

we might do impossible. And ultimately everything will be exposed; the judgment-seat of God has to be faced by every mortal; and every sin unconfessed and unforgiven will there fall under the immeasurable retribution of eternity.

JAMES STALKER.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE LAST VERSES OF MARK.

1. BY PROFESSOR TH. ZAHN.
2. BY DR. A. RESCH.

THE following article contains a translation, made at the request of the Editor, of the criticisms passed by two distinguished German scholars, Dr. A. Resch, and Professor Theodor Zahn, upon an article which appeared in this journal in October, 1893, entitled: "Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark." Professor Zahn is well known for his history of the canon, and for many other solid contributions to our knowledge of early Christian literature. His judgments have therefore a peculiar weight in regard to such a problem. Dr. Resch has given his theory to the world in the form of an appendix to his recent volume, entitled: "Aussercanonische Paralleltex-te." Professor Harnack also contributed an article upon the significance of the notice in the *Etschmiadzin Evangeliar*, brought to light by me in the above-mentioned number of the EXPOSITOR, to the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for November, 1893. In his notice Prof. Harnack inclines to the view that the last twelve verses are due to Aristion, and that the Armenian notice discovered is to be taken in that sense. I have refrained from quoting his article at length, because it is little more than a recapitulation of my article in the EXPOSITOR. In the *Nuova Anthologia* also for January, 1894, there appeared a learned and sympathetic criticism of the matter, entitled: "Una Nuova Scoperta Biblica," from the pen of Professor Chiapelli, of the University of Naples. I have, however, confined myself to the two criticisms of Prof. Zahn and of Dr. Resch, because of the interesting hypotheses which they both of them raise in conjunction with my discovery, and of the very different conclusions which they derive from it. In a subsequent article I hope I may

be allowed to supplement my first article with more information with respect to the end of Mark which I have gathered from a careful inspection of the oldest manuscripts of the Gospels preserved in Venice, in London, and in Oxford. I shall at the same time offer some criticisms of the positions advanced in the two criticisms herewith translated.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

ARTICLE OF PROF. TH. ZAHN, of Erlangen, Translated from the *Theologische Literaturblatt*, of Leipzig, for 22 December, 1893: "Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark."

Under this title Mr. F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, has published a small but important discovery which he has made, in the October number of the *EXPOSITOR*, pp. 241-254. I venture to give a short account of it, accompanying it with some remarks of my own. The discovery was made in the *Evangeliarium* of Etschmiadzin. This is in a single volume, bound in beautiful panels of carved ivory and containing interesting paintings, concerning all of which we read in J. Strzygowski's learned monograph published two years back, (*Byzantische Denkmäler*, 1, Wien, 1891). The ivory diptych, which has been used as a binding for it, is, after careful comparison, reckoned by this authority on the history of art to be a masterpiece of Ravennese art of the first half of the sixth century, while the pictures bound in at the beginning and end of the volume are esteemed to be products of Syrian miniature painting of the same epoch. The text of the Armenian Gospel, however, was written in the year 438 of the Armenian era, that is to say (438 + 551) 989 years after Christ (not 986, as Conybeare states, p. 242; see Strzygowski, p. 19 *f.*, and under the *corrigen*da), and the writer of it was a certain John, who wrote it for a monk and Presbyter Stephanus, in the monastery of Noravank.¹ This evangeliar is quite the oldest hitherto known biblical manuscript which contains Mark xvi. 9-20; for all the others which contain this section belong to the time of the Crusades, or are even later (Martin, *Introd. partie prat.*, II. 330). Now there is, it seems, a second Armenian version of Mark xvi. 9-20, which is not included in the printed Bibles (Martin, pp. 326-329). It is to be desired that Mr. Conybeare, who has examined the manuscripts of Etschmiadzin on the spot, should

¹ = New monastery.

give us a full account of the relation of this text to the versions of the end of Mark which are already printed.

