible, though there is no textual evidence to back it (but s. below) — which is why VAN MANEN only adduces it in Abschnitt III (*Wijzigingen, die niet door getuigen zijn gestaafd = Modifications not supported by textual evidence*): After 5,2-5 had emphatically shown that circumcision and faith are by no means compatible (eva.n perite,mnhsqe(Cristo.j u`ma/j ouvde.n wvfelh,sei), 5,6 is quite a

surprise for any reader. Those that might object with the argument that 5,6 did not at all address uncircumcised Gentile Christians that only now wanted to be circumcised or had just been circumcised, but rather (since birth) circumcised Jewish Christians, would have to take into account that there is nowhere a hint at such a distinction in the text itself— and that the original author most probably didn't have it in mind. The repetition of the particle *ga.r*, (used already in 5,5) is clumsy style, the more so, since there is nothing in the sentence that could be interpreted as a substantiation of what was said in 5,5.

A serious *objection*, however, against VAN MANEN'S conjecture might be the fact that Tertullian in Marc 5.4.10-11 seems to allude twice to Gal 5,6:

Denique si circumcisionem ab alio deo veniens excludebat, cur etiam praeputationem negat quicquam valere in Christo, sicut et circumcisionem? ... Et in nomine eius nationes credunt, illius fidei quam dicendo per dilectionem perfici sic quoque creatoris ostendit.

Though Tertullian's reference is a weighty argument against VAN MANEN'S assumption of 5,6 to be the work of an editor, we have, in defense of VAN MANEN, to draw attention to the fact that -as has been proved- Tertullian in other places as well deviates from his fundamental principle, namely to fight Marcion with his own weapons, i.e. with his own recension of the Paulina (cf. the annotations to Gal 2,2: Tertullian's »quote« *ne in vacuum tot annis cucurrisset aut curreret*) — be it because the edition of the Marcionite *Apostolus* used by Tertullian already contained some Catholic revisions, or be it because he had more or less frequently to deviate from his methodical basis for polemical (i.e. tendentious) reasons.

35. Gal 5,9

#59) Gal 5,9	δολοῖ > ζυμοῖ	cor
Epiph Pan 42.11.8 (120,13f) = 42.12.3 (157,1f)		
Clabeaux #14) App A (cor)		

Textual Evidence

Epiphanius Pan 42.11.8 (120,13f) = 42.12.3 (157,1f): ἀντὶ τοῦ μικρὰ ζύμη ὄλον τοῦ φύραμα ζυμοῖ ἐποίησε δολοῖ.

From HILGENFELD, 443, to CLABEAUX, 86, 152 scholars time and again expressed their doubts whether the variant *δολοῖ* (to forge) instead of *ζυμοῖ* (to sour), evidenced as Marcionite by Epiphanius (but occurring elsewhere, too : D*; Goth Bas Const; lat; Lcf), really be a modification by Marcion, or whether contrariwise the Catholic text be the secondary one. We might indeed

have here a later harmonizing with I Cor 5,6 (οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ;). Why an ordinary transcriber should have changed ζυμοῖ into δολοῖ is quite difficult to explain. Moreover, the unmistakably negative δολοῖ is better integrated in the context than the ambivalent ζυμοῖ and might have been replaced by the later editor because of its wry overtone (VAN MANEN, 495).

36. Gal 5,14

#60) 5,14	[έν] ὑμῖν πεπλήρωται > έν ένι λόγῳ πεπλήρωται	cor
Marc 5.4.12; Epiph Pan 42.11.8 (120,15f) = 42.12.3 (157,9f) Clabeaux #15) App A (incor)		
#61) 5,14	– έν τῷ	cor
Marc 5.4.12 Epiph Schol 5 Clabeaux #17) App A (incor)		

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.12 : »*Tota enim, inquit, lex in vobis adimpleta est: Diliges proximum tuum tamquam te*«. Epiphanius, Pan 42.11.8 (120,15f) = 42.12.3 (157,9f): ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ὑμῖν πεπλήρωται· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

