

James A. Kelhoffer, “The Witness of Eusebius’ *ad Marinum* and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates Concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark’s Gospel”, *ZNW* 92 (2001), p. 78-112.

The Witness of Eusebius’ *ad Marinum* and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark’s Gospel¹

by James A. Kelhoffer

(McCormick Theological Seminary, 5555 South Woodlawn Avenue, USA-Chicago, IL 60637)

In comparison with Greek manuscripts and early versions, patristic sources for the text of the New Testament have, for the most part, suffered from benign neglect. ... Their value is nonetheless beyond dispute.²

I. Introduction

Attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 260–340 C. E.), the *ad Marinum* (“To Marinus;” CPG 3470) testifies to a debate concerning the original conclusion to the Gospel of Mark and is of great importance to NT textual criticism – both ancient and modern. In response to Marinus’ question, “How is it that the risen Savior appears ‘on the evening of the Sabbath’ in Matthew [28,1]

¹ Some years ago I had anticipated including this discussion of the *ad Marinum* in my dissertation on Mark 16,9–20, which was written under the supervision of Adela Yarbro Collins (The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark [Mark 16:9–20] [Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1999]). This work was subsequently published as *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (WUNT 2.112), Tübingen 2000; page numbers cited for this work refer to the published dissertation. Because the dissertation interprets the Longer Ending in its early second-century context and does not focus on later external attestation to this Markan appendix, I decided to return to this project on the *ad Marinum* after I had finished the dissertation. Since that time this essay’s initial inquiry into the *ad Marinum* has been expanded to include a number of other later Christian discussions of Mark’s original conclusion. My thanks to Professor Collins for reading an earlier version of this article. I wish also to thank the editors of *ZNW* for their comments, as well as those who gave feedback when portions of this work were presented at the New Testament Textual Criticism Section of the 1999 SBL Annual Meeting, the University of Chicago Divinity School Bible Club and the Association of Chicago Theological Schools New Testament Group.

² B. D. Ehrman, *The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism*, in: *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Church History* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 7), ed. by B. Aland/J. Delobel, Kampen 1994, 118.

but 'early on the first day of the week' in Mark [16,2, 16,9]?,” the second of two explanations given is that, whereas Matthew refers to the resurrection, Mark relates the time of the appearances of the risen Lord (cf. Mark 16,9–14). Responding somewhat differently to the same question, the first answer states that the apparent discrepancy in timing between Matthew and Mark is a moot point for “the one who rejects the pericope which says this (ὁ ... τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικοπῆν ἀθετῶν) [Mark 16,9–20],” which “does not appear in all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark, [that is,] the ‘accurate’ copies (τὰ ... ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων).” Notably, the *ad Marinum* offers a window to a point in time when “nearly all the copies” of Mark ended at Mark 16,8. Such a striking awareness of diverse readings among NT MSS calls for a full examination of questions concerning what copies of Mark were known to this and subsequent authors, the practice of ‘textual criticism’ in the early and medieval church and the significance of these claims for contemporary scholarship on the Markan endings.

In contrast to the testimony of the *ad Marinum*, roughly 99% of the surviving copies of the Second Gospel agree with the Textus Receptus and include Mark 16,9–20 at some point after Mark 16,8.³ This article will study those writings that shed light on the manuscript history of the Longer Ending. Moreover, an explanation why so much of the surviving external evidence includes the Longer Ending as a part of Mark will also be given.

The Greek text of the Vatican MS containing the *ad Marinum* (Codex Vat. Palat. 220, s. x, f. 61–96) was first published by Cardinal Angelo Mai in 1825 and had previously been known to only a handful of scholars like Andreas Birch and Karl Lachmann.⁴ No one to date has provided a thorough

³ For this figure see K. Aland and B. Aland, who write: “It is true that the longer ending of Mark 16:9–20 is found in 99 percent of the Greek manuscripts as well as the rest of the tradition, enjoying over a period of centuries practically an official ecclesiastical sanction as a genuine part of the gospel of Mark” (The Text of the New Testament, Revised and enlarged ed., Grand Rapids, MI/Leiden 1987, 287); also earlier K. Aland, Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums, in: L’Évangile selon Marc (BETHL 34), ed. by M. Sabbe, Gembloux ²1988, 446. The Longer Ending appears in MSS either immediately after Mark 16,8 or after Mark’s “Shoter Ending” (e.g., in L, d¹², [0112], Y).

⁴ See the note below (n. 6) on A. Birch and K. Lachmann. A. Mai copied the Greek text from a Vatican manuscript and made a few minor emendations of probable scribal errors, the more significant of which are noted below in the footnotes: Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticani Codicibus, Rome 1825, 1,61–82. Mai published a revised edition of the *ad Marinum* in idem, Novae patrum bibliothecae, Rome 1847, 4,255–268 = PG 22,937–953. Unless otherwise noted, the Greek text and Latin translation cited here are from Mai’s 1847 edition of the *ad Marinum*. Mai’s flawed publication of Codex Vaticanus (1857, 1859) is renowned (see, e.g., F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Grand Rapids, MI ²1953, 77–85). As is noted below, a number of infelicities in Mai’s edition of the *ad Marinum* need further explanation or correction.

study of this writing or a complete English translation of it. John W. Burgon (1871) and William R. Farmer (1974) discussed selected parts of the *ad Marinum* to support their specious arguments for the Markan authorship of Mark 16,9–20. Unfortunately, the only other noteworthy attention given to this writing comes from B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort (1881–1882), who wrote in response to many of Burgon’s flawed inferences. Furthermore, although other scholars have referred, usually in passing, to the testimony of “Eusebius,” they have not taken the context of the *ad Marinum* into account. The discussion to follow includes an introduction to this writing, the Greek text and a new translation of Parts I–II.1, and an analysis of this author’s claims concerning the textual history of Mark’s Longer Ending and the original conclusion to the Second Gospel. An analysis of analogous statements in subsequent Christian writings will follow in the penultimate section of this article.

II. Content of the ad Marinum as a Whole and Questions of Authorship and Genre

The following introductory comments on the *ad Marinum* are offered with the recognition that much remains to be done with this important Christian writing that dates to the fourth century or earlier. The *ad Marinum* addresses a total of four questions, of which the first two are relevant for this investigation. As mentioned above, the first asks why the timing of the resurrection in Matt 28,1 (ὁψὲ σαββάτων) contradicts that of Mark 16,2 (πρωτὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων) and 16,9 (πρωτὶ πρώτῃ σαββάτου). The importance of answering such questions is easily recognized at a period when the four NT Gospels had been collected and alleged discrepancies in scripture were alternately scrutinized by critics like Celsus (ca. 170 C. E.) and Porphyry (ca. 232/3–305 C. E.), and addressed by Christians like this author.

In Part I of the *ad Marinum*, what follows the first question about Matt 28 and Mark 16 is not one but two different answers. The first answer claims that the majority of the best MSS of the Gospel of Mark end at Mark 16,8. As a result, any alleged contradiction between the narratives of Matthew and Mark does not, in fact, pose a problem since the Longer Ending is not an authentic part of Mark. By contrast, the second answer to this question disputes that there is an actual discrepancy between Matt 28 and Mark 16 and argues that each evangelist refers to a different event: whereas Matthew refers to the resurrection, Mark points to subsequent appearances of Jesus. There is thus no contradiction between Matt 28,1–20 and Mark 16,1–20. Furthermore, this second response maintains that, because the accounts of Matthew and “Mark” complement one another, one does not need to, and should not, question the reception of the Longer Ending as scripture.

An analysis of Part I of the *ad Marinum* is of particular significance because the first answer to the question corroborates the testimony of Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (S) and certain other witnesses (for example, S^s, it^k), which

do not contain Mark 16,9–20. Moreover, the second answer reflects an approach to scripture that contributes to an explanation how this originally minority reading eventually came to be attested in almost all of the surviving MSS.

With regard to the authorship of this writing, the *ad Marinum* is attributed to Eusebius and receives its name because the author writes as though responding to the questions of a certain Marinus. On the basis of rather little evidence, scholars for nearly two centuries have unquestioningly accepted the Eusebian designation. The evidence for this ascription stems primarily from the superscription in the Vatican codex published by Mai. The ascription is also attested in later Syriac fragments of this material and in certain later Christian writings.⁵ The attribution to Eusebius, which has never been questioned, needs to be tested, but such an inquiry lies beyond the scope of this investigation.⁶ As is discussed below, Jerome (Ep. CXX 3 [*ad Hedybiam*]; ca. 406–407 C. E.) made rather extensive use of this writing and thus offers a *terminus ante quem* for the *ad Marinum* that could support the case for Eusebian authorship.

In terms of its genre, this writing belongs to the little-studied *Quaestiones et Responsiones* on scripture.⁷ A superscription in the manuscript edited by

⁵ On this point see A. Baumstark, *Syrische Fragmente von Eusebios' Περί διαφορίας εὐαγγελίων*, *OrChr* 1 (1901) 378–382; G. Beyer, *Die evangelischen Fragen und Lösungen des Eusebius in jakobitischer Überlieferung und deren nestorianische Parallelen: Syrische Texte herausgegeben, übersetzt und untersucht*, *ORChr.NS* 12–14 (1922–24) 30–70; 3. Ser. 1 (1926) 80–97.284–292; 2 (1927) 57–69.

⁶ For earlier discussions of the *ad Marinum* and the unquestioned use of the Eusebian designation, see A. Birch, *Variae Lectiones ad Textum IV Evangeliorum*, Hauniae 1801, 226; K. Lachmann, *Rechenschaft über seine Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments*, *ThStKr* 3 (1830) 843–845; idem, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, Berlin ²1842, 1,314; S. P. Tregelles, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*, London 1854, 247–251; J. W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark Vindicated against Recent Critical Objectors and Established*, Oxford/London 1871, 41–51; B. F. Westcott/F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Cambridge ²1896, Appendix, 2,30–33; C. R. Williams, *The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark*, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 18 (February, 1915) 444–447; G. Bardy, *La littérature patristique des «QUAESTIONES ET RESPONSIONES» sur l'Écriture Sainte*, *RB* 41 (1932) 228–236; J. Quasten, *Patrology*, 3,337; J. K. Elliott, *The Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel* (1971), in: *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: An Edition of C. H. Turner's "Notes on Marcan Usage" together with Comparable Studies (NT.S 71)*, Leiden/New York 1993, 203–211, here: 204; W. R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark (SNTSMS 25)*, Cambridge 1974, 3–13; J. Hug, *La finale de l'évangile de Marc: Mc 16,9–20 (Études Bibliques)*, Paris 1978, 11–12, 193–194; K. Aland, *Bemerkungen zum Schluß des Markusevangeliums*, in: *Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, Edinburgh 1969, 160; idem, *Schluß* (see n. 3), 438; Aland/Aland, (see n. 3), 287.

⁷ The question/answer format of the *ad Marinum* can be compared with many similar writings addressing a plethora of other questions. A number of these can be found in the

Mai describes the word as a “brief epitome (ἐκλογὴ ἐν σύντομῳ)” of a longer work. Assuming the plausibility of Eusebian authorship, it is possible that the *ad Marinum*, as well as two writings addressed *ad Stephanum* (“To Stephanus”), represent parts of Eusebius’ lost work *On the Inconsistencies of the Gospels*.⁸ As Westcott and Hort note, at certain points the compact and sometimes awkward syntax occurring in the *ad Marinum* is consistent with the condensing work of an epitomizer.⁹ Less accurate, however, is W. Farmer’s characterization of this writing as fragmentary.¹⁰

An additional question concerns the amount of this abridged work which may have been lost. As noted above, Burgon and Farmer conclude that a significant portion of Eusebius’ work has not survived. This author’s two writings *To Stephanus* are concerned with resolving inconsistencies toward the beginning of the Gospels.¹¹ In his Preface to the *ad Marinum*, the author claims to be “skipping over the middle parts (τὰ μέσα παρελθῶν)” of the Gospels and “proceeding next to the questions that are always being raised by everyone at the end of” these writings. Unclear, however, is whether the “skipping” is being done by the original author or by the later condenser of this material. Burgon and Farmer seem to infer that the epitomizer has omitted

volumes edited by Mai, or in volume 22 of Migne’s *Patrologia graeca*. A more detailed study of the whole of the *ad Marinum* in its own cultural and apologetic context is also beyond the scope of this investigation. On this genre as a whole, see G. Bardy, *La littérature patristique des «QUAESTIONES ET RESPONSIONES» sur l’Écriture Sainte*, RB 41 (1932) 211–236, 341–369, 515–537; 42 (1933) 14–30, 211–229, 328–352; C. Curti, *Art. Quaestiones et Responsiones on Holy Scripture*, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* 2 (1992) 727–728.