The Stephanus at whose commission the Etschmiadzin book was written declares in a notice which he appends that "this book is to be read in this church, for it is copied from authentic and old originals" (Strzygowski, p. 19). The supposition that the much older binding and the pictures, which come at the beginning and end of the Armenian text of the year 989, belonged to one of these authentic and old originals, is a very obvious one to make; and the circumstance that the pictures appear to have been painted in or near Edessa suggests the further conclusion, that the Armenian text also is ultimately derived from the same quarter; and this is most probable so far as regards the ending of Mark upon other grounds (compare my history of the Canon, II. 913-924 *f.*). The information given by Conybeare, p. 243, is important for the further study of this question also; it is the following: After Mark xvi., 8, a space of two lines is left blank. Then follows in the same hand, only written in red, "*Ariston Eritzou*," *i.e.*, Ariston, the Presbyter's, and there then come, still by the same hand, the verses Mark xvi. 9-20. It needs no proving to show that the original writer of these two words meant to say that the following section has not, like that which precedes, Mark for its author, but a certain Presbyter Ariston. Supposing that there existed in those genuine and old originals, or if not in them, at any rate in the oldest Armenian MSS. of the Gospels, such a title as this sharply demarcating the addition from the rest of the book, we can understand two circumstances that are in any case remarkable:—Firstly, that in so many Armenian MSS. up to quite modern times the addition is entirely absent; and secondly, that where it is given, it is regularly separated from the Gospel by a formal subscription and a jagged line (Martin, p. 331). As yet we do not know whence is derived the tradition so shortly, yet so clearly expressed in the words: "Ariston the Presbyter's"; but we must bear in mind that the Syrians were wont to hand down similar notices in their Bibles through hundreds of years. The notice as to how the Philoxeniana arose is derived from the archetype itself, and in the recension of Thomas of Heraklea has been transmitted to us in all later copies along with the latter's own notice of the revision he had made. The same is true of the notices as to the translations of John viii. 1-11.

In the case before us the question is not who was the translator, but who was the author; for the fact of the translation being by Aristion could not be so shortly expressed. The *genetivus auctoris* here is rather to be classed with the "Matthæi, Marci" in the titles of the columns of the Syriac Curetonian.

Now who is this Aristion? Conybeare has quite rightly rejected the idea of Aristion of Pella. It is quite true that Moses of Chorene had plenty of fables to narrate about him (II. 60), and we could not avoid thinking of him, if Langlois (*Coll. of Arm. Hist.*, I. 391; II. 110, n. 3) were right in ascribing to Moses the statement that Aristion was secretary of the Bishop Mark, of Jerusalem, in the time of Hadrian.

If that were so, the completer of the Second Gospel must have been identified with the secretary of the Evangelist Mark, and also have received the name Aristion. Langlois, however, seems to me to have made a mistake. For Moses has in view an Aristion who was secretary of Adrian and was sent by him to Persia, cf. also Lauer's translation, p. 118. Aristion of Pella, who wrote his dialogue, "Jason and Papiscus," after 135, and perhaps a good deal later, cannot be the author of a section, which Tatian already read in his Mark at the latest in 170, and which Justin had already known, so it would seem, as early as 150, though perhaps not as an integral part of the Gospel of Mark. There remains no other but the Aristion who was one of Papias' authorities (Eus., *H.E.*, III. xxxix. 4, 6, 7, 14). The title of Presbyter is given to him quite rightly, for Papias in that passage terms the teachers from whom he directly learned "The Presbyters" (xxxix. 3, *παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*). He does indeed also remark that he had occasionally derived information from such as were only pupils of these Presbyters, but this does not refer to Aristion. For the latter, along with the Presbyter John, were just the very teachers to whom, according to Eusebius, he especially referred by name, and to whom he claims to have himself listened. It follows that they were both "disciples of the Lord," and, instead of being pupils of the Apostles, belonged in their double capacity of chief teachers of Papias and of "disciples of the Lord" to the circle of those whom Papias calls *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*. Whether or not the author of the title which prefaces the end of Mark understood this title rightly, makes no difference. We also have no right to foist upon him the perverse and forced interpretations of Eusebius.