Context

Shortly before, Tertullian had cited Gal 5,10 — *qui autem turbat vos, iudicium feret*; Paul threatens those that trouble the communities with God's judgement. Polemically he asks by which God (*a quo deo?*) this judgement could possibly be pronounced? Surely not by Marcion's *optimus deus* since that God does not judge (*non iudicat*). But neither would the *creator* (= God of the Jews) condemn a maintainer of circumcision. Since (according to Marcion) there be no other to execute judgement, only he, who had determined on the cessation of the law, would be able to condemn the defenders of the law, and what, if he also affirmed the law in that portion of it where it ought (to be permanent)? Tertullian then cites the Marcionite version of 5,16: »*Tota enim, inquit, lex in vobis adimpleta est: Diliges proximum tuum*

tamquam te«. Then he he rejects the (apparently Marcionite) interpretation of the quote as if Paul had intended to say the Law had been fulfilled (*adimpleta*) and it no longer had to be fulfilled (*non adimplenda est*). If this were implied, Paul wouldn't have at the same time given the commandment to love one's neighbour as oneself. Tertullian does not interpret this commandment as a *dispendium*, but as a *compendium* of the *lex creatoris*. Therefore 'we must evermore continue to observe this commandment' (*Sed perseverandum erit semper in isto praecepto*).

Reconstruction

Based on the quotes from Epiphanius und Tertullian, it is generally assumed that Marcion in 5,14 omitted ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ (#60) and read (ἐν) ὑμῖν instead.

Not settled is the question whether the phrases ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ and ἐν τῷ (the latter used to introduce the quote) were *erased* in the Marcionite edition or *inserted* in a Catholic recension.

HARNACK, 78*, assumes that the the canonical Catholic text shows the original version and as to the genesis of the Marcionite text he sees the following alternative: »Had ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ accidentally been dropped after ἐν ὑμῖν in an old Marcionite issue and had the error slipped into Tert. and Epiph. that way? Or was it M. who wrote ἐν ὑμῖν (and ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ) contrasting it in thought with: 'Not in the Jews?' That's much more probable«.

VAN MANEN, on the contrary, considers the Marcionite text original since, in his opinion, the canonical version contains problems of *content* and *language*. The author, having preached in 5,3 that his fellow-believers were not obliged to »fulfill the entire Law«, would contradict himself by reinstating the *lex Creatoris* of old in 5,14 (in the sense of Tertullian's *compendium*). »Fulfillment« of the Law, as the author understood the term, meant »fill, add what is still missing «— just like in the original usage of the word. By no means the author had intended to summarize all stipulations of the Law in one short commandment (*compendium*), his intention had been to show — in defense of his strong request of those called to freedom to be each others' servants—, by which new Law the old commandments had been fulfilled.

In my opinion, VAN MANEN best of all does justice to both context and linguistic findings. Moreover, his explanation results in a relatively easy comprehension of the *genealogy* of the other variants:

1. The addition of ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ is explained by the intention of a Catholic editor to take the antinomist sting out of the sentence and to interpret the

fulfillment of the Law as its summary, i.e. as *compendium* in Tertullian's sense.

2. To make that result even more explicit, ἐν τῷ was later added. CLABEAUX, 152, recognizes #60), #61) as (pre-) Marcionite variant.

37. Gal 5,20.24

#62) 5,20	εἰδωλολατρίαι, φαρμακείαι > εἰδωλολατρία, φαρμακεία	nlq
Epiph Pan 42.12.3 (157,17-21)		
#63) 5,20	ἔρεις, ζῆλοι > ἔρις, ζῆλος	nlq
Clabeaux #7) App B:	ἔρεις > ἔρις	
Clabeaux #8) App B:	ζῆλοι > ζῆλος	
#)64 5,20	φόννοι > φθόννοι	nlq
#)65 5,24	Χριστοῦ > Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ	cor
Epiph Pan 42,11,8 (121,1f) = 42,12,3 (158,22f) and P 46 DFG 0122c M latt sy – cf. Harnack 78*		
To 5,21 cf. CLABEAUX #10) <i>App B</i> (+ καί after καθῶς).		

Textual Evidence

In his Panarion 42.12.3 (157,17-21) Epiphanius knows of some other variants, apart from those mentioned above, but they are estimated not to be of much worth (s. below), e.g.: εἰδωλολατρίαι, φαρμακείαι instead of εἰδωλολατρία, φαρμακεία; φόννοι instead of φθόννοι —but differently Pan 42.11.8 (120, 17-21): εἰδωλολατρία, φαρμακεία, φόννοι— *Appendix B*, CLABEAUX #9: do not add φόννοι after φθόννοι).