⁸ So Burgon, *Verses* (see n. 6), 30–31; Westcott/Hort, *New Testament* (see n. 6), 2,30–31 (the surviving extracts “are extant in a condensed form,” 31); Farmer, *Verses* (see n. 6), 3. Aware of the redactional influences that may have shaped such an epitome, Burgon also offers that it “may reasonably be doubted” that the first question-and-answer section “came [exactly] from the pen of Eusebius” (*Verses* [see n. 6], 42–43). Moreover, “in some instances *amputation* would probably be a more fitting description of what has taken place” (43). Somewhat curiously, however, Burgon expresses confidence that a complete copy of this lost work by Eusebius, once discovered, will not “exhibit anything essentially different from what is contained in” the first section (44).

⁹ Westcott/Hort, *New Testament* (see n. 6), 2,31–32. Examples are listed in the notes to the English translation offered below (see nn. 16 and 22).

¹⁰ Farmer typically refers to this writing as “the Mai fragments” (*Verses* [see n. 6], 3). For example, he infers, “... the four questions in the text published by Mai represent only a small selection from the latter portion of a much larger work” (3). The designation of this writing as “fragments” is not apt for describing the extended arguments offered in response to the questions raised in the writing. In short, there is a significant difference between an epitome, on the one hand, and isolated “fragments,” on the other.

¹¹ The sixteen questions addressed in the *ad Stephanum* focus on the birth narratives of Matthew and Luke and especially on interpreting the genealogies (Matt 1,2–17, Lk 3,23–38). For the Greek text of the epitome of the two writings addressed *ad Stephanum*, see Mai, *bibliothecae* (see n. 4), 4,219–254 = PG 22,879–936.

numerous answers to perplexities among the middle parts of the Gospels. If, as is perhaps more likely, the original author chose to address only issues stemming from the opening and concluding pericopes of the NT Gospels, then no significant portion of the work(s) would necessarily have been lost. Nonetheless, since Jerome's letter (discussed below) knows of twelve questions, the original content of the *ad Marinum* must remain an open question. Despite the many uncertainties concerning the authorship, origin and original content of the *ad Marinum*, there is much to be learned from a close examination of its opening sections.

III. Text and Translation

The Greek text reproduced here is the revised text published by Mai in 1847. Certain differences between Mai's 1847 text and that of his 1825 edition, as well as that subsequently published in J.-P. Migne's *Patrologia graeca*, are discussed in the notes. The rather sparse enumeration offered here for individual sections of the *ad Marinum* corresponds to Mai's edition, and the translation of the *ad Marinum* I–II.1 is my own.¹² The writer offers this translation and critical discussion of parts of the *ad Marinum* in the hope that they will lead to further study of this important text.

Τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις εὐαγγελίοις¹³
περὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπορουμένων ζητημάτων
καὶ λύσεων, δύο πεπονηκῶς ἤδη πρότερον
συγγράμματα,¹⁴ πάρεμι νῦν, τὰ μέσα παρ-

Having already formerly labored over
two compositions made up of perplexing
questions in the divinely-inspired Gospels
near the beginning and [their] resolutions,¹⁵

¹² Words supplied in the translation which do not have explicit equivalents in Greek are placed in brackets []. The reason for offering a translation of only the initial sections of this writing, which constitute approximately one-fourth of the *ad Marinum*, is twofold. First, the writing is too long to be translated and analyzed in a single article. Second, only Part I of the *ad Marinum* discusses the Longer Ending in any detail. Part II.1 is also included here because its contents contribute to the sorting out of the contrasting attitudes toward the Longer Ending reflected in Part I. The remainder of Part II and Parts III and IV of the *ad Marinum* do not bear directly upon this discussion. The rest of Part II develops similar arguments concerning the compatibility of the chronologies of Matthew 28 and John 20 that do not bear on the ending of Mark (see further n. 62). Part III, like Part II, discusses the timing of Jesus' appearance in Matthew and John and compares when "the Magdalene and the other Mary" touched Jesus' feet (Matt 28,9) and when Jesus told Mary Magdalene not to touch him (John 20,17). Part IV (περὶ τοῦ τάφου καὶ τῆς δοκούσης διαφωνίας) seeks to rectify an apparent contradiction in the timing of Jesus' burial.

¹³ Θεοπνεύστοις εὐαγγελίοις: cf. 2Tim 3,16: πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος ...

¹⁴ Mai's editions (1825 and 1847) read συγγράμματα rather than συγγράμματα. This apparent mistake either on the part of Mai or by a copyist of the MS is corrected in PG 22,957.

¹⁵ This translation begins with the participle πεπονηκῶς and construes Τῶν ... ἀπορουμένων ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων as dependent upon δύο ... συγγράμματα. Moreover, ἐν τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις εὐαγγελίοις περὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν modifies ζητημάτων but not λύσεων. The ques-

ελθών, ἔπειτα πρὸς τῶ τέλει τῶν αὐτῶν πάντοτε τοῖς πᾶσι ζητούμενα· τάχα που τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῆς διὰ τῶν σῶν ἐπιταγμάτων ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἡμᾶς παρορησάσης, Μαρῖνε υἱὲ τιμιώτατέ μοι καὶ φιλοπονώτατε· ἠρώτας δὲ τὸ πρῶτον·

I. Πῶς παρὰ μὲν τῶ Ματθαίῳ ὁπὲ σαββάτων φαίνεται ἐγηγεμένους ὁ σωτήρ, παρὰ δὲ τῶ Μάρκῳ πρῶτῃ τῆ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων;

α'. Τοῦτου διττῆ ἂν εἴη ἡ λύσις· ὁ μὲν γὰρ (τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ) τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικοπὴν ἀθετῶν,¹⁶ εἴποι ἂν μὴ ἐν ᾧ αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκου εὐαγγελίου· τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων τὸ τέλος περιγράφει τῆς κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἱστορίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὀφθέντος νεανίσκου ταῖς γυναῖξιν καὶ εἰρηκότους αὐταῖς «μὴ φοβεῖσθε, Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν ναζαρηνόν» καὶ τοῖς ἐξῆς, οἷς ἐπιλέγει· «καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.»

I am now, skipping over the middle parts, proceeding next to the questions that are always being raised by everyone at the end of the same texts. [I do so] without much delay since the will of God spurs us on to this through your commands, Marinus, my most honored and most industrious son. You asked first,

I. How is it that in Matthew the Savior, after having been raised, appears “late on the Sabbath”¹⁷ but in Mark “early on the first day of the week”?¹⁸

1. The solution to this might be twofold. For, on the one hand, the one who rejects the passage itself, [namely] the pericope which says this, might say that it does not appear in all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark. At any rate, the accurate ones of the copies define the end of the history according to Mark with the words of the young man who appeared to the women and said to them, “Do not fear. You are seeking Jesus the Nazarene”¹⁹ and the [words] that follow. In addition to these, it

tions arise from the opening portions of the Gospels, and the two works addressed *ad Stephanum* (mentioned above in this article [see n. 11]) provide the resolutions.

¹⁶ Westcott/Hort explain the compact and somewhat redundant syntax of ὁ μὲν γὰρ (τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ) τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικοπὴν ἀθετῶν as the work of a later epitomizer who brought similar parts of this writing together: “Some slight roughnesses in the Greek of this passage are evidently due to condensation. Thus the duplicate phrases in the apposition, τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ and τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικοπὴν ..., may very possibly have been brought together from different sentences” (New Testament [see n. 6], 2,31). Less helpful is Burgon, who rejects τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικοπὴν as “probably a gloss, explanatory of τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ” (Verses [see n. 6], 45 note r).

¹⁷ The adverb ὁπὲ usually means “after a long time” or “late.” It is to be differentiated from πρῶτῃ, and thus Matt 28,1 would be construed as “late on the Sabbath.” A dubious, yet common, rendering of ὁπὲ in Matt 28,1, which may reflect an underlying desire to harmonize Matt 28,1 with Mark 16,2, is as an improper preposition meaning “after” (BAGD, 601; cf. LSJ, 1282). See further the persuasive critique and analysis by T. W. Martin, *Time and Money in Translation: A Comparison of the Revised Standard Version and the New Revised Standard Version*, BR 38 (1993) 55–73, here: 67–69.

¹⁸ The question compares the *whole* of Mark 16 and includes elements of *both* Mark 16,2 and 16,9. Πρῶτῃ τῆ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων is an exact citation of Mark 16,2 rather than Mark 16,9 (πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββάτου). Yet the words φαίνεται ἐγηγεμένους seem to have been drawn from Mark’s Longer Ending (cf. ἐφάνη, Mark 16,9; ἐγηγεμένους, Mark 16,14).

¹⁹ This citation of Mark 16,6 (μὴ φοβεῖσθε, Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν ναζαρηνόν) reflects assimilation to Matt 28,5 (μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς, οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε).

Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου περιγράφεται τὸ τέλος· τὰ δὲ ἕξῃς σπανίως ἐν τισιν ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι²² φερόμενα περιττὰ ἂν εἶη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ· ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἴποι ἂν τις παραιτούμενος καὶ πάντη ἀναιρῶν περιττὸν ἐρώτημα.

Ἄλλος δὲ τις οὐδ' ὅτι οὖν²³ τομῶν ἀθετεῖν τῶν ὀπωσοῦν ἐν τῇ τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφῇ φερομένων, διπλῆν εἶναι φησὶ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλοῖς, ἑκατέραν τε παραδεκτέαν ὑπάρχειν, τῷ μὴ μᾶλλον²⁴

says,²⁰ “And having heard [this] they fled, and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.”²¹

For in this way the ending of the Gospel according to Mark is defined in nearly all the copies. The things that appear next, seldom [and] in some but not in all [of the copies], may be spurious, especially since²⁵ it implies²⁶ a contradiction to the testimony of the rest of the evangelists. This then [is what] someone might say to avoid and completely do away with²⁷ a superfluous question.

On the other hand, someone else, who dares to set aside nothing whatsoever of the things which appear, by whatever means,²⁸ in the text of the Gospels,²⁹ says that the reading is double,³⁰ as also in many other

Cf. Mark 16,6: μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦς ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἔσταυρωμένον. This and numerous other Gospel citations in the *ad Marinum* give rise to the question whether this author may have been influenced by a harmony of the Gospels or by one or more Gospel MSS which had been edited with a harmonizing principle.

²⁰ Note the shift in subject. The νεανίσκος is the subject of εἰρηκότος, while the Gospel of Mark is the implied subject of ἐπιλέγει.

²¹ The reading καὶ ἀκούσασσι ἔφυγον agrees with Codex Freerianus (W, 032), (099), and some Syriac MSS (sy^{sp. hmg}). Cf. the Nestle-Aland²⁷ text of Mark 16,8: καὶ ἐξεληθοῦσαι ἔφυγον κτλ.

²² On the possible changes by an epitomizer to the syntax of both περιγράφεται τὸ τέλος and σπανίως ἐν τισιν ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι, see Westcott/Hort, *New Testament* (see n. 6), 2,31.

²³ Ὅτι οὖν: neut. of ὅστις οὖν (“anything whatsoever”), negated by οὐδ'. Mai's 1847 edition, but not his 1825 edition or PG 22,957, contains an apparent misprint: ὅτι οὖν.

²⁴ Mai indicates that the codex reads ἄλλον.

²⁵ There is an element of ambiguity in the translation of εἴπερ, which can mean “if,” “if indeed” or “since.” The last of these is most apt for the passage above because the author seems to have conceded the fact of the contradiction and intended the meaning “since.”

²⁶ On the translation of ἔχοιεν, see LSJ s. v. ἔχω, A. Trans. I. 4.

²⁷ Note the hendiadys in παραιτούμενος καὶ πάντη ἀναιρῶν. The participle παραιτούμενος is construed as expressing purpose (LSJ II.2.a).

²⁸ The adverb ὀπωσοῦν could also be construed as meaning “ever so little,” “ever so seldom,” or even “however seldom.” In the above context it could refer either to the brevity of Mark 16,9–20 as compared with the length of the Second Gospel or, more likely, to the means by which the Longer Ending may have come to be associated with the Gospel of Mark. That is to say, “someone else” would never consider setting aside a passage like Mark 16,9–20, regardless of whether Mark wrote it and, moreover, of how it came to be added to the Second Gospel.

²⁹ Lit.: “the Scripture of the Gospels.”

³⁰ Note the change from the optative mood above (εἴποι) to the indicative mood (φησὶ) in the second explanation. Διπλήν: i. e., there are two readings.

ταύτην ἐκείνης, ἢ ἐκείνην ταύτης, παρὰ τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ εὐλαβέσιν ἐγκρίνεσθαι.