Nor does the slight difference in the form of the name tell against our identification of the Presbyter Ariston and of the Aristion mentioned in Papias. For, in the first place, according to Conybeare, p. 243, the Armenian translation of Eusebius renders Aristion as Ariston, and in the second place the failure to distinguish the names is often met with elsewhere (see *Pape* under 'Αρίστων, no. 1a, and under 'Αριστίων, no. 1d. Also the Ariston of *Const. Ap.*, VII. 46, p. 228, 21, must certainly be the Aristion of Papias).

Now this Aristion can certainly not be the author of Mark xvi. 9-20; for he was not a writer. Papias assures us that he had been, not a reader of the writings, but an ear-witness of (*αὐτήκοος*), therefore a listener to the oral information of Aristion and John (39, 7). We are thus at the outset precluded from making the distinction and contrast which Conybeare makes, between the *διηγήσεις* of Aristion, as if these were written narratives, and the oral *παραδόσεις* of John in 39, 14. The comparison of Luke i. 1 does not justify such a distinction; for we only know that Luke is referring to written narratives, because he speaks of their being composed (*ἀναράξασθαι διήγησιν*). A comparison of 39, 14 with 39, 7 rather proves this, that Eusebius at one time regards the communications of Aristion and John as *παραδόσεις* of the same kind, and so applies that name to both in a passage where he is expressly dealing with heard, that is to say, oral information; while at another time he varies his expression, though without varying his sense, and puts them together as the *διηγήσεις* of Aristion and the *παραδόσεις* of John.

Now, as we have no reason for assuming that any one else besides Papias collected and jotted down narratives of Aristion's, it follows, supposing the tradition to be a true one, that we must here look to the work of Papias as the source of Mark xvi. 9-20. It was to this very work, namely, to the already quoted preface of Papias that the description of Aristion as a Presbyter directed us. Papias ascribed his traditions for the most part to his own instructors, of whom Aristion was one (39, 7); it is therefore quite conceivable that the name of Aristion, rather than that of Papias, was retained in the Armenian title, because we have here a narrative expressly attributed by Papias to Aristion.

This conclusion cannot indeed be true of the whole section Mark xvi. 9-20, for its contents are too heterogeneous to be all of

one origin; for the narrative contained in xvi. 9-13 and xvi. 19-20 cannot be referred to a single witness; no more do these verses correspond to the precise statement of Eusebius (*Ἀριστίωνος* . . . τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγων διηγήσεις, 39, 14). In xvi. 9-13 the chief apparitions of the risen Christ are enumerated according to the accounts of Luke and John, but they are not related. Neither can the verses xvi. 19-20 be termed a narrative of the Ascension and of the missionary activity of the apostles. In fact, it is only to the portion xvi. 14-18, so different in style and so original (*Hist. of the Canon*, I. 913 f.), that the Armenian title as well as the description which Eusebius gives of the character of Aristion's narratives can be held to apply. But here the principle acts: *a potiori fit denominatio*. Nor can we suppose that the entire end of Mark stood in Papias in such a form as this; a work consisting of five books and in accordance with its title intended to be mainly an exposition of the sayings of the Lord, containing moreover, according to the preface of Papias and the testimony of Eusebius, many traditions never before written down, cannot have passed so summarily over the whole of the history of the apostles and over such materials as we have in John xx. and Luke xxiv., as do the passages Mark xvi. 9-13 and 19-20. The following is what really occurred:—Some one who wished to give a fitting ending to the Gospel, which had been left incomplete, used for the purpose, not only the Gospels of Luke and John, but also the work of Papias. Out of the latter he took the single narrative, Mark xvi. 14-18, which Papias had inserted as information derived from Aristion. This is confirmed in a surprising way by the fact which Conybeare communicates, that in a MS. of Rufinus belonging to the Bodleian the name Aristion is written against the margin of Eusebius, iii. 39, 9, that is to say, against a narrative which closely concerns Mark xvi. 18, and which indeed proves to be a proof of the fulfilment of the very promise made by Jesus therein. In such a case there can be no talk of accident.