Reconstruction

Whether Epiphanius in Gal 5,20 accurately cites the Marcionite text is a controversial issue. In the other places, the quotes from the Marcionite text seem to be correct. In my opinion, however, the question whether the latter or the canonical variant is the more authentic one, cannot be answered.

38. Gal 6,6

#66) 6,6

– ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς

nlq

Orig in Jer., CommGal (PL 26 [1845] 429B, 11-15)

Textual Evidence

Jer, CommGal (PL 26 [1845] 429B, 11-15): *Marcion hunc locum ita interpretatus est, ut putaret fideles et catechumenos simul orare debere et magistrum communicare in oratione discipulis, illo vel maxime elatus, quod sequatur in omnibus bonis.*

Reconstruction

Whereas most scholars assume that Marcionite and canonical version were identical in this place, VAN MANEN, based on the quote from Origen in Jerome, thinks Marcion did not have ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς. His reasoning: κοινωνεῖν (»take part in«; I Tim 5,26; I Petr 4,13; II Joh 11) be not κοινοῦν (= »share sth with s.o.«). The original author had not had in mind a *community of property*, but a *spiritual companionship* of the catechumen and his teacher. After having given the general rule in 6,4 and 5 that everybody should be able to stand on their own two feet, the author now formulates an exception of that rule: »Let him who is taught the word, live in companionship with him who teaches.« In this context there was no room for ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς, which interprets or could possibly interpret this companionship as one of joint property.

If VAN MANEN were right (his deliberations cannot be simply dismissed entirely), in this place, too, the Marcionite text would be the authentic one.

39. Gal 6,7

#67) Gal 6,7

– μὴ

nlq

Marc 5.4.14

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.14: »*Erratis, deus non deridetur. Atquin derideri potest Marcionis, qui nec irasci novit nec ulcisci. Quod quod enim severit homo, hoc et metet*«.

The variant *πλανᾶσθε* is commonly acknowledged to be the Marcionite one.

VAN MANEN is the only one to discuss the question whether it –an not the canonical variant- might be the original version. VAN MANEN'S opinion is that the Marcionite variant harmonize better with the »terse, harsh tone« of (original) Paul, and therefore might »very well be the more original one«. *Μὴ πλανᾶσθε* be a watered down form. The editor had intended to alter the text into »a general admonition Catholic Christians could take advantage of«. — Though there is some degree of probability in these considerations, they are, on the other hand, i.m.o., not absolutely compelling.

40. Gal 6,9.10

#68) Gal 6,9	– καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλύομενοι	cor
#69) Gal 6,10	καὶ > "Ἄρα οὖν	cor
#70) Gal 6,10	καιρῷ δὲ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν > πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ	cor
Marc 5.14.14-15	πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.	

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.14-15: »*Bonum autem facientes non fatigemur, et Dum habemus tempus, operemur bonum ... Tempore autem suo metemus*«.

Reconstruction

Though obviously Tertullian accurately cites the wording of the passage, HARNACK in his reconstruction, 79*, rearranges it, very likely just adopting the Catholic variant:

HARNACK 79*

TERTULLIAN MARC 5.4.14+15

6,9 τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ
ἐγκακῶμεν*14 Bonum autem facientes non
fatigemur*

καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν

*et Dum habemus tempus, operemur
bonum ...*6,10 ὡς ἔχομεν καιρον, ἐργαζώμεθα
τὸ ἀγαθόν*15 Tempore autem suo metemus.*

VAN MANEN's reconstruction, 500, on the other hand, follows Tertullian:

VAN MANEN

TERTULLIAN MARC 5.4.14:

6,9 τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ
ἐγκακῶμεν*Bonum autem facientes non
fatigemur*6,10 καί ὡς καιρον ἔχομεν,
ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθόν.*et Dum habemus tempus,
operemur bonum ...*

καιρῷ δὲ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν.

15. Tempore autem suo metemus.

VAN MANEN'S reconstruction and his translation to the Greek are to be preferred, since they are the more accurate ones.

The Question which is the Original Variant

must be settled by means of criteria of language/style and of contents. Problems and tensions appear in the canonical text –not to be found in the the Marcionite version–, that provide a clue as for it being secondary compared with the latter:

1. μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι (v. 9) comes unmotivated and is a hapaxlegomenon in the *Corpus Paulinum* (in the NT elsewhere only Mt 15,32; Mk 8,3, Hebr 12,3.5); cf. SCHLIER, 278;

2. in the canonical text the hint at the *harvest* is *anticipated* and doesn't make sense until the end of the passage, i.e. in v. 10.