β'. Καὶ δὴ τοῦδε τοῦ μέρους συγχωρουμένου εἶναι ἀληθοῦς, προσήκει τὸν νοῦν διερμηνεύειν τοῦ ἀναγνώσματος· εἰ γοῦν διέλοιμεν³¹ τὴν τοῦ λόγου διάνοιαν, οὐκ ἂν εὗροιμεν αὐτὴν ἐναντίαν τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Ματθαίου ὁψὲ σαββάτων ἐγηγέρθαι τὸν σωτήρα λελεγμένοις· τὸ γὰρ «ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωτὶ τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ σαββάτου³²» κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον, μετὰ διαστολῆς ἀναγνωσόμεθα· καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστὰς δὲ, ὑποστήσομεν καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀφορίσομεν τῶν ἐξῆς ἐπιλεγόμενων· εἶτα τὸ μὲν ἀναστὰς ἂν, ἐπὶ τὴν παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ ὁψὲ σαββάτων· τότε γὰρ ἐγήγερτο· τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς ἐτέρας ὄν³³ διανοίας ὑποστατικόν, συνάψωμεν τοῖς ἐπιλεγόμενοις· πρωτὶ γὰρ τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ σαββάτου ἐφάνη Μαρίᾳ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς.³⁴

τοῦτο γοῦν ἐδήλωσε καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης πρωτὶ καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ σαββάτου ὄφθαι αὐτὸν τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς μαρτυρήσας· οὕτως οὖν καὶ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ πρωτὶ ἐφάνη αὐτῇ· οὐ πρωτὶ ἀναστὰς, ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρότερον

[cases], and [that] each of the two [readings] must be accepted in that [they both] are approved in the opinion of the faithful and pious, not this [reading] rather than that, or that [reading] rather than this.

2. And what is more, since it is granted that this part is true, it is appropriate to interpret the sense of the passage. If then we should determine the meaning of the expression, we would not find it³⁵ [to be] contrary to the things spoken by Matthew, [that] “late on the Sabbath” the Savior was raised. For the [passage], “and having risen early on the first day of the week” according to Mark we will read with a pause: after the “and having risen” we will insert a comma. And we will separate the meaning of the [words] that are read afterward. Thus, on the one hand, we may read³⁶ the [expression] “having risen” with reference to the [meaning³⁷ found] in Matthew, “late on the Sabbath.” For that is when he was raised. On the other hand, we could [also] join³⁸ what follows, which gives rise to³⁹ a different meaning, with the [words] that are read afterward: for “early on the first day of the week he appeared to Mary Magdalene.”

At any rate, John has also made this clear, and has himself testified that “early on the first day of the week” [Christ] appeared to the Magdalene. In this manner, therefore, also in Mark he appeared “early” to her. It

³¹ Διέλοιμεν: following the conjecture of Migne (PG 22,940). Mai’s 1825 and 1847 editions read διελόμην (first person singular, middle voice) rather than διέλοιμεν (first person plural, active voice).

³² Note the conflation of Mark 16,2 (καὶ λίαν πρωτὶ τῆς μιᾶς τῶν σαββάτων) and Mark 16,9 (ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωτὶ πρώτῃ σαββάτου).

³³ It appears that ὄν is a mistake for ὄν.

³⁴ Note the omission of the adverb πρώτον in the above citation of Mark 16,9. Note also the distinction made between the two parts of Mark 16,9a (respectively, ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωτὶ τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ σαββάτου and πρωτὶ γὰρ τῆς μιᾶς τοῦ σαββάτου ἐφάνη Μαρίᾳ τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς).

³⁵ Αὐτὴν, referring to τὴν ... διάνοιαν (“meaning”).

³⁶ Cf. ἀναγνωσόμεθα above.

³⁷ The definite article in ἐπὶ τὴν refers to τὴν διάνοιαν above.

³⁸ Construing ἂν ... συνάψωμεν as a conditional subjunctive.

³⁹ On ὑποστατικόν see LSJ s. v. ὑποστατικός, II.2.

κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ὁψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου· τότε γὰρ ἀναστὰς ἐφάνη τῇ Μαρίᾳ, οὐ τότε ἀλλὰ πρωΐ· ὡς παρίστασθαι ἐν τούτοις καιροῦς δύο· τὸν μὲν γὰρ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τὸν ὁψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου· τὸν δὲ τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐπιφανείας, τὸν πρωΐ, ὃν ἔγραψεν ὁ Μάρκος εἰπὼν (ὃ καὶ μετὰ διαστολῆς ἀγνωστέον) ἀναστὰς δέ· εἶτα ὑποστίζαντες, τὸ ἐξῆς ῥητέον, πρωΐ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου ἐφάνη Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια.⁴⁰

II. Πῶς κατὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ὁψὲ σαββάτων ἢ Μαγδαληνῇ τεθεαμένη τὴν ἀνάστασιν, κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἢ αὐτῇ ἐστῶσα κλαίει παρὰ τῷ μνημείῳ τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου;

α'. Οὐδὲν ἂν ζητηθεῖ κατὰ τοὺς τόπους, εἰ τὸ ὁψὲ σαββάτων μὴ τὴν ἐσπερινὴν ὥραν τὴν μετὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου λέγεσθαι ὑπολάβοιμεν, ὡς τινες ὑπειλήφασιν, ἀλλὰ τὸ βραδὺ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς νυκτὸς τῆς μετὰ τὸ σάββατον.⁴⁴ οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς ὥρας εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, καὶ ὁψὲ τοῦ καιροῦ, καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς χρείας· οὐ τὴν ἐσπέραν δηλοῦντες, οὐδὲ τὸν μετὰ ἡλίου δυσμὰς χρόνον, τὸ δὲ σφόδρα βράδιον τούτῳ

is not [that] he “rose early” but much earlier, according to Matthew, “late on the Sabbath.” For, “having risen” at that time, he appeared to Mary, not at that time,⁴¹ but “early.” The consequence is that⁴² two points in time are presented in these [pericopes], for the one⁴³ [is the time] of the resurrection, which was “late on the Sabbath.” The other [is the time] of the manifestation of the Savior, which was “early.” Mark wrote [about the later time] when he said that which must be read with a pause, “and having risen.” Then, after having inserted a comma, one must read what follows, “early on the first day of the week he appeared to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons.”

II. How is it that according to Matthew the Magdalene saw the resurrection “late on the Sabbath,” [but] according to John she cried while standing at the tomb “on the first day of the week?”

1. Nothing would be disputed about these passages, if we would understand the [expression] “late on the Sabbath” to designate, not the evening hour which is after the day of the Sabbath,⁴⁵ as some have understood [it], but a point advanced and ‘late’ in the night which is after the Sabbath. For in this way also we are accustomed to say ‘late in the hour’ and ‘late in the season’ and ‘[too] late in the time of need.’ We are not signify-

⁴⁰ Cf. Mark 16,9b: Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια. The above reading (ἀφ' ἧς) agrees with Lk 8,2b (Μαρίᾳ ... Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει), as well as numerous witnesses to Mark 16,9 (e. g., A C³ Σ Ψ f^{1.13}).

⁴¹ I. e., at the same time as he had risen. Both instances of the adverb τότε refer to the same point in time, namely “late on the Sabbath” (Matt 28,1).

⁴² Construing ὡς ... δύο as a consecutive clause (Smyth § 3000).

⁴³ The accusative case of τόν is governed by καιροῦς δύο.

⁴⁴ Farmer (Verses [see n. 6], 5) gathered into a single paragraph Burgon's (Verses [see n. 6], 46–47) partial and fragmentary translation. Farmer's reproduction, however, does not indicate that Burgon omits the lines after the end of the last sentence (βραδὺ καὶ ὁψὲ τῆς νυκτὸς τῆς μετὰ τὸ σάββατον) and begins again below with ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν σχεδὸν νοεῖσθαι καιρὸν ... Farmer also does not seem to be aware that Burgon's translation ends with ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῦσι χρόνον διαφόροις ῥήμασι, omitting the last lines of Part II.1.

⁴⁵ That is, Saturday evening. Note the contrast between the evening of Saturday (μὴ τὴν ἐσπερινὴν ὥραν τὴν μετὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ σαββάτου) and late during the night between Saturday and Sunday (ὁψὲ τῆς νυκτὸς τῆς μετὰ τὸ σάββατον).

σημαίνοντες τῷ τρόπῳ· ὅθεν ὡσπερ διερμηνεύων αὐτὸς ἑαυτὸν ὁ Ματθαῖος μετὰ τὸ ὀψὲ σαββάτων, ἐπήγαγε τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ· φησί⁴⁸ δηλαδὴ ὥρα τῇ λοιπὸν⁴⁹ ἤδη ὑποφαινούσῃ καὶ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν,⁵⁰ ἣτις ἦν ὀψὲ καὶ πόρρω λοιπὸν ἐλαύνουσα τῶν σαββάτων· λέλεκται δὲ ὀψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου παρὰ τοῦ ἐρμηνεύσαντος τὴν γραφήν·⁵¹ ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ματθαῖος ἐβραΐδι γλώττῃ παρέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν φωνὴν μεταβαλὼν αὐτὸ, τὴν ἐπιφωσκούσαν ὥραν εἰς τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, ὀψὲ σαββάτων προσεῖπεν· ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν σχεδὸν νοεῖσθαι καιρὸν, ἢ τὸν σφόδρα ἐγγύς, παρὰ τοῖς εὐαγγελιστοῖς διαφόροις ὀνόμασι⁵² τετηρημένον· μηδὲν τε διαφέρειν Ματθαῖον εἰρηκότα «ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων ἦλθε Μαρία⁵³ ἢ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρησαὶ τὸν τάφον» Ἰωάννου φήσαντος

ing the evening or the twilight.⁴⁶ Rather, we are indicating in this manner [something] much later. Accordingly, Matthew, as though he himself were interpreting himself, added “at the lighting up” after⁴⁷ the [expression] “late on the Sabbath.” He clearly speaks with reference to the hour which was then already glimmering and “lighting up” of the Lord’s day. This hour was “late” and was then far advanced into the Sabbath. “Late on the Sabbath” is to be read by the one who interprets the scripture. For the evangelist Matthew handed down the Gospel in the Hebrew language, and the one who translated it into the Greek language⁵⁴ called the hour “lighting up” of the Lord’s day “late on the Sabbath.” As a result, nearly the same time, or a [time] very close, was intended by the evangelists,⁵⁵ although it was preserved in different words. Further, Matthew differs in no way from John, since the former says,

⁴⁶ Lit.: “the [time] after the setting of the sun.”

⁴⁷ Cf. Matt 28,1 (ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων κτλ.), where τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ follows ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων.

⁴⁸ I construe δηλαδὴ as an adverb modifying φησί and have thus altered Mai’s punctuation from ἐπήγαγε τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ φησί· δηλαδὴ το ἐπήγαγε τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ· φησί δηλαδὴ.

⁴⁹ The two occurrences of λοιπὸν in this sentence appear in contexts referring to a future point in time (cf. the third definition for λοιπός in LSJ, 477). Both are left untranslated because an English equivalent would make both phrases overly redundant.

⁵⁰ Presumably following the codex, Mai punctuates this phrase with a comma after ὑποφαινούσῃ (ὑποφαινούσῃ, καὶ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς τὴν κυριακὴν ἡμέραν) but does not include one in his Latin translation (*suberat atque illucescebat in diem dominicum*). I have removed this comma from the Greek text above and translated ὑποφαινούσῃ καὶ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ as part of the same phrase.

⁵¹ Mai’s Latin translation is quite different at this point: *Id vero tempus a scripturae evangelicae interprete sero sabbati appellatum est* (“In truth this time is pronounced by the interpreter of the gospel scripture [as] ‘late on the Sabbath.’”).

⁵² Lit.: “with different names.” Cf. διαφόροις ῥήμασι later in II.1.

⁵³ Compare with Matt 28,1: ... ἦλθεν Μαριάμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρησαὶ τὸν τάφον. The Nestle-Aland²⁷ lists no variant reading corresponding to ἦλθε. In addition, Μαρία agrees with A D Q¹.¹³ and the Textus Receptus.

⁵⁴ Cf. Eusebius, h. e. III 39,16 summarizing Papias: “Matthew collected (συντάσσω) the oracles in the Hebrew language (διάλεκτος), and each person interpreted (ἐρμηνεύω) them as he was able.” See also below in the *ad Marinum*, where the author of the Fourth Gospel is referred to as an interpreter of Matthew (ὁ διερμηνεύων κτλ.).

⁵⁵ That is, the evangelists Matthew and John.

«τῆ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ πρῶτῃ εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἔτι οὕσης σκοτίας.» πλατυκῶς γὰρ ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δηλοῦσι.⁵⁶ χρόνον διαφόροις ῥήμασι· ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος ὀψέ, ἀντὶ τοῦ βράδιον· καὶ ὀψέ τῆς νυκτὸς ὀνομάσας πρῶτῃ, ὁ διερμηνεύων⁵⁷ ἐπήγαγε τὸ σκοτίας οὕσης,⁵⁸ ἵνα μὴ τις τὸν ὀρθρον λέγειν αὐτὸν ὑπολάβοι· ὡς καὶ ὁ Ματθαῖος τῶ ὀψέ σαββάτων, ἵνα μὴ τὴν ἑσπερινὴν ὥραν νομίσειε τις λέγεσθαι, προσέθηκε τὸ τῆ ἐπιφωσκούση εἰς μίαν σαββάτων· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀκριβῶς οὗτος σαββάτου εἶπεν τὴν ὀψίαν, μὴ τις τὴν ἑσπέραν ὑπολάβοι λέγεσθαι τὴν μετὰ ἡλίου δυσμὰς, ἀλλὰ σαββάτων φησὶν ὀψέ.