We may assign as the date of the composition of the appendix to Mark the years 130-140, if we remember on the one hand that Papias in all probability wrote his work under the reign of Hadrian, 117-138, say about the year 125 (see *Hist. of the Canon*, I. 802-854); and if we bear in mind, on the other hand, that Tatian at the latest about 170 knew the end of Mark, while the heathen Celsus probably knew it, as well as Justin, as early as

about the year 150. Now it would be an extremely improbable assumption that the composer of the appendix to Mark should have actually named Aristion as his authority, either in a prefatory title or in a marginal notice. If he did, how can we explain the fact that the notice was lost and disappeared from the hundreds of copies in which that appendix has been transmitted to us, so that we had no trace of it, until the Etschmiadzin Gospel was discovered? A learned notice of the kind is quite out of keeping with the style of Mark xvi. 9-20. Has not the author of it moreover cited John and Luke in *vv.* 9-13? On the other hand, the whole matter is easily explained if we assume that a learned man of the fourth or fifth century, who was interested in the question of the origin of Mark xvi. 9-20, because he did not find the section in all copies, who also knew the work of Papias and found in it a *Diegesis* of Aristion's, essentially the same with Mark xvi. 14-18, availing himself of his information, entered on the margin of his copy of the Gospels the words *Ἀριστίωνος πρεσβυτέρου*. This notice may then have gained currency over a small range and have made its way to Armenia among other places. I may recall the parallel of Apollinarius, to whom we owe Papias' description of the death of Judas.

Thus interpreted, Conybeare's discovery gives a final solution of another problem, which before could not be solved. The longer form of the text of Mark xvi. 14, which Hieronymus quotes, *C. Pelag.*, ii. 15, is certainly not to be regarded as no more than an amplification of the canonical text such as a foolish but honest copyist may have perpetrated. It is also very improbable that the very original text, which Hieronymus there cites, attained its canonical form in the course of the transmission of Mark xvi. 9-20. For our witnesses to the text are so old and so numerous that we could not fail to find some trace of the original text in some other quarter as well. We are therefore met here with a fact similar to that of the variants of the Cambridge MS., which have a more than textual significance, and as such have lately been learnedly treated of by F. Blass (*Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1894, pp. 86-119). I had already pointed out the probability, the sole probability indeed (*Hist. of the Canon*, II. 935-937), that the text quoted by Hieronymus¹ flowed from the same source,

¹ *Hier. c. Pelag.*, 2, 15: "in quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime in Gr. codd. iuxta Marcum in fine eius euangelii scribitur: Postea quum accubuissent un-

from which also the composer of the end of Mark drew. Now we know what was this source. It is the work of Papias and ultimately the oral tradition of Aristion. Just as one scholar, struck by the essential identity of Mark xvi. 14–18, with a section of Papias contented himself with noting in the margin of his book the words 'Ἀριστιῶνος πρεσβυτέρου; so another supplemented the canonical text from the narrative of Aristion as it lay more fully before him in Papias.

TH. ZAHN.

AUSSER-CANONISCHE PARALLELTEXTE ZU DEN EVANGELIEN, by Alfred Resch, x. Band, Heft 3, of v. Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, p. 449.

I have already had occasion to refer to Burgon's work entitled : *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark*, vindicated against recent critical objectors, and established by John W. Burgon, Oxford and London, 1871. This work is a volume in gross octavo of 323 pages, and as to it Lagarde regretted (*Mittheilungen*, I. 113) that a treatise, so full of charm because of the enthusiasm for the Church and for true science which pervades it, should not be independently known in Germany.

Burgon defends with the emphasis of conviction the genuineness of the canonical ending of Mark and its original inclusion in the second canonical Gospel. I too am, and always have been, persuaded of the remote and respectable antiquity of the section of the text comprised in Mc. xvi. 9–20, and my patristic studies have but confirmed me in my conviction.