For the reasons mentioned, VAN MANEN, 500, i.m.o. rightly considers the Marcionite variant to be the more original one.

41. Gal 6,13

#71) Gal 6,13	περιτεμνόμενοι > περιτετμημένοι	cor
Epiph Pan 42.11.8 (121, 3) = 42.12.3 (159,3f)		
= #11) Clabeaux, App B (»cor«)		

Textual Evidence

Epiphanius reads Gal 5,3 as περιτετμημένος (= perfect; see the annotation); but in Gal 6,13 he has, with the majority of referring manuscripts (Pan 42.11.8 (121, 3) = 42.12.3 (159,3f)) περιτεμνόμενοι (= aorist).

Reconstruction and Evaluation

Whereas HARNACK, CLABEAUX and NESTLE-ALAND²⁶ favour this variant (based above all on some more important referring manuscripts), VAN MANEN, 500, because of Gal 5,3, assumes an erroneous reading by *Epiphanius* and an original περιτετμημένοι (perfect) in Marcion. — The question, what Marcion read in this place, is not answerable i.m.o., and consequently neither is the question, which was the authentic version.

42. Gal 6,15-16

#72) Gal 6,15-16	-15-16	nlq
[Marc 5.4.15]		

Textual Evidence

Marc 5.4.15: »*Sed et mihi, famulo creatoris, mundus crucifixus est, non tamen deus mundi, et ego mundo, non tamen deo mundi. Mundum enim quantum ad conversationem eius posuit, cui renuntiando mutuo transfigimur et invicem morimur. Persecutores vocat Christi. Cum vero adicit stigmata Christi in*

corpore suo gestare se (utique corporalia competunt), iam non putativam, sed veram et solidam carnem professus est Christi, cuius stigmata corporalia ostendit.«

As shown by this quote, Tertullian apparently did not know Gal 6,15-16. In Tertullian's text, the (tendentious) quoting and interpreting of verse 14 are followed by the remark that Paul (at the end of his letter) addresses the *persecutores* (»*Persecutores vocat Christi*«), which –what way ever the remark may be interpreted– (cf. Harnack 79*) cannot but refer to the content of 6,17.

There is no evidence in the other referring manuscripts either for Marcion knowing of verses 15-16.

The Original Version

That 6,15-16 be indeed an addition to the original (Marcionite) text, is backed up by the fact that the content of 6,15 does not match the preceding text. Tendency and nature of the interpolation remind of 5,6. Like in that place the sentence is connected by means of the particle γὰρ, though there is nothing in it that could be seen as substantiating the preceding phrase. Concerning contents, the liberal attitude about circumcision, all of a sudden shown in 6,15, is not well comprehensible in the context of the overall polemical nature of the letter, as e.g. the disapproval of circumcision (5,2f) or the harsh attack of 5,12. 6,15 – like already 5,6 – probably is an adaptation and a combination of ICor 7,19/II Cor 5,17. Since we can assume I Cor 7,19 to be the work of a Catholic editor, we have subsequently to assume that the same editor tried to variegate his own text in 6,15 (but did so in a very clumsy way). Be it as it may, 6,15 is incomprehensible without I Cor 7,19/II Cor 5,17.—If 6,15 is an addition, verse 16, too needs must be editorial, since it is directly connected with the preceding verse. In any case, the fundamental rule the author of the verse is speaking about, cannot be derived from 6,14, it rather refers to 6,15 and the there expressed maxim.

6,17, on the other hand, follows 6,14 quite smoothly. The picture of the apostle crucified together with Jesus Christ and the mention of the στίγματα. (caused by the cross) go together quite well.