“Late on the Sabbath, at the lighting up of the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the tomb,” and the latter, “On the first day of the week Mary Magdalene came early to the tomb while it was still dark.” For, broadly speaking, they signify one and the same time in different words. For Matthew [wrote] “late” instead of later. And [John], who interprets [Matthew], called late in the night “early” and added the [expression] “while it was still dark,” lest someone should suppose that he referred to the dawn. So also Matthew [28,1] added the [expression] “at the lighting up of the first day of the week” to “late on the Sabbath,” lest someone should think that the evening hour was meant. Since this [evangelist] also spoke precisely about the evening of the Sabbath, no one should suppose that twilight is meant; he says rather, “late on the Sabbath.”

IV. Biblical Interpretation in the *ad Marinum*

The first question of the *ad Marinum* discusses a possible contradiction between the chronologies of Matt 28 and Mark 16. A brief review of certain terms occurring in Matt 28,1, Mark 16,2, Mark 16,9 and John 20,1 helps one to recognize the points at which this author refers, oftentimes in passing and with abbreviated citation(s), to one or more of these verses.

ὀψέ δὲ σαββάτων τῆ ἐπιφωσκούση εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, ἦλθεν Μαριάμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον.

Late on the Sabbath, at the lighting up of the first day of the week, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to behold the tomb. (Matt 28,1)

καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν. καὶ λίαν πρῶτῃ τῆ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου.

And after the Sabbath had passed, Mary Magdalene, Mary the [mother] of James and Salome bought spices in order that they might come and anoint him. And very *early* on the first day of the week they came to the tomb after the sun had risen. (Mark 16,1–2)

⁵⁶ Mai indicates that the codex reads δηλοῦν.

⁵⁷ Note the anacoluthon: after ὁ μὲν Ματθαῖος one would expect ὁ δὲ διερμηνεύων.

⁵⁸ Apparently referring to John 20,1 (Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρῶτῃ σκοτίας ἔτι οὕσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον). The argument seems to presuppose that Matthew was a source interpreted by the author of the Fourth Gospel.

ἀναστὰς δὲ πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρία τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ’ ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια.

And *having risen early* on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. (Mark 16,9)

τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρῶτῃ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου.

On the first day of the week Mary Magdalene came *early* while it was still dark to the tomb and saw that the stone had been taken away from the tomb. (John 20,1)

Among the terms highlighted above are those in Matthew and Mark to which the author of the *ad Marinum* refers repeatedly. In Matthew’s account, ὄψε ... σαββάτων (“late on the Sabbath”) designates a point in time late in the night on Saturday. With λίαν πρῶτῃ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (“very early on the first day of the week”), Mark had placed the beginning of his pericope somewhat later, namely on Sunday morning.⁵⁹ Thus, the chronology to be reconciled concerns the disparity between Matthew (Saturday evening: ὄψε) and Mark (Sunday morning: πρῶτῃ).

Two strikingly *different* – and, it may be added, logically incompatible – solutions are offered in response to the first question. The first answer maintains that, since the “accurate” copies of Mark end at Mark 16,8, the difficulty is resolved by omitting Mark 16,9–20 from the Second Gospel. The Longer Ending appears only “scarcely (σπανίως)” in certain copies of the “history (ἱστορία)” or “Gospel (εὐαγγέλιον)” according to Mark. The spurious passage may thus be dispensed with, especially in the case that it should contradict another Gospel like Matthew.

Differently from the first, the second answer to this first question maintains that, whereas Matthew refers to the timing of the resurrection, “Mark”⁶⁰ describes an appearance subsequent to the resurrection. This latter argument hinges on the occurrences of the adverb πρῶτῃ in Mark 16,2 (λίαν πρῶτῃ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται) and in 16,9 (ἀναστὰς δὲ πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη). Mark 16,2, like Matt 28,1, refers to the point at which the women visited Jesus’ tomb. The opening verse of the Longer Ending, however, relates the timing of both Jesus’ resurrection and his post-resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene (Mark 16,9). This solution ignores the occurrence of πρῶτῃ in Mark 16,2 and focuses instead on the one in Mark 16,9.⁶¹ Matthew, then,

⁵⁹ In the above discussion I assume the chronological priority of Mark. Lk 24,1 (τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ μνημα ἦλθον φέρουσαι ἃ ἠτοίμασαν ἀρώματα) and John 20,1 (cited above) agree with the timing of Mark. Among the NT Gospels, then, the chronology of Matt 28,1 (cited above) is distinctive. In his own day, Matthew could, and did, revise Mark as he saw fit. The distinctive terminology in Matthew would probably not have posed a problem until after the NT Gospels had been collected and compared with one another.

⁶⁰ That is, Mark 16,1–20 (both vv. 1–8 and vv. 9–20).

⁶¹ With Westcott/Hort, who note that Mark 16,9 is “incorrectly combined with” Mark 16,2 (New Testament [see n. 6], 2,31).

can be said to designate the timing of the resurrection “late” on Saturday evening, while Mark places the appearance to Mary “early” on Sunday morning. Recognizing the many similarities between the appearances of Jesus to Mary Magdalene in Mark 16,9–11 and John 20,11–18, moreover, the author observes correctly that John 20,11 (τῆ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ... πρωΐ) agrees with the timing of Mark. Thus the author may conclude that, since the two time designations (καίρου δύο) in Matthew and Mark refer to different events, they pose no contradiction.

Part II.1 of the *ad Marinum* addresses a related question of chronology in the post-resurrection narratives of Matt 28 and John 20. Having argued that Matthew and Mark refer to different points in time (Part I, answer two), the author seeks to explain how the accounts of Matthew and John relate to one another. In particular, he attempts to clarify the timing of Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene in Matt 28,1 (discussed in Part I, ὄψε σαββάτων) and in John 20,1 (τῆ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου). The solution to this second question maintains that Matthew's designation (“late on the Sabbath” = Saturday night) does, in fact, correspond to that of John (“on the first day of the week” = Sunday morning). Thus again follows the conclusion that there is no contradiction between the testimony of the NT evangelists.⁶² A critical evaluation of this answer as compared with the two offered in Part I of the *ad Marinum* will be offered in the following two sections of this article.

V. Evaluation of the Claims and Implicit Assumptions of the *ad Marinum*'s Second Answer to Question One

Each of the three answers discussed above — the two answers to question one and the first answer to question two — could by itself lay claim to having ‘resolved’ a single alleged discrepancy between two (or more) biblical passages. There is occasion for pause, however, when one finds them together within the *same* writing, for they are not logically compatible. With regard to the tension within Part I, the two answers to the first question cannot be harmonized: either one rejects the Longer Ending as a part of Mark, or one distinguishes between the timing of Matthew's reference to the resurrection,

⁶² The remainder of Part II of the *ad Marinum* develops, with additional examples and argumentation, this same thesis concerning the compatibility of the chronologies of Matthew 28 and John 20 (Part II.2–3), as well as of the identity of the women (Matthew) or woman (John) who visited the tomb (Part II.4–7). For example, in Part II.2 it is argued that Matthew οὐκ εἶπὼν ἔσπέραν τοῦ σαββάτου, οὐδὲ ὄψε σαββάτου (“did not say the evening of the sabbath but ‘late on the Sabbath’”). Moreover, in Part II.7 an allusion to Mark 16,9 in relation to this latter argument concerning the identity of Mary Magdalene is not pertinent to the text-critical problem of the ending of Mark. As mentioned above (see n. 12), the rest of Part II and Parts III and IV comprise the remaining three-fourths of the *ad Marinum* and are not translated or discussed here because they do not bear directly upon the subject at hand.

on the one hand, and Mark's (and John's) description of the subsequent appearance to Mary, on the other. The author's initial suggestion, then, that these two answers may be complementary – namely, “the solution to this might be twofold (τούτου διττῆ ἄν εἴη ἡ λύσις)” – is simply not tenable.⁶³

Furthermore, equally puzzling is the fact that the second answer to question one *also* stands in contrast to the answer immediately following question two. In the former response, the event related in Matthew (the resurrection) is *prior to* that in Mark (the appearance to Mary), and that in Mark is said to be the *same* as in John.⁶⁴ The first response to question two, however, maintains that Matthew and John depict in complementary ways the *same* timing of the appearance to Mary. Thus, there are at least two conspicuous contradictions in these three answers. As a result, any analysis of a certain part of this writing – for example, of claims concerning the original conclusion to Mark or the textual history of the Longer Ending – must take into account the puzzling elements of the composition as a whole.

Also noteworthy is that the first answer to question one and the answer to question two *are* compatible with one another. Were one to regard the second answer to question one as a later addition to the *ad Marinum*, both of the contradictions noted above could be accounted for. Alternately, one could perhaps posit, as J. Burgon did over a century ago, that the *first* answer to question one reflects an opinion different from that of the author of the *ad Marinum*. Burgon thought that the first answer probably comes from Origen and that the second answer stems from Eusebius himself, who corrected an earlier author like Origen.⁶⁵ Although usually standing in counterpoint to Bur-

⁶³ Against Farmer, who takes the statement at face value (Verses [see n. 6], 6–7). An oft-overlooked problem, moreover, is that many scholars who cite “Eusebius” as a witness either for or against the authenticity of the Longer Ending highlight the answer that is more congenial to their argument without explaining the origin of the other conflicting testimony. Indeed, the ultimate origin of the various pieces of tradition collected in this and other *Quaestiones et Responsiones* constitutes a daunting and promising, yet sadly neglected, area of research.

⁶⁴ According to the second answer to question one, the event related in Matthew would have to be *different* from and prior also to that in John.

⁶⁵ Burgon argued that Eusebius himself had both added and championed the second answer, which implicitly affirms the authenticity of Mark 16,9–20 and, in Burgon's view, may be as old as Origen in the third century C.E. (Verses [see n. 6], 38–69, esp. 38–51). Burgon's interpretation of the *ad Marinum*, moreover, follows two lines. First, Burgon questions whether Eusebius himself actually doubted the authenticity of the Longer Ending and maintains that this church father merely quoted the opinions of others *without* agreeing with them. Second, Burgon argues that other patristic witnesses were dependent upon the *ad Marinum* and, like “Eusebius,” merely quoted a position which was not their own. This line of reasoning apparently comes in response to Tischendorf and Tregelles, who portrayed the first solution as the opinion of Eusebius. Burgon merely suggests the opposite point of view. For a more detailed critique of Burgon's larger argument concerning the authenticity of the Longer Ending, see S. L. Cox, *A History and Critique of*

gon's conclusions, Westcott and Hort agree with him on this source-critical question: they "strongly suspect" that this was the case but note correctly that the source-critical question "cannot be decided."⁶⁶ There is much to be said for Westcott and Hort's cautious and partial agreement with Burgon on this point, for the use of the optative mood for this first answer suggests reservations on the part of the (final) author.

Whereas Burgon explored the different answers to the first question in Part I, W. Farmer has more recently focused on the contradiction between Parts I and II of this writing.⁶⁷ Farmer maintains that "fragment two" (Part II) belongs to Eusebius and that the testimony dealing with the Longer Ending in "fragment one" (Part I) is even older. Although noting the difference between the answers of I.2 and II.1 is an important insight, Farmer offers no reason why Part I should be considered older than Part II.⁶⁸

Of primary concern to this study is the fact that the final – or, perhaps more likely, the original – author was content to offer these three answers in the same writing. Such inconsistencies within the *ad Marinum* justify the inference that its author's main interest lies not, for example, in presenting text-critical observations concerning Mark's Longer Ending. On the contrary, and as the Preface states, his aim here and elsewhere is to offer resolutions to perplexing questions (ἀπορουμένων ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων ... συγγράμματα) stemming from the accounts of the NT Gospels. Accordingly, the writing's primary purpose is *to defend the integrity of scripture*; thus, the author need not insist upon one particular way of responding to the questions.⁶⁹

Scholarship Concerning the Markan Endings, Lewiston 1993, 60–61; M. H. Heuer, An Evaluation of John W. Burgon's Use of Patristic Evidence, *JETS* 38 (1995) 519–530; see also Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1), 17–20.

⁶⁶ That is, proven (Westcott/Hort, *New Testament* [see n. 6], 2,32; so also Williams, *Appendices* [see n. 6], 445).