Nevertheless, Burgon's conclusions as regards the criticism both of text and sources will not hold good. Respectable as is the antiquity of this section, yet it is certainly from another hand than that which penned as far as Mc. xvi. 8 and then abruptly ceased. It is not merely that the two oldest uncial codices, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (cp. Heft i. 19), in conjunction with many other weighty witnesses (cp. Tischendorf, *Ed. oct. crit. maj. N.T.*, p. 403–407) intimate to us that Mc. xvi. 9–20 did not originally belong to the Second Gospel; beside their testimony we have that of two

decim, apparuit eis Iesus, et exprobrauit incredulitatem et duritiam cordis eorum (quia his qui uiderunt eum resurgentem) non crediderunt. Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Sæculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia (ed. Vat. sub satana) quæ non sinit per immundos spiritus ueram dei apprehendi uirtutem. Idcirco iam nunc reuela justitiam tuam.³

from which also the composer of the end of Mark drew. Now we know what was this source. It is the work of Papias and ultimately the oral tradition of Aristion. Just as one scholar, struck by the essential identity of Mark xvi. 14-18, with a section of Papias contented himself with noting in the margin of his book the words 'Ἀριστιῶνος πρεσβυτέρου; so another supplemented the canonical text from the narrative of Aristion as it lay more fully before him in Papias.

TH. ZAHN.

AUSSER-CANONISCHE PARALLELTEXTE ZU DEN EVANGELIEN, by Alfred Resch, x. Band, Heft 3, of v. Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, p. 449.

I have already had occasion to refer to Burgon's work entitled : *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark*, vindicated against recent critical objectors, and established by John W. Burgon, Oxford and London, 1871. This work is a volume in gross octavo of 323 pages, and as to it Lagarde regretted (*Mittheilungen*, I. 113) that a treatise, so full of charm because of the enthusiasm for the Church and for true science which pervades it, should not be independently known in Germany.

Burgon defends with the emphasis of conviction the genuineness of the canonical ending of Mark and its original inclusion in the second canonical Gospel. I too am, and always have been, persuaded of the remote and respectable antiquity of the section of the text comprised in Mc. xvi. 9-20, and my patristic studies have but confirmed me in my conviction.

Nevertheless, Burgon's conclusions as regards the criticism both of text and sources will not hold good. Respectable as is the antiquity of this section, yet it is certainly from another hand than that which penned as far as Mc. xvi. 8 and then abruptly ceased. It is not merely that the two oldest uncial codices, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus (cp. Heft i. 19), in conjunction with many other weighty witnesses (cp. Tischendorf, *Ed. oct. crit. maj. N.T.*, p. 403-407) intimate to us that Mc. xvi. 9-20 did not originally belong to the Second Gospel; beside their testimony we have that of two

decim, apparuit eis Iesus, et exprobrauit incredulitatem et duritiam cordis eorum (quia his qui uiderunt eum resurgentem) non crediderunt. Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: Sæculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia (ed. Vat. sub satana) quæ non sinit per immundos spiritus ueram dei apprehendi uirtutem. Idcirco iam nunc reuela justitiam tuam.³

much more ancient witnesses, namely, the first and third evangelists themselves. Both of these clearly hint that the Mark from which they drew ended with the verse Mc. xvi. 8 (=Lc. xxiv. 8 = Matt. xxviii. 8).

From this point on, each of these supplies us with other kinds of information, of which the difference in character is so marked as to show at once that the determining influence on both of the Gospel of Mark is interrupted in Luke at ch. xxiv. 8, in Matthew at ch. xxviii. 8. The entire literary style of their concluding sections (Mt. xxviii. 9-20 and Lc. xxiv. 9-53) announces to us that they flow from sources which were hidden from the second evangelist and never opened by him. But more than this. A thoroughgoing analysis of the text of Mc. xvi. 9-20 in itself proves that this section did not originally belong to the Gospel of Mark, nor form any part thereof. Thus we have the testimony of all three evangelists declaring that in these verses some other writer than Mark addresses us.

Who then was it to whom we owe the end of Mark? The answer is near to hand: it was he who drew up and edited the first canon of the Gospels. But who was this editor of the earliest canonical collection of the Gospels?