O'NEILL, too, in his »Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians«, 71-72, considers 6,16 to be editorial because of its contents. »The phrase 'Israel od God' is a tell-tale sign that the words printed at the head of his note are a gloss. The implication is that there is a false Israel as well as a true Israel, and that they are two organized entities ...The gloss was added at a time when the Church and Israel were sharply distinguished, when Jews who believed could not longer remain within Israel because they could not recite the Test Benediction.« Most appealing is O'Neill's deliberation: »Perhaps, indeed, the gloss is a deliberate appropriation of another of the Benedictions, the nineteenth, which runs in the Babylonian

recension, ‘Give peace, happiness, and blessing, grace, loving kindness, and mercy upon us and upon all Israel your people...’ The gloss reflects an age when the Church, made up of Gentiles and Jews, saw itself as the true Israel, and this was an age much later than Paul’s.«

The assumption that 6,16 reminds of the 19th Benediction of the Babylonian recension of the Amidah (= prayer of the eighteen benedictions), is widely acknowledged; e.g. SCHLIER, 283: »Very likely the apostle was thinking of the 19th benediction of the Amidah.«

Since the Amidah is usually dated not until late 1st or early 2nd century CE, a dating of our gloss –in agreement with O’NEILL– to the 2nd century is nothing but a reasonable assumption. It cannot be excluded with absolute certainty, however, that the Amidah be dependent on earlier traditions.

43. Gal 6,17

#73) Gal 6,17	τοῦ Χριστοῦ > τοῦ Ἰησοῦ	nlq
Marc 5.4.16 — against: Dial V,22		

Textual Evidence

Tertullian Marc 5.4.2.: »*Persecutores vocat Christi. Cum vero adicit stigmata Christi in corpore suo gestare se (utique corporalia competunt), iam non putativam. sed veram et solidam carnem professus est Christi, cuius stigmata corporalia ostendit*«.

HARNACK’S and VAN MANEN’S Reconstructions; Which Version is the Original?

HARNACK, 79*, has instead of τοῦ λοιποῦ the variant τῶν δ’ ἄλλων. In his opinion, Tertullian, too, read τῶν δ’ ἄλλων »... and understood those ἄλλοι to be Christ’s enemies (‘From among the others, namely Christ’s persecutors, let no man trouble me’)« HARNACK thusly can explain, how Tertullian arrives at his extraordinary statement »*Persecutores vocat Christi*«. As to τῶν δ’ ἄλλων, Harnack assumes that it is derived from the Latin translation of τοῦ λοιποῦ = »de ceteris«. —HARNACK’S deliberations may be correct. But then we nevertheless have to keep in mind that τῶν δ’ ἄλλων came into the text through the Latin translation of τοῦ λοιποῦ, and that by all means the latter variant might already have been Marcionite. In any case, »*Persecutores vocat Christi*« is a misunderstanding of Tertullian’s —if the text at this place did not

contain a passage which later fell victim to an editors scissors (a possibility never to be excluded once and for all).

Furthermore, HARNACK. 79*, without giving reasons, at this place follows Tertullian, i.e. instead of Ἰησοῦ he reads Χριστοῦ.

Likewise VAN MANEN, 500f, with the argument that the Marcionite variant στίγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ be more original than the Catholic one because at this place it's not the signs of the passion of Jesus –hardly to be found on Paul– but the signs of the apostle's passion that were meant. The latter demonstrated that he belonged to Christ »as stigmata on slaves or soldiers demonstrate whose property or warriors they are«. The modification be probably intended to remind –against docetic heretics– of the doctrine that Jesus had not simulated his suffering on the cross, but that his had been a passion in a real human body. If VAN MANEN'S argument were correct, we would still have to ask the question how Tertullian in that quote, in spite of all those considerations, can use *stigmata Christi* as evidence for an antidocetic opinion of the apostle. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ be more clearly antidocetic than στίγματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. So, after all, a later editor might have hanged τοῦ Χριστοῦ into τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with the intention of giving the text a more markedly antidocetic turn.¹¹

Apart from all such deliberations (which, however just as well might have inspired Marcion to alter the text out of his contrasting doctrinal interest), we have i.m.o. to point out above all the fact that the name 'Jesus' does nowhere in Galatians occur *in absolute*, but only in conjunctions like Christ Jesus or Jesus Christ: 1,1; 1,3; 1,21; 1,24; (2,16); 3,1; (3,14); (3,26); 3,28; 4,14; (5,6); (5,24); 6,14; 6,17; 6,18.

¹¹ According to ZAHN, 504, VAN MANEN »occupies himself with futile considerations whether the Catholic Ἰησοῦ or the Marcionite Χριστοῦ be the original version« It's a fact very much to be deplored, that the great scholar had nothing more to say to the subject!