⁶⁷ As is discussed above, the second answer to question one explains that the event Matthew purportedly relates (i. e., the resurrection) is prior to that in Mark and John (i. e., the appearance to Mary). Farmer refers to the difference between "fragments" one and two but actually compares only Parts I.2 and II. 1 of the *ad Marinum*. As is also mentioned above (see n. 10), Farmer refers to the various Parts of the *ad Marinum* as "the Mai fragments."

⁶⁸ Farmer, *Verses* (see n. 6), 5–6. Building upon the conjecture of a third-century date (that is, before Eusebius) for "fragment one," Farmer suggests that the scribes of Origen's Alexandria probably deleted the Longer Ending from early copies of Mark (59–75). He begins his assessment of the external evidence in Part One with this interpretation of the *ad Marinum* and then proceeds to interpret numerous other patristic witnesses in light of this conjecture. His interpretation of the *ad Marinum* (3–13) is thus crucial to the larger questionable hypothesis that the Longer Ending was deleted by Alexandrian scribes. Since Farmer, like Burgon, offers no credible reason for his dating of the traditions within the *ad Marinum* I.2–II.1, the inferences he draws regarding the Longer Ending's textual history are also not compelling.

⁶⁹ Thus, if there is any overt bias in this testimony concerning the Longer Ending, it lies in the author's having taken part in this apologetic enterprise. Such an undertaking should

It is probably for this reason that this author can write concerning question one that “the solution to this might be twofold.” Although the author himself seems to favor the second answer to question one, whether one accepts the first or the second answer, parts of both solutions or perhaps some other resolution is not of primary concern to him. As long as it is agreed that alleged contradictions are indeed resolved, the author would presumably not care about one’s particular view of the manuscript evidence pertaining to Mark 16,9–20. These issues concerning the witness of certain MSS are discussed in the *ad Marinum* only because they are of possible use in resolving the first question. Had this particular question about Matt 28 and Mark 16 never been a concern, it is likely that the precious information contained in the answer concerning the content of MSS of Mark would not have been preserved here. As is discussed below, the same could also have been true for subsequent Christian writings that seem to know the *ad Marinum*’s statements concerning the end of the Second Gospel.

VI. Text-Critical Implications of the ad Marinum’s Second Answer to Question One

One reason that the harmonizing second answer to the first question could have been deemed necessary is that some people in the early church may not have welcomed the information of the first answer concerning disparate readings in Gospel MSS. The use of the optative mood in the first answer to question one (for example, εἴπτοι), which calls attention to the tentative nature of the suggestion,⁷⁰ might also anticipate the rejoinder that, although a certain question concerning Matt 28 and Mark 16 can be answered on these grounds, other more troubling problems concerning the reliability of the text of the Gospels could be raised by such a response.

A previously unacknowledged point is that this second answer supports an explanation why nearly all of the surviving manuscripts of the Second Gospel include Mark 16,9–20 at some point after 16,8. According to this answer, all readings, even rare ones, should be preserved and esteemed. The implication of this tendency is that one should regard positively “someone else, who does not dare to set aside anything whatsoever of the things which appear, by whatever means, the text of the Gospels.” Such a primary criterion

not necessarily discredit the value of this person’s testimony, for it is highly unlikely that an apologist would have fabricated or highly exaggerated the solution of *ad Marinum* I.1 when other resolutions were possible and arguably less controversial. Alternate solutions could include explaining the apparent discrepancy (cf. answer two to question one) or denying that the contradiction exists (cf. answer one to question two), and could also incorporate an allegorical reading of the text. The issue then is not *that* this person wrote with apologetic motives but *how* he chose to do so.

⁷⁰ Contrast the change to the indicative mood (φησι) in the second answer.

complements the position, criticized above in this article, “that the reading is double” (Part I.1, last paragraph). It also supports the corresponding elaborate program of showing that the various readings do not contradict one another. With recourse to such harmonizing tendencies, the potential danger of perplexing questions is nullified. The author thus advocates that one should not favor a certain passage rather than another as the more accurate account (τῶ μὴ μᾶλλον ταύτην ἐκείνης, ἢ ἐκείνην ταύτης).

Such a harmonizing approach to the manifold character of sacred scripture has obvious implications for the eventual prevalence of Mark 16,9–20 in nearly all MSS of Mark. In contrast to the unusually judicious attitude toward textual evidence in answer one, the blatantly uncritical perspective of answer two reveals something important about the argument for retaining the Longer Ending as a reliable, and presumably original, part of Mark’s Gospel. The criterion assumed here is that, *if a passage like the Longer Ending can be shown to agree with other received texts, its authenticity should not be questioned.*

Elsewhere I have argued that the author of the Longer Ending knew and drew heavily from the four Gospels that eventually were incorporated into the NT, in order to make his addition to Mark resemble these writings that had gained at least some level of acceptance in certain Christian communities.⁷¹ The author of this Markan ending wrote around 120–150 C. E. after the collection of the NT Gospels and before Justin Martyr’s *First Apology*.⁷² Around the middle of the second century, then, at least one copy of the Second Gospel ended with Mark 16,9–20. Assuming that the earliest recoverable ending to Mark is ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ (16,8), the addition of the Longer Ending must, at least initially and perhaps for some decades, have constituted a minority reading. Certain rather distinctive features of Mark 16,9–20 notwithstanding,⁷³ many parts of the passage clearly resemble other passages of the NT Gospels. The similarities of the Longer Ending to other esteemed writings would thus make it *impossible* for someone with the perspective of the second answer to raise doubts concerning the Longer Ending’s authenticity. If the hermeneutic of harmonization of this second answer were later applied to this

⁷¹ Compare, e. g., Lk 8,2b with Mark 16,9b; Mark 6,12 and Lk 9,6 with Mark 16,20a, and see Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1) 48–156.

⁷² See Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1), esp. 169–177. The *terminus post quem* for Mark 16,9–20 is set by this author’s use of material from the four NT Gospels, which were probably not collected before ca. 110–120 C. E. The *terminus ante quem* is established by Justin Martyr’s knowledge of Mark 16,20a in *Apol.* I 45,5 (cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III 10,5, citing Mark 16,19).

⁷³ Some of the more distinctive elements of this passage, namely the expectation that ordinary believers will perform miracles (σημεῖα, vv. 17a, 20), including the picking up of snakes (v. 18a) and the ability to survive the drinking of a deadly substance with impunity (v. 18b), are discussed in Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1), 245–472.

minority reading, there would be a significant impetus for, as eventually did occur, adding this passage to many other manuscripts of Mark that previously had not contained the Longer Ending. If it is also granted that the perspective of answer two was far from unique in the early centuries of Christendom, it can be inferred that over time such an attitude contributed to the evolution of a minority reading into the majority of witnesses.

Scholars have long known, as J. Burgon put it, that the early church fathers were “but very children in the Science of Textual Criticism.”⁷⁴ The naiveté with which ‘text-critical’ problems were sometimes dismissed is perhaps nowhere stated more bluntly in all of early Christian literature than in the *ad Marinum*: if one is able to harmonize two passages like Matt 28 and Mark 16, it is appropriate, and even preferable, to ignore manuscript evidence questioning the authenticity of one of the passages. This criterion as reflected in the *ad Marinum* may also shed light on the eventual prevalence of other secondary expansions like the “Shorter Ending” of Mark found, for example, in Codex Bobbiensis (it^k),⁷⁵ as well as of passages like John 7,53–8,11, John 21,1–25 and perhaps also Romans 16. As is evidenced by the interpolation between Mark 16,14 and 16,15 in Codex Freerianus (W, 0,32), the Longer Ending itself was not immune to expansion by a later author.⁷⁶ Indeed, if the manuscript evidence presented in the first answer were regarded as immaterial by those who affirmed the second answer, there would conceivably be no limit to the types of additions, corrections and alterations that could be introduced to esteemed early Christian writings, especially if such changes were made in order to resolve perplexities arising from a comparison of these same writings with one another.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Burgon, *Verses* (see n. 6), 49. As noted above, Burgon makes the dubious suggestion that the testimony of *ad Marinum* I.a concerning Mark 16,9–20 thus cannot be reliable.

⁷⁵ The Shorter Ending of Mark may be translated as follows: “And all that had been commanded them they told briefly (or: promptly; Gk.: συντόμως) to those around Peter. And afterward Jesus himself sent out through them, from east to west, the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation.”

⁷⁶ After the Longer Ending was written, and apparently before the time of Jerome in the early-fifth century (Jerome, c. Pelag. II 15), the author of the interpolation known as the Freer-Logion placed into the mouths of Jesus and the disciples the following exchange, which occurs between Mark 16,14 and 16,15: “And they replied, saying, ‘This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who by means of evil spirits does not permit the true power of God to be apprehended; therefore reveal your righteousness now.’ They were speaking to Christ, and Christ said to them in reply, ‘The limit of the years of the authority of Satan has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near, even for the sinners on whose behalf I was delivered up to death, that they might turn to the truth and sin no more, in order that they might inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven’” (English translation: V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, London 1957, 614–615).

VII. *The End of Mark: The ad Marinum and Analogous Claims in Early and Medieval Christian Writings*

Despite the primary concerns of the author of the *ad Marinum*, Westcott and Hort are correct to note that the first answer given in Part I has “an independent value.”⁷⁸ This answer, moreover, merits study in relation to statements made by subsequent Christian authors. Assessing the value and legacy of this testimony is the subject of this section. The position to be argued here is that the *ad Marinum*'s first answer to question one concerning the state of the Markan MSS was both credible and, to a certain extent, verifiable at the time this author wrote in the fourth century or earlier. In addition, statements concerning the end of Mark like those in the *ad Marinum* occur in a number of later Christian writings. It thus remains to consider the *ad Marinum*'s testimony concerning the conclusion of Mark in relation to analogous statements made by other Christian authors and scribes.

According to the *ad Marinum*, the person who rejects Mark 16,9–20 would do so because the passage does not appear in most and in the most accurate copies of the Second Gospel. In particular, the more reliable MSS of Mark end at Mark 16,8:

... the one who rejects (ὁ ... ἀθετῶν) the passage itself, [namely] the pericope which says this, might say that it does not appear in all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark. At any rate, the accurate ones of the copies (τὰ ... ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων) define the end of the history according to Mark with the words of the young man who appeared to the women and said to them, ‘Do not fear. You are seeking Jesus the Nazarene’ and the [words] that follow. In addition to these, it says, ‘And having heard [this] they fled, and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.’ For in this way the ending of the Gospel according to Mark is defined in nearly all the copies. The things that appear next, seldom [and] in some but not in all [of the copies] (σπανίως ἐν τισιν ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι), may be spurious, especially since it implies a contradiction to the testimony of the rest of the evangelists.

⁷⁷ On this larger subject see B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, New York/Oxford 1993, esp. 274–283; cf. H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church*, New Haven/London 1995, 123–128, esp. 125–126.

⁷⁸ They write, “Whatever may have been [the author’s] own judgement, the textual facts stated by Eusebius ... have an independent value, and require to be carefully noted” (Westcott/Hort, *New Testament* [see n. 6], 2,32). Unpersuasive, however, is the way in which J. Burgon dismisses the testimony of the first answer, which denies the Longer Ending’s authenticity: “The exaggeration” that most MSS do not contain the Longer Ending “is so gross that it refutes itself” (Verses [see n. 6], 49). Burgon argues this point on two grounds. First, the perspective of this answer does not fit with other church fathers and many other MSS. Second, since the early church fathers were generally “but very children in the Science of Textual Criticism,” the testimony of *ad Marinum* I.a cannot be reliable (49). Such an *a priori* dismissal of a primary source is unwarranted. Although the practice of ‘textual criticism’ in the early church does not compare with modern standards, this cannot stop the historian from making judicious use of all relevant pieces of evidence.

At least two parts of the above statement merit attention here: the possible identity of the manuscripts which this author may have known and the extent to which the author's observation is attested elsewhere in subsequent Christian writings.⁷⁹

First, the manuscripts of Mark that do not include the Longer Ending at some point after Mark 16,8 could hardly be described as comprising a majority of the surviving witnesses. But they are some of the earliest and best. Perhaps most significantly, Sinaiticus (Σ) and Vaticanus (B) end promptly with ἐφοβούντο γάρ (Mark 16,8). The same is true for 304, 1420 and 2386, as well as for the Sinaitic Syriac (S^s), the Old Latin of Codex Bobbiensis (it^k), numerous Old Armenian (about one hundred MSS) and the two oldest Georgian translations of Mark.⁸⁰ The possibility is to be acknowledged, of course, that this author's claim to knowledge of a more 'accurate' textual tradition for the end of Mark may constitute something of a rhetorical device. As is discussed below in this article, later Christian authors made strikingly similar claims about the best MSS of Mark in order to *defend* the authenticity of the Longer Ending. Nonetheless, the survival of such diverse witnesses reflecting no knowledge of Mark 16,9–20 suggests the likelihood that the testimony of the *ad Marinum* was, in fact, both credible and, to a certain extent, verifiable at the time it was written in the fourth century or earlier.⁸¹ The use of this knowledge concerning MSS of Mark by the author of the *ad Marinum* for the apologetic purpose of defending the consistency and accuracy of the biblical writings may reflect a novel use of such 'text-critical' data and, moreover, attests a manuscript tradition preserved by precious few of the surviving witnesses.