Until now this question has been impenetrably obscure. Yet our age, so rich in important literary discoveries, has brought us in regard to our ending of Mark a discovery calculated to throw some light on the question.

Under the title: "Aristion, the author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark," there was published by Conybeare in the *EXPOSITOR* (for October, 1893, pp. 241-254) a brief but weighty article, in which he announced to the theological world a discovery he had made in an Armenian manuscript of the Gospels, which bore upon the question before us.

It was this. In contrast with all the other Armenian versions of the Gospels, which agree in rejecting the end of Mark, an Armenian codex of the Gospel, written in the year 989, and found in the patriarchal library of Etschmiadzin, gives the section Mc. xvi. 9-20 in the same hand as the rest of the Gospel, yet leaving between Mc. xvi. 8 and 9 an interval of two lines, in which there are inserted in red letters the words:

"Ariston Eritzu (*Ἀρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου*)." These words, which beyond doubt rest on a very old tradition, and have been accur-

ately handed down by the copyists from century to century, occupy an entire line (the codex being written in double columns), and so form the title of the section Mc. xvi. 9-20. The addition in an age long prior to textual criticism in our sense, and indeed to any textual criticism at all, of this title: 'Αρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου, yields us a twofold testimony, on the one hand of the fact that the canonical ending of Mark did not originally belong to the second Gospel, on the other of the authorship of the additional section attached at a very remote time to Mc. xvi. 8.

It is true that the brief character of the notice leaves the latter point somewhat obscure. If we take the name 'Αρίστων in the strict form in which it has been transmitted, no other person can be considered to be referred to thereby than *Ariston* of *Pellu*. Yet the confusion of the names 'Αρίστων and 'Αριστίων was in antiquity very common, as may be proved from several sources. If we adopt the form 'Αριστίων, it is an obvious thing to follow the theory which Conybeare, at the suggestion of his friend Archer, has propounded,—that in the author of the end of Mark we should recognise the Aristion whom Papias mentions along with the Presbyter John as one of his teachers and masters in tradition.

The contents and character of the section Mc. xvi. 9-20 agree well enough with such an assumption. For this section is free from all affectation and from all legendary colouring, such as, for example, we meet with in the pseudo-Petrine Gospel. It is rather characterised by a compendious abruptness, such as shows that the author of it says less than he knows. And accordingly Zahn (*Theol. Literaturblatt*, 1893, No. 51) has in all essential respects assented; as also Harnack (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1893, No. 23), who thus expresses himself: "In my judgment the facts are of a kind as to render unsuitable here a discussion of the main question involved"—so refraining from dissent.

Nevertheless there are considerations which tell against the theory and which must be carefully weighed.

In the first place, in the appeal of Papias to his two authorities, John and Aristion, we have to do with oral traditions and not with written memoranda. But the title of the end of Mark, "'Αρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου," found in the Armenian codex of the Gospels, proves by its very brevity that in it there is named not an authority in the way of oral tradition, but the actual writer and author of the section.

Secondly, it is extremely unlikely that Aristion, had he been the author of the ending of Mark, would not have communicated it to Papias; or that Papias, when he gives us the valuable information he had gathered from *παράδοσις*, orally communicated to him concerning the origin and character of Mark's Gospel, should have remained silent as to the origin of the end of Mark, supposing he had derived from his authorities any information on the point.

Thirdly, in view of the fact that the first and third Evangelists used the Gospel of Mark in the shorter form only, which ends at ch. xvi. 8; and also of the fact that this its original form was kept in the two oldest codices and was not unknown in the Church for centuries,—in view of all this, it is unlikely that the Second Gospel should have been rounded off and completed as a literary whole by the addition of the existing canonical ending at any time earlier than that in which our Gospel-canon grew up. It is, however, impossible to relegate the formation of our fourfold Gospel canon to so remote an age as that of Aristion, when oral tradition (*παράδοσις*) still had so great an influence and such a lofty significance.