Literature

- ALTHAUS, P./ H. W. BEYER-P.: Der Brief an die Galater, NTD, ⁹1962.
- BAARDA, T.: Marcion's Text of Gal 1,1, VigChr 42, 1988, 236-256.
- BARNIKOL, E.: Der nichtpaulinische Ursprung des Parallelismus der Apostel Petrus und Paulus (Gal 2,7-8) 1931 = The Non-Pauline Origin of the Parallelism of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Galatians 2:7-8, in: JHC, Volume 5/2, Fall 1998, 285-300 (here quoted from) .
- BAUER, B.: Kritik der paulinischen Briefe. Erste Abtheilung: Der Ursprung des Galaterbriefes.
- BAUER, W.: Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch, 1963, ⁵1971.
- BAUR, F.CHR.: Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, 1845, 1866, 1867.
- BENGL, J.A.: Gnomon, Auslegung des Neuen Testaments in fortlaufenden Anmerkungen, II. Briefe und Offenbarung, ⁷1960
- BERGH VAN EYSINGA, G.A. VAN DEN: Pro Domo, in: NTT, 1923.
- BLACKMAN; E.C.: Marcion and his influence, 1948.
- BLASS, F.-DEBRUNNER, A.-REHKOPF, F.: Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, ¹⁵1979.
- BULTMANN, R.: Theologie des Neuen Testaments, 1953, ⁹1984.
—Art. περίθω, ThW VI 2-3.
- CLABEAUX, J.J.: A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul. A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion, CBQ. MS 21, 1989.
- COUCHOUD, P.L.: La première édition de Saint Paul, RHR , 1926, 242-263.
- DELAFOSSÉ, H.: Les écrits de Saint Paul III, Christianisme 13,17,23,28, 1926-1928.
- DETERING, H.: Paulusbriefe ohne Paulus? Die Paulusbriefe in der holländischen Radikalkritik, 1992.
—: Der gefälschte Paulus, 1995.
—: The Dutch Radical Approach to the Pauline Epistles, JHC, Fall 1996, Vol. 3, No. 2, 163-193.
- HARNACK, A.V.: Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche. Neue Studien zu Marcion, 1921, ²1924 =1960.
- HILGENFELD, A.: Das Apostolikon Marcion's, ZHTh, 1855, 426-484.
- HOFMANN, J.: Marcion, on the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulist Theology in the Second Century, 1984.
- H. LIETZMANN, Galaterbrief, HNT, 1910.
- KILPATRIK, G.D.: Galatians 1,18 ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν (in: New Testament Essays, Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893-1958, ed. by J.B. Higgins, 1959.)
- LÖFFLER, J.F.C.: Marcionem Pauli epistolas et Lucas euangelium adulterasse dubitatur, 1788.
- MANEN, W.C.VAN: Marcions brief van Paulus aan de Galatiërs, ThT 21, 1887, 382ff, 451ff.
- MCGUIRE, F.R.: Did Paul write Galatians? in: Hibbert Journal 66, 1967-68 , 52-57.
- O'NEILL, J.C.: The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians, 1972.
- OEPKE, A.: Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater, ThHK, 1930.

- OSTEN-SACKEN, P.V.D.: Paulus und die Wahrheit des Evangeliums. Zum Umgang des Apostels mit Evangelium, Gegnern und Geschichte in Galater 1-2; in: Die Heiligkeit der Tora, 1989.
- PERSON, A., NABER, A.A.: Verisimilia. Laceram conditionem Novi Testamenti exemplis illustrant et ab origine repetierunt, 1886.
- SCHLIER, H.: Der Brief an die Galater, KEK VII, ¹²1962.
- SCHMID, U.: Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe, 1995
- SCHMITHALS, W.: Das kirchliche Apostelamt. Eine historische Untersuchung, FRLANT 79, 1961.
- : Der Römerbrief, 1988.
- SCHOEPS, H.J.: Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte, 1959.
- SODEN, H.V.: Der lateinische Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian, FG f. A, Jülicher, 1927, 229-281.
- STECK, R.: Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht nebst kritischen Bemerkungen zu den Paulinischen Hauptbriefen, 1888.
- WIDMANN, M.: Literarkritische Untersuchung des Galaterbriefs, FS Stachel, 1987.
- ZAHN, TH.: Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Zweiter Band: Urkunden und Belege zum ersten und dritten Band. II/1.2, 1890/1892.
- : Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater, MeyerK ³1922.