Second, observations like those in the *ad Marinum* on the textual history of the Second Gospel and of Mark 16,9–20 appear in a number of other Christian writings and manuscripts. The materials discussed below have re-

⁷⁹ This section is indebted to, and seeks to further the discussions of, Williams, Appendices (see n. 6), 356–419; Aland, Bemerkungen (see n. 6), 157–180; idem, Schluß (see n. 3), 435–470.573–575; Hug, finale (see n. 6), 187–216, esp. 187–197; cf. T. Zahn, Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons, Erlangen 1888–1892, 2,910–938; Elliott, Text (see n. 6), 255–256; Farmer, Verses (see n. 6), 3–75; B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London/New York 1971 102–106; Kelhoffer, Miracle (see n. 1), 1–46.

⁸⁰ In Codex Vaticanus, the large space following Mark 16,8 might suggest one copyist's decision to leave room for the possible later inclusion of Mark 16,9–20 after having chosen to omit the passage. Moreover, a page is missing after Mark 16,8 in 1420 and in 2386. One could also mention witnesses that include after Mark 16,8 *both* the Shorter Ending *and* the Longer Ending, which attest to the originality of neither conclusion: for example, L 7¹² (0112) Ψ T¹ (099) 0112 579 274 (mg).

⁸¹ On the date of the *ad Marinum*, see the discussion below of Jerome's letter *ad Hedybiam de Quaestionibus Duodecim*.

ceived attention from J. W. Burgon, B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, C. R. Williams, K. Aland, J. Hug and others, who were interested primarily in the debate concerning the authorship, or authenticity, of the Longer Ending. The primary foci of this discussion are the extent to which the *ad Marinum*'s claims found both supporters and dissenters, as well as what can be learned about the way in which 'text-critical' matters were approached by other authors and scribes in the early and medieval church. As much as possible, these writings will be discussed chronologically and with reference to the larger argument or agenda of each author. Certain points of similarity between some of these writings and MSS will be noted in passing here and will be summarized at the end of this article.

As mentioned above, Jerome's letter *ad Hedybiam de Quaestionibus Duodecim* (Ep. CXX: "to Hedybia concerning twelve questions," ca. 406–407 C. E.) reflects knowledge of the *ad Marinum*. The problems addressed in questions 3–6 of Jerome's letter correspond to the order and content of the four questions of the *ad Marinum*. Throughout the answers Jerome offers, there appear numerous instances of borrowing from and, perhaps, paraphrasing of the *ad Marinum*. Furthermore, the fact that Jerome's longer letter responds to more questions than the *ad Marinum* does (twelve rather than four) and the likelihood, discussed above, that the *ad Marinum* is an epitome of a longer work suggest the possibility, worthy of a full investigation, that Jerome preserves an earlier and more complete version of the writing upon which the *ad Marinum* is based. Of particular interest is Jerome's comment concerning the Longer Ending:

Cuius quaestionis duplex solutio est. Aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur euangeliis, omnibus Graeciae libris paene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, praesertim cum diuersa atque contraria euangelistis certis narrare uideatur . . .

The solution to this question is twofold. Either we do not receive the testimony of Mark, which appears scarcely in [copies of] the Gospel, while almost all books in Greek do not have this pericope at the end, especially since it seems to narrate things different and contrary to certain evangelists. . . .⁸²

Jerome's letter thus offers the earliest *terminus ante quem* for the *ad Marinum*, which can be placed in the fourth century or earlier. Such a date would be

⁸² Jerome, Ep. CXX 3. The above citation may, albeit unintentionally, leave the impression of an anacolouthon. Jerome argues that one accepts either (*aut*, in the above citation) the first point concerning the witness of most manuscripts or (*aut*, not in the above citation) the second answer of harmonization. Such a claim, of course, stands in tension with his initial statement, *Cuius quaestionis duplex solutio est*. As in the *ad Marinum*, the above statement occurs after the question is raised and, moreover, following a citation of Mark 16,9–11, which does not occur in the *ad Marinum*. Afterward, as in the *ad Marinum*, the second answer to this question follows. Latin text: I. Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* (CSEL 55), Vindobonae 1996, 470–515, here: 481; cf. PL 22,986–987.

consistent with the *ad Marinum*'s Eusebian authorship, but cannot, of course, confirm it. There is no reason that the *ad Marinum* or the material incorporated by its author or epitomizer could not date to even the third century or earlier.⁸³ Since Jerome had already traveled widely in the East before he wrote this letter, his knowledge of the *ad Marinum* could have arisen from his journeys in any of a number of different geographical locales.⁸⁴ Thus, Jerome offers a firm *terminus ante quem* for the *ad Marinum* but no sign of where the *ad Marinum* itself may have arisen.

Equally significant, Jerome betrays no indication that he possesses any independent knowledge of the textual history of the Longer Ending.⁸⁵ He himself may have known of MSS that concluded with Mark 16,8, but the statement of his letter neither establishes nor denies this point.⁸⁶ It has been noted above that, although likely, it cannot be proven that the author of the *ad Marinum* himself possessed such knowledge. The important point here is that, for both of these authors, the testimony was regarded as credible enough to be reproduced.

Perhaps like the author of the *ad Marinum* (σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις), Jerome could both mention the evidence against the passage's authenticity (*omnibus Graeciae libris paene*) and nonetheless translate Mark 16,9–20 in the Vulgate.⁸⁷ The inclusion of the Longer Ending in the Vulgate,

⁸³ If one grants that the Longer Ending is not an authentic part of Mark; that the earliest copies closest to the autograph of Mark lacked this passage; and that the witness of answer one to MSS of Mark is reliable, the author of the *ad Marinum* probably wrote at a time when most MSS still lacked the Longer Ending, quite possibly in the third century or earlier. If, on the other hand, it is much later (i. e., early-fourth century, around the time of Eusebius), then the first answer would indicate that the Longer Ending gained only regional acceptance during the first two centuries after this passage was added to the end of Mark.

⁸⁴ See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies*, London 1975, 135, 164; cf. 116–140, who discusses, *inter alia*, Jerome's travels in Palestine (e. g., in ca. 387 C. E.) and access to the famous library at Caesarea.

⁸⁵ Jerome, Ep. CXX 3–5. On this point see also Burgon, *Verses* (see n. 6), 51–57; Farmer, *Verses* (see n. 6), 22: Jerome's "letter to Hedibia is secondary to the text attributed to Eusebius;" and Hug, *finale* (see n. 6), 12, 194. Cox's argument that Jerome was independent of the *ad Marinum* is not persuasive (*History* [see n. 65], 34–36). Cox seems to be responding to Burgon, who had discounted the significance of certain patristic witnesses against the authenticity of Mark 16,9–20. According to Burgon, these writers were dependent on the opinion that "Eusebius" cited, but like "Eusebius" himself did not agree with it themselves. In responding to Burgon's dubious inference, Cox overlooks the obvious verbal similarities between the *ad Marinum* and Jerome's letter.

⁸⁶ Against Williams, *Appendices* (see n. 6), 446, who argues that "Jerome, likewise, would not have repeated this statement unless he too was familiar with MSS of this type."

⁸⁷ Cf. Williams, *Appendices* (see n. 6), 446. Such an inclusion in the Vulgate, of course, says nothing about Jerome's own view of the Longer Ending, for Jerome translated also books like *Judith* and *Tobit* under protest.

moreover, must have had a positive effect on the subsequent reception of the passage in the Latin West. Due to the influence of Tatian's *Diatessaron* (ca. 172 C. E.), which incorporates the Longer Ending, one can infer the same also in the case of the Syriac-speaking East by the time of the late-second century.⁸⁸

Writing a generation or two after Jerome did, Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. 450 C. E., or shortly thereafter) unambiguously states that the Gospel of Mark did not originally include post-resurrection appearances. Question 52 of his *Collectio Difficultatum et Solutionum* is concerned with the various accounts of the vision (ὄπτασις) beheld by the women who visited Jesus' tomb.⁸⁹ Part of Hesychius' answer is concerned with the identity of those to whom Jesus later appeared:

Διαφόρως γὰρ πρὸς τὸ μνήμα δραμούσαις, οὐ ταῖς αὐταῖς γυναιξίν, ἀλλὰ ποτὲ μὲν δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν, ποτὲ δὲ μιᾷ ἑτέρᾳ παρ' αὐτάς τυγχανούση, ποτὲ δὲ ἄλλαις, διαφόρως καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἐφάνη· ὧν τῇ μὲν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρα, τῇ δὲ ὡς τελειότερα τυγχανούση· καταλλήλως ἐμέτρει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐμφανισμόν ὁ Κύριος. Ὅθεν Μάρκος μὲν ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ τὰ μέχρι τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀγγέλου διελθὼν, τὸν λόγον κατέπαυσεν.

For [he appeared] to different women who ran to the tomb, not to the same women, but now to 'two of them,' and then to one other one who happened to be with them, and again to others, and the Lord appeared in various ways; [he appeared] to one of these who happened to be rather weak, and to another more mature. The Lord apporportioned the manifestation of himself in a way appropriate [to their capacities]. For which reason Mark, having narrated briefly the [events] up to the one angel,⁹⁰ ended his account.⁹¹

⁸⁸ This issue is somewhat more complicated in that, for many Syrian congregations, the *Diatessaron* seems to have constituted a *substitute* for the liturgical use of the individual NT Gospels. Nonetheless, familiarity with the *Diatessaron* could well have contributed to the prevalence of this passage in Syriac translations of Mark, where a rare exception to the inclusion of the Longer Ending is the Sinaitic Syriac (S^S). On Tatian's use of the Longer Ending, see Zahn, *Geschichte* (see n. 79), 2,553–554; cf. 2,924; T. Baarda, *An Unexpected Reading in the West-Saxon Gospel Text of Mark 16.11*, NTS 41 (1995) 458–465; C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes* (JSSt.Suppl. 2), Oxford 1993, 289. On the date of the *Diatessaron*, see W. L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, in: H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, London/Philadelphia 1990, 403.428–429.

⁸⁹ See Mark 16,1–8 par. Discrepancies that Hesychius seeks to resolve include whether the woman or women saw one individual (so Matt 28 and Mark 16) or two (so Luke 24 and John 20), as well as whether the messenger(s) is (are) described as human (Mark and Luke) or angelic (Matthew and John).

⁹⁰ Mention of "the one angel (τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀγγέλου)" suggests that Hesychius interprets the reference to "a young man (νεανίσκος, Mark 16,5)" as a synonym for ἀγγελος (cf. ἄγγελος ... κυρίου, Matt 28,2; ὁ ἄγγελος, Matt 28,5).

⁹¹ Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Coll. Diff. et Sol.* 52. Greek text: Aland, *Schluf* (see n. 3), 575 = PG 93,1391–1448; here: 1440.

Much like the author of the *ad Marinum*, Hesychius mentions the conclusion to the Second Gospel in a work comprising questions and answers on scripture. Unlike Jerome, however, Hesychius gives no indication that he knows a tradition like that of the *ad Marinum*.

The probability of Hesychius' independence vis-à-vis the *ad Marinum* is strengthened by his silence concerning the Longer Ending at two other points in his *Collectio*. For example, his answer to question 50, like question one in the *ad Marinum*, is concerned with the timing of the resurrection in the Gospels.⁹² Although the goal of resolving inconsistencies is the same in both writings, Hesychius never repeats either of the two solutions given after the *ad Marinum's* first question. In addition, the question in his Coll. 54, like question 52, presupposes that Mark ends at 16,8. Question 54 asks why in Mark, differently from Matthew, Luke and John, the women are silent (σιωπῶ) and do not relate the news of the resurrection to the apostles.⁹³ Nowhere does Hesychius resort to Mark 16,9–11, according to which at least Mary Magdalene reported such a message. His statements in Coll. 52 concerning the end of Mark thus add a significant testimony concerning the content of this Gospel known to at least one author in the first half of the fifth century. The independence of this witness is corroborated by Hesychius' statements in Coll. 50 and 54.

One peculiarity about Hesychius' response to question 52 (cited above), however, is that, whereas he distinguishes between the content of the Second Gospel and that of Mark 16,9–20, he nonetheless seems to incorporate parts of the Longer Ending in his discussion of Jesus' post-resurrection appearances. Perhaps most clearly, his reference to an appearance to two of the women (ποτέ μὲν δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν) seems to draw from the Longer Ending's second appearance.⁹⁴ Lk 24,13–35 narrates a similar appearance to two of Jesus' (male) disciples (δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν, Lk 24,13). Yet nowhere in Mark 16,12 is it claimed that both of the people to whom Jesus appeared were male.⁹⁵ Since in the Second Gospel, Mark 16,12–13 follows an appearance to Mary Magdalene (16,9–11) and the women are the focus of attention in Mark 15,42–16,8, Hesychius infers that those to whom Jesus appeared in Mark 16,12 were two of the women who had visited Jesus' tomb. Moreover, his mention of an appearance to a different woman who had been with the initial group (μιᾶ ἐτέρα παρ' αὐτὰς τυγχανούση) may be an adaptation of Mark 16,9.⁹⁶

⁹² Whereas the author of the *ad Marinum* compares only Matthew and Mark, Hesychius discusses the accounts of all four NT Gospels. For the Greek text of Coll. 50, see PG 93,1433–1437.