On the other hand, there are sure signs that the canonical ending of Mark originated at the same time and along with the Gospel canon. On the basis of the exposition contained in Heft i. 30–47 we can demonstrate a conclusion which seems never to have been put forward by any school of critics concerned with the examination of the ending of Mark, just because the connection between the different families of the Gospel text, and the oldest form of the Gospel canon, had not yet been clearly shown. On page 36 of the introductory volume the following rule was established for the criticism of the N.T. text: “Agreement between the Greek codex D, the old Latin versions and the Syriac of Cureton gives us beyond a doubt the text of the Archetype, that is to say, of the oldest Gospel canon, which was formed about 140 A.D.” Following this rule, we must allow that the end of Mark, which figures in the Codex Cantabr., in the Syriac version of Cureton 2, in seven Italæ MSS. (among these is the important Codex Colbertinus), and besides that is contained in the *Diatessaron* (about 160–170), which depends on these sources, belonged to and formed part of that oldest Gospel canon. This Gospel canon, with which already Justin was acquainted, though he did not use it exclusively, in a few decades and apart from the Syriac Church, asserted its

supremacy as the only one in use, and came to be recognised to the exclusion of all others. Through it the end of Mark won the same recognition, being expressly mentioned by Irenæus, and was widely diffused in the manuscripts.

Now if an Ariston was the author of the canonical end of Mark, then the same Ariston must also have been the redactor of the earliest Gospel canon. The same hand which arranged the Gospels together in a well articulated whole also appended to the Second Gospel the section Mc. xvi. 9-20 by way of rounding it off as a literary whole. This twofold, though at the bottom single, editorial activity cannot in any case be carried back as far as Ariston, who was a pupil of the disciples and the authority from which Papias drew his collection of oral *παράδοσεις*; and it therefore follows that the Armenian title, "Ariston Eritzu (*i.e.* 'Αρίστωνος πρεσβυτέρου), can refer, as Sanday has already conjectured, (cp. Conybeare, p. 243) to no other person than the well-known Ariston of Pella. With such an inference well agrees the time in which Ariston lived, the locality in which he worked, and his roll in the Church so far as we know ought of it.

For the period of Ariston's activity the year 135 is the *terminus a quo*, a limit also which best agrees with the appearance about the year 140 (cp. vol. i. 12) of the Gospel canon. The scene of Ariston's activity lay in the region east of the Jordan, where, after the destruction of Jerusalem, was the seat of the bishop of Jerusalem, and the focus of the most ancient and precious form of Judaic Christianity. Close by Pella were also the head-quarters of heretical Jewish Christianity. Comp. *Epiph. Haer.*, xxx., 18, p. 142 A, in regard to the Ebionites: ἀπό τε τῆς Βατανείας καὶ πανεάδος τὸ πλείστον, Μωαβιτιδὸς τε καὶ Κωχαβῶν τῆς ἐν τῇ Βασανίτιδι γῆ, ἐπέκεινα Ἀδραῶν. *Haer.*, xv. 1, p. 291 D: ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ ἐν Κωχάβῃ,¹ ἔθθα οἱ τῶν Ἑβριωναίων τε καὶ Ναζωραίων ρίζαι ἐνήρξαντο. Euseb., *Onom.*, p. 372, 9-13, ed. Lagarde: Χωβά, ἣ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀριστέρᾳ

¹ In this connection Nestle has called attention to the remarkable fact that the scribe of the Vatican manuscript, which has preserved to us the *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum*, Elias of Abud, was abbot in a "star-cloister" (יָאֵר כּוֹכַב), and remarks thereon: "Perhaps what we have of Christian Palestinian literature is connected with this oldest trans-Jordanic Jewish Christianity. Lagarde long ago pointed out the importance which attaches to these regions for the original history of the churches. Perhaps it was such a reflexion which led him to devote a portion of his dying powers on the edition of the *Evangelium Hierosolymitanum*."

Δαμασκοῦ. ἔστι δὲ καὶ χωρὰ, κώμη ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς μέρεσιν, ἐν ᾗ εἰσὶν Ἑβραῖοι οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσαντες Ἑβιωναῖοι καλούμενοι.