⁹³ Hesychius of Jerusalem Coll. Diff. et Sl. 54; Greek text: PG 93,1441.

⁹⁴ Cf. Mark 16,12: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερῶθη κτλ.

⁹⁵ Hesychius seems to overlook that the masculine forms in Mark 16,13a (κακείνοι ἀπελθόντες) imply that at least one, if not both, of the two individuals in Mark 16,12–13 was male.

⁹⁶ In this case Hesychius would have reversed the order of the appearances as presented in Mark 16,9–11 and 16,12–13. Note also Hesychius' use of ἐφάνη, which occurs also in

As was observed with Jerome, then, there is thus an implicit *ambiguity* in Hesychius' testimony concerning the content of Mark and the canonical status of Mark 16,9–20. Although Mark did not include material like that of the Longer Ending, one or more parts of this pericope can still illuminate the Lord's post-resurrection appearances (Coll. 52). Such use of Mark 16,9–20 for the apologetic purpose of defending the accuracy of the NT Gospels could well have provided an additional impetus to subsequent Christian authors for preserving this pericope that was known to be spurious. Appeals to the Longer Ending for dogmatic purposes arose not quite three centuries before Hesychius wrote and date at least as early as Irenaeus' (ca. 180 C.E.) citation of Mark 16,19.⁹⁷ What is new with Hesychius is the use of the passage *despite* his awareness of the 'text-critical' problem concerning the Longer Ending.

In addition to Jerome's letter, the content of the *ad Marinum* is both presupposed and affirmed in a homily of Severus of Antioch (465–534 C.E.):

ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις ἀντιγράφοις τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον μέχρι τοῦ ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ ἔχει τὸ τέλος. Ἐν δὲ τισὶ προσκεῖται καὶ ταῦτα· Ἄναστας δὲ πρωτῆς πρώτης σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρώτον Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἐπιτὰ δαιμόνια.

Thus, in the more accurate copies, the Gospel according to Mark ends at the [passage], 'For they were afraid.' But in some [copies] this too is added: 'And having risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene.'⁹⁸

Mention of the more accurate copies (ἐν ... τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις ἀντιγράφοις) of Mark calls to mind the assessment of the first answer to question one in the *ad Marinum* (τὰ ... ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων).

Nonetheless, Severus also seems to follow the *ad Marinum's* second answer to question one with regard to resolving the possible contradiction in

Mark 16,9. This appearance to one woman could, however, be based upon John 20,1–18 rather than on the Longer Ending.

⁹⁷ Note also Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I 45,5, citing Mark 16,20a. On Irenaeus and the Longer Ending see Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1), 169–170. In *Adv. Haer.* III 10,5 Irenaeus discusses only two passages from Mark's Gospel, Mark 1,1–3 and 16,19. Unlike Hesychius, however, Irenaeus never reflects an awareness of MSS that omit Mark 16,9–20 and assumes that the passage rightly belongs *in fine ... Evangelii*. Latin text: A. Rousseau et al., *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies* (SC 210–211), Paris 1974; an English translation appears in ANF 1,315–567.

⁹⁸ Severus of Antioch, *Homily 77*. Severus' cathedral homilies date to 512–526 C.E. A Greek text of this homily survives and appears in E. Triffaux/M.-A. Kugener, *Les Homilies cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche: Traduction syriaque de Jacques d'Edesse* [PO 16/5], Paris 1976) 840, lines 7–9. The Greek text also appears in both Burgon, *Verses* (see n. 6), 31 note c and p. 268, and Aland, *Schluß* (see n. 3), 574. In parallel columns Burgon lists the numerous correspondences between the Greek of the *ad Marinum* and of Severus' writing (*Verses* [see n. 6], 267–268). Burgon (*ibid.* 39–41.57–59) also notes the mistaken attribution of this writing of Gregory of Nyssa's (b. 335/340; d. after 394) second *Homily on the Resurrection*.

chronology between the Longer Ending and Matt 28: it is necessary to pause (ὑποστίξαι χρή) between ἀναστὰς δὲ and πρωτὶ πρώτη σαββάτου in Mark 16,9.⁹⁹ In addition, toward the end of this homily, Severus demonstrates further his own acceptance of the Longer Ending as an authentic part of Mark when he cites Mark 16,19 as τὸ παρὰ τῷ Μάρκῳ γεγραμμένον.¹⁰⁰ Once again, despite an awareness of the ‘text-critical’ problem concerning the canonical status of the Longer Ending, the passage may nonetheless be cited for the edification of the congregation. Such a use of Mark 16,9–20 in a liturgical setting, like that by Hesychius of Jerusalem for apologetic purposes, could also have contributed to the acceptance of this passage as an original part of the Second Gospel.

Positive echoes of the tradition against the Longer Ending’s authenticity preserved in the *ad Marinum* like those discussed above were not universal in the early church, however. A striking exception to the views of Jerome, Hesychius of Jerusalem and Severus of Antioch survives in a catena attributed to Victor of Antioch (flour. ca. 500 C. E.). Rather little is known about Victor, and even less is certain about the origin and date of the catena to which his name was eventually attached. One statement incorporated into this writing, which also appeared in a plethora of medieval minuscules, offers the following observations concerning the disparate witnesses to Mark’s original conclusion:

εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωτὶ πρώτη σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς ἐπιφερόμενα, ἐν τῷ κατὰ μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ παρὰ πλείστοις ἀντιγράφοις οὐ κείνται, ὡς νόθα νομίσαντες αὐτὰ τινες εἶναι· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξ ἀκριβῶν ἀντιγράφων ὡς ἐν πλείστοις εὐρόντες αὐτὰ κατὰ τὸ παλαιστιναῖον εὐαγγέλιον μάρκου, ὡς ἔχει ἢ ἀλήθεια συντεθεικάμεν, καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιφερομένην δεσποτικὴν ἀνάστασιν μετὰ τὸ ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, τούτεστιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωτὶ πρώτη σαββάτου καὶ καθ’ ἐξῆς μέχρι τοῦ διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων. Ἄμην.

Even if the [reading], ‘and having risen early on the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene’ and what follows afterward in the Gospel according to Mark, does not occur *in most copies*, with the result that some people think it to be spurious, we, since we have found it in *most of the accurate copies* in accordance with the Palestinian Gospel of Mark, have included [it] in accordance with the truth. And [we have also included] the resurrection of the Master which follows in it after the [passage], ‘For they were afraid,’ that is, from the [passage], ‘and having risen early on the first day of the week’ and what follows, until the [passage] ‘through the accompanying signs. Amen.’¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Greek text: Triffaux/Kugener, *Homiliae* (see n. 98), 840, line 9–842, line 5. Cf. the similar position taken in the *ad Marinum*: καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστὰς δὲ, ὑποστίξομεν καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀφορίσομεν τῶν ἐξῆς ἐπιλεγόμενων.

¹⁰⁰ As Aland notes (Schluß [see n. 3], 574); Greek text: Triffaux/Kugener, *Homiliae* (see n. 98), 858, lines 7–9. Severus highlights the similarities of Mark 16,19 (ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) to Lk 24,51 (ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) and to the NT book of Acts (cf. Acts 1,2, 1,11, 1,22).

¹⁰¹ Aland (Schluß [see n. 3], 444–445) lists the middle part of the Greek text cited above along with certain variant readings; Burgon offers more of the Greek text and a discus-

Highlighted above are the strikingly different uses of the superlative adjective πλεῖστος. Initially it is suggested that most MSS (παρὰ πλείστοις ἀντιγράφοις) do not contain the Longer Ending. Later, however, the author claims that most of them do (ἐν πλείστοις). The first statement probably constitutes an echo of the *ad Marinum*,¹⁰² but it is not a sympathetic echo. Whereas the *ad Marinum* takes the position that both the majority and the most accurate of the copies lack the Longer Ending, this text takes the opposite position, namely that most accurate copies include Mark 16,9–20. The echo of a statement like, or the same as, that of the *ad Marinum* thus points to an author who sought to discredit the earlier writing's claims.

Unlike the harmonization found in the second answer to question one in the *ad Marinum*, the author of the material incorporated into this catena cites a superior textual tradition that, in his view, refutes that of other manuscripts that lack Mark 16,9–20. Much about the origin and content of the edition of Mark to which this author refers is unknown. One or more copies of it may, in fact, have existed in Palestine at some point. The *crux interpretum* for this author is that the so-called Palestinian edition of Mark, which includes the Longer Ending, is regarded as authoritative.

In light of the reading of this allegedly Palestinian edition of Mark, moreover, this author has even taken the liberty of *adding* (συντίθημι) *the Longer Ending to witnesses that previously had not contained it*. Furthermore, Kurt Aland notes that, with certain minor variations, statements much the same as the one attributed to Victor of Antioch occur in a myriad of minuscules dating from the tenth to the sixteenth centuries.¹⁰³ One can only wonder how many scribes may likewise have appended Mark 16,9–20 to MSS of Mark during the medieval period.

In addition, an analogous understanding of the manuscript tradition occurs in the eleventh-century Minuscules 20 and 215:

ἐντεῦθεν ἕως τοῦ τέλους ἐν τισὶ τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐ κείται· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις πάντα ἀπαράλειπτα κείται

From here until the end does not occur in some of the manuscripts; but in the old ones the entire passage occurs without omission.¹⁰⁴

sion of the passage (Verses [see n. 6], 288–289; cf. 59–65.269–290; Farmer, Verses [see n. 6], 24–26). Different from a commentary, a catena is a collection of authoritative interpretations of one or more esteemed documents, e.g., scripture (C. Curti, Art. Catena, Biblical, Encyclopedia of the Early Church 1 [1992] 152–153; cf. J. Irmischer, Art. Victor of Antioch, *ibid.* 2 [1992] 868).

¹⁰² With Hug, who finds “un écho d’Eusèbe” (finale [see n. 6], 196–197); so also Westcott/Hort, *New Testament* (see n. 6), 2,35.

¹⁰³ For example, Minuscules 24, 36, 37, 40, 63, 108, 129, 137, 143 (Aland, *Schluß* [see n. 3], 445). The latest of these is Minuscule 2579, which dates to the sixteenth century. Aland writes, “Auch diese Zahl ist, wie gesagt, vorläufig; dennoch ist es aufschlußreich, daß von 51 Handschriften nur 8 diese Notiz auslassen” (446).

¹⁰⁴ The Greek text is cited by Aland, who seems not to grasp the positive estimation of the authenticity of the Longer Ending (*Schluß* [see n. 3], 443).

In these two minuscules the ancient tradition attesting the Longer Ending is deemed not specifically as Palestinian but rather is said to comprise that of the old manuscripts as opposed to those of more recent origin.

A perhaps insoluble question concerns whether the assertion in the catena attributed to Victor was borrowed from one or more of these minuscules (or, perhaps, their prototypes), or whether the copyists of the minuscules were ultimately dependent upon this catena or its source. Whatever the origin of this testimony, such awareness concerning different Markan endings must have been rather widespread during the Middle Ages. Like the solution of harmonization advocated in the *ad Marinum*, the textual emendation advocated in the statement incorporated into this catena offers an additional reason why witnesses like Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and the Sinaitic Syriac, which lack the Longer Ending, are, numerically speaking, in the distinct minority. Given this statement's widespread occurrence in the catena and in over forty minuscules, it may well, as mentioned above, have given the impetus for any number of scribes to add Mark 16,9–20 to their edition(s) of the Second Gospel. It might have had an effect, for example, on Minuscules 138 and 264, where Mark 16,9–20 appears to have been “zwar jeweils von späterer Hand.”¹⁰⁵

Despite the measure affirmed in the catena attributed to Victor of Antioch and in numerous medieval minuscules, Theophylactus of Ochrida (ca. 1055/56–1107/08 or 1125/26 C. E.) still recognizes a disparity among MSS of Mark and advocates caution in the interpretation of the Longer Ending:

Cod. 26 pergit: φασὶ τινες τῶν ἐξηγητῶν ἐνταῦθα συμπληροῦσθαι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον, τὰ δὲ ἐφεξῆς προσθήκην εἶναι μεταγενέστεραν. Χρὴ δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐρμηνεύσαι, μεδὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ λυμαιομένους.

Codex 26 continues: Some of the interpreters say that the Gospel according to Mark is finished here [i. e., at 16,8], and that the [words] that follow are a subsequent addition. It is necessary to interpret this [passage; i. e., 16,9–20] without doing any harm to the truth.¹⁰⁶

Likewise, writing perhaps shortly after Theophylactus,¹⁰⁷ Euthymius Zigabenus (eleventh or twelfth c. C. E.) makes nearly the same declaration:

φασὶ δὲ τινες τῶν ἐξηγητῶν ἐνταῦθα συμπληροῦσθαι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον· τὰ δὲ ἐφεξῆς προσθήκην εἶναι μεταγενέστεραν. Χρὴ δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐρμηνεύσαι, μεδὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ λυμαιομένην.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Aland, *Schluß* (see n. 3), 443.

¹⁰⁶ Theophylactus of Ochrida, *Enarratio in Evangelium Marci* Note 90 (PG 123, 677; cf. also Aland, *Schluß* (see n. 3), 574.

¹⁰⁷ Although uncertainties remain concerning the dates of both Theophylactus and Euthymius, Aland describes Theophylactus as having been “einen wortgleichen Vorgänger” of Euthymius (*Schluß* [see n. 3], 574).

¹⁰⁸ Euthymius Zigabenus, *Comm. in Marcum* 48. There are three small differences between the statements of Theophylactus and Euthymius. First, only Theophylactus attributes his

Once again an ambiguous perspective on the canonical status of the Longer Ending surfaces: care must be taken in the interpretation of Mark 16,9–20 because some say that Mark did not include post-resurrection appearances. Not specified, however, is just how one should interpret the passage without harming the truth.

Precedents for this principle of distinguishing between the Gospel of Mark and the Longer Ending, on the one hand, and of affirming the canonicity of Mark 16,9–20, on the other, were observed above in both Hesychius of Jerusalem and Severus of Antioch. The affirming of such a dichotomy has found a host of followers among scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as well.¹⁰⁹ Accordingly, just because an ancient, medieval or even a modern author deems that Mark 16,9–20 should not be denied some association with the Second Gospel and thus be interpreted as scripture, such an evaluation does not necessarily bespeak his or her view of the passage's authorship or origin.

Theophylactus and Euthymius were not alone among those in the Middle Ages who were aware of problems with the end of Mark. For example, a note in Minuscule 199 (twelfth century) offers the following caution before Mark 16,9:

ἐν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐ κεῖται τοῦτω [*sic*]: ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα καταπαύει·

In some of the copies this does not occur, but it stops here [i. e., at 16,8].¹¹⁰

Striking here is the lack of an explanation why some manuscripts lack the Longer Ending, or whether one set of witnesses should be accepted over another.

Furthermore, in another group of minuscules one finds, with certain variations, the following:

ἐν τισι μὲν τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕως ᾧδε πληροῦται ὁ εὐαγγελιστῆς· ἕως οὗ καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἔκανόνισεν· ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φέρεται

information to Codex 26. Second, if Euthymius wrote in light of Theophylactus' statement, the former may have added the postpositive δέ after φασί. Third, Euthymius may also have altered the participle λυμαινομένους so that λυμαινομένην would agree with the pronoun ταύτην in gender, number and case. The Greek text for Euthymius' *Commentarius* appears in PG 129,765–852; that cited above occurs in Hug, finale (see n. 6), 197 and in Aland, Schluß (see n. 3), 439 = PG 129,845.

¹⁰⁹ On this point see the discussion in Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1), 12–13.

¹¹⁰ Rather than the misspelled τοῦτω, one would instead expect τοῦτο. Greek text: Aland, Schluß (see n. 3), 443. Note also G. W. Horner's discussion of the Bohairic version, in which Mark 16,8 is followed by a break. Afterward appears the following gloss written in Arabic: "this is the chapter expelled in the Greek" (*The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1898, 480; cf. Williams, *Appendices* [see n. 6], 392).

because they were known to be ancient, so perhaps also were notices concerning the original conclusion to Mark passed along because they too had become part of the tradition.

VII. Conclusions

What began as an analysis of one author's apologetic response to a question concerning the chronology of Matt 28 as compared with Mark 16 has given rise to a fuller understanding of contrasting perspectives in the early and medieval church about the original conclusion to the Gospel of Mark. This study has also considered the importance – or, alternately, the irrelevance – of text-critical observations to those who took part in such debates. The first response given to the *ad Marinum*'s first question is striking both for its apparent awareness of text-critical information and its drawing on the same to dispel the chronological difficulty: the best copies of the Second Gospel (τὰ ... ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων) do not contain Mark 16,9–20, which occurs only seldom (σπανίως) in certain witnesses. Analogous statements resounded subsequently in a number of other early and medieval writings and manuscripts.

The significance of this part of the *ad Marinum* and of other such statements seems not to have been recognized in the modern period before the work of Andreas Birch at the turn of the nineteenth century.¹¹⁶ Rather, for centuries and with rare exception, this brief excerpt of the *ad Marinum* has been discussed without regard for the context of this writing or for the agenda of its author. Much of this article comprises an effort to move beyond this impasse and to suggest by way of demonstration that *all* patristic witnesses to the text of the NT must, to the extent that it is possible, be analyzed in relation to what is known about a particular author, the writing as a whole in which they occur, or both. Since the ascription of the *ad Marinum* to Eusebius of Caesarea seems likely, but is not certain, the life and works of this prolific and influential individual have been discussed only in passing here. Instead, a discussion of the *ad Marinum* as a whole and of similar statements in subsequent Christian writings and manuscripts has received primary consideration. This investigation has yielded a number of insights concerning the practice of 'textual criticism' in the early and medieval church.

First, the author of the *ad Marinum* is not interested primarily in 'textual criticism' per se but rather in resolving a discrepancy concerning the point at which the women visited Jesus' tomb. This task is not an easy one. Matthew places their visit on Saturday evening (ὄψε ... σαββάτων, Matt 28,1), and Mark describes it as occurring somewhat later, on Sunday morning (λίαν πρωῖ τῆ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων, Mark 16,2; cf. Lk 24,1, John 20,1). To resolve this difficulty, the author mentions that Mark 16,9–20 occurs only in a few, less

¹¹⁶ A. Birch, *Variae Lectiones ad Textum IV Evangeliorum*, Hauniae 1801, 225–227. On this point see Kelhoffer, *Miracle* (see n. 1), 6–7.

reliable manuscripts. Related consistently in the optative mood, however, this first solution is apparently offered with some reservation. The author's primary concern is that the difficulty be resolved and not that others in the church pay greater heed to the diverse readings of different witnesses.

This main interest seems also to be the reason that a second, and markedly different, solution is offered to the same question concerning Matt 28,1 and Mark 16,2. The *ad Marinum's* second answer to question one, moreover, supports an alternate theory how a spurious minority reading could – as, of course, it eventually did – find a place in the majority of later MSS of Mark. The primary motivation of answer two stems from fear of ‘daring’ to omit any contested part of scripture under any circumstances, especially if it can be harmonized with other received passages. Thus, if a problematic text can be construed as agreeing with other Gospel accounts, one must never consider dispensing with it. On the basis of such a criterion, the general tendency would be to *include*, rather than *exclude*, questionable passages like Mark 16,9–20, Mark's Shorter Ending (Codex Bobbiensis [it^k]) and John 7,53–8,11.

Despite the dogmatic purposes of this author, the testimony in the first answer to question one concerning the state of the Markan MSS was likely both credible and, to a certain extent, verifiable at the time the author wrote in the fourth century or earlier. A perhaps unanswerable question, however, is whether the author himself possessed direct knowledge of the manuscripts, or if he incorporated from an earlier source this information, which could have originated in the third century or, for that matter, at any point in the second century after the Longer Ending had been appended to Mark.

Of arguably equal significance are statements by a host of subsequent authors and scribes concerning the end of Mark. The earliest of these is Jerome, whose letter *ad Hedybiam* (Ep. CXX 3) concurs with the *ad Marinum* that “almost all books in Greek” do not contain Mark 16,9–20. Moreover, and apparently independently of both the *ad Marinum* and Jerome, Hesychius of Jerusalem states that Mark did not include post-resurrection narratives (Coll. Diff. et Sol. 52; cf. 50.54). Severus of Antioch (Hom. 77) also affirms unequivocally that the more accurate copies (ἐν ... τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις ἀντιγράφοις) of Mark end at 16,8. A similar tradition is preserved and, notably, opposed in a catena attributed to Victor of Antioch and in numerous medieval minuscules, the latest of which dates to the sixteenth century. According to the catena and these medieval minuscules, a Palestinian version of Mark, which includes Mark 16,9–20, offers an authoritative textual tradition that justifies the appending of the Longer Ending to copies of Mark without the passage.

Despite the apparent practice of adding the Longer Ending to manuscripts that previously had not contained the passage, the tenacity of other MSS concluding Mark at 16,8 is evident in the nearly identical statements of Theophylact of Ochrida (Enarr. in Ev. Marci Note 90; ca. 1055/56–1107/08 or 1125/26 C. E.) and of Euthymius Zigabenus (Comm. in Marcum 48; eleventh or

twelfth c. C. E.). Cautionary notes in certain medieval witnesses – for example, in Minuscules 22 and 199 – also point to a continued awareness of unresolved problems concerning the end of Mark. At such a late date, however, one cannot help but wonder whether marginal notes concerning the Markan endings had themselves become part of the tradition that, like the scripture itself, was routinely passed down from one generation to the next. There is thus more work to be done in the analysis of these and other scribal notes about variant readings among NT MSS.

The individual analyses of this article have highlighted at least three areas of NT scholarship for which an informed approach to the *ad Marinum* is significant. First, with regard to the earliest recoverable conclusion to the Gospel of Mark, the surviving manuscript witnesses to the ending at Mark 16,8 need to be evaluated alongside statements in the *ad Marinum*, Jerome's letter, Hesychius of Jerusalem's *Collectio* and Severus of Antioch's homily. Each of these four writings can be placed within two centuries of the approximate dates for Sinaiticus (S) and Vaticanus (B). At the very least, these authors preserve an indisputably accurate tradition concerning the content of the earliest manuscripts of Mark; the authors could well have been able to verify this information themselves.

Second, this article has discussed a variety of conflicting approaches to text-critical issues and their implications. Perhaps the best example of this are the two answers to question one in the *ad Marinum*. The possible effects of the harmonizing approach of answer two on the subsequent reception of Mark 16,9–20 have been summarized above. Similar inconsistencies were noted in various other Christian authors. Jerome, for example, could concur with the *ad Marinum*'s first answer but still include the Longer Ending in his Latin Vulgate. Likewise, Hesychius of Jerusalem could, in the same part of his homily, state that Mark did not include post-resurrection appearances, but nonetheless use material from the Longer Ending to elucidate these same appearances. Part of the catena attributed to Victor of Antioch and preserved also in scribal notes in a plethora of medieval minuscules mentions a claim like that of the *ad Marinum*'s first answer to question one only in order to refute it by referring to an alleged Palestinian edition of Mark. Finally, Theophylactus and Euthymius acknowledge the opinion of certain interpreters that Mark ends at 16,8: both medieval authors maintain that the Longer Ending must be interpreted, but also advocate caution in its use. In all of these writings a discernible pattern is evident: *an awareness of the text-critical problem concerning Mark 16,9–20 does not necessarily lead to a decision to refrain from making use of this passage.*

It can thus be overly simplistic, if not misleading, to classify patristic witnesses into those who are “for” or “against” a certain reading. On the contrary, an alleged witness for the Longer Ending's omission my, in his own day, have actually contributed to the *acceptance* of Mark 16,9–20 by virtue of his use of the passage for apologetic, dogmatic or hortatory purposes. As

has also been mentioned above, patristic sources need to be analyzed *in context* and in comparison with one another. Although it is interesting, for example, that a certain author does or does not accept Mark 16,9–20 as an original part of the Second Gospel, equally fascinating are the ways in which various positions are supported and the extent to which these authors may agree with, or seek to refute, earlier judgments.

Finally, a brief comment on areas meriting further study. There remains much to be learned about the origin, content and transmission of the *ad Mari-num*. Additional treasures, some of which have been mentioned in passing here, also await (re-)discovery in other *Quaestiones et Responsiones* on scripture. In his 1993 presidential address to the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Martin Hengel emphasized the vital importance of a broad familiarity with patristic literature for those who specialize in NT.¹¹⁷ This article affirms Hengel's judgment and also shows the value of an awareness of NT critical issues for the study of patristic literature. It is hoped that the observations offered here will contribute to these areas of inquiry and encourage further exploration of these and related questions.

¹¹⁷ M. Hengel, *Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft*, NTS 40 (1994) 321–357, esp. 325.329–333.340–342. See also the critique of previous work and discussions of methodology by B. D. Ehrman, *Use* (see n. 2), 118–135; and G. D. Fee, *The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism*, in: *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Studies and Documents 46), Grand Rapids, MI 1995, 191–207.