It was among the Ebionites and Nazareans settled in these regions that we can trace the earliest use of the first Gospel (comp. above, p. 2, 3). It is to Pella also that we must look, if we would seek it, for the birthplace of the first Gospel. For the Jerusalem traditions, which have been precipitated in the peculiar passages of the Gospel according to S. Matthew (Mt. xxvii. 3-10; xxvii. 52, 53, 62-66; xxviii. 2-4, 9-15), were transplanted when the community of Jerusalem emigrated as a colony to Pella (Eus., *H.E.*, i. 7). Towards the same locality, lastly, is our attention directed by the question of the origin of the oldest Gospel canon, which by setting in the forefront and at its head the *εὐαγγέλιον* of the Jewish Christians is stamped with its origin in the most characteristic way possible.

But Ariston's standing in the Church, no less than the time and place in which he lived, makes him a fitting person in whom to recognise the redactor of the first Gospel canon and at the same time the author of the end of Mark. The Armenian manuscript of the Gospels indicates the author of Mc. xvi. 9-20 to have been a presbyter. That Ariston was not bishop of Pella one knows from the list of the bishops of Jerusalem, which Epiphanius (*Haer.*, lxvi. 20) has preserved to us. The first fifteen bishops, who were all Jewish Christians (*Epiph.*, p. 637 A : οὗτοι δὲ ἀπὸ περιτομῆς ἐπισκόπευσαν τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ) bear names which have nothing in common with the name Ariston. Even if one be not disposed to accept this list as quite historical, it is yet certain that a name like that of Ariston, supposing he had been bishop of the Jerusalem colony at Pella, could not have fallen into oblivion. But if he was not a bishop, he was most likely to be a Presbyter in Pella; and if the bishops were Jews by birth, the Presbyters would be so likewise. That Ariston however was a Jewish Christian may be inferred with certainty from the information about him preserved to us, in spite of its meagreness. For in the dialogue between Jason and Papiscus, which he composed in Greek, the Jewish Christian Jason was put forward against the Alexandrine Jew Papiscus as the champion of Christianity in general. (Comp. Orig. Praef. in *Librum c. Celsum*.) But the redactor of the oldest Gospel canon must have been a Jewish Christian, otherwise it would not be intelligible that the Judao-Christian *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου*

should head this canon. The person who for the first time arranged together the Gospels in one whole beyond doubt set a higher value on the *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον* than on all the other Gospels. All these considerations suit the Jewish Christian Presbyter, Ariston of Pella.

If this contemporary of Justin's was the originator of the Gospel canon, and if the establishment of that canon, which was an event of the greatest importance for the future development of the church, took place in Pella, then we can understand how it was that Justin, who was a native of the neighbouring Samaria, knew of it at so early a date, and that he who was doubtless converted from being a Nazarene to Christianity, and who retained all through life his affection for the primitive and venerable Jewish Christian faith, should have sanctioned by use, at so early a time, the newly created Gospel canon. The same facts would explain the circumstances that his pupil Tatian worked up this Gospel canon into his *διὰ τεσσάρων* for the use of the Syrian Church, and that in a few decades the recognition of the Gospel canon by the Church was full and final.

It may be, then, that Conybeare's discovery of this important notice in the Armenian manuscript of Etschmiadzin not only dissipates the darkness which hitherto enshrouded the canonical ending of Mark, but at the same time supplies us with an answer to the still more important question of who was the author of the canon of the Gospels.

A. RESCH.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION.—*Place aux Dames*: the new series, *Studia Sinaitica*, issued by the Cambridge University Press, is led off by Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, the former contributing as the first number of the series a *Catalogue of the Syriac MSS.* in the convent of S. Catharine on Mount Sinai, while the latter gives us as the second number *An Arabic Version of the Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians*, with part of the Epistle to the Ephesians from a ninth century MS. found in the same convent. The enterprise, scholarship and industry of these ladies are worthy of the amplest recognition. No ordinary familiarity with the Semitic languages and with ancient and