

*ON THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF ST. MARK'S  
GOSPEL.*

1. I HAVE been invited by the editor of the *EXPOSITOR* to criticise the views put forward by leading German critics as to the significance to be attached to my discovery of a tenth century Armenian MS. of the Gospels in the library of Edschmiadzin, in which the disputed final verses of Mark are attributed in a rubric which heads them to a certain Ariston Eritzu or Ariston Presbyter. This discovery I announced in these pages, and more recently I made a translation, which also appeared in the *EXPOSITOR*, of what Prof. Zahn and Dr. Resch had recently written on the subject. But before I approach the discussion of their views, I may be allowed to lay before my readers such further information about these disputed verses as the Armenian MSS. furnish.

2. And to begin with, it is of no small importance to fix the date at which the version of these twelve verses was made. The Armenian version of the Gospel was probably complete in its present form about the year 400; though I believe that its first inception was much earlier. If we think how versions of the Bible first arose, this will appear the more probable. Thus we find in our libraries early Greek and Latin manuscripts of the Scriptures which are glossed between the lines with Celtic and other versions. The vernacular equivalents are in such MSS. simply written in a small hand underneath the Greek or Latin words to which they correspond. The next step would be to copy out these interlinear glosses in a book by them-

selves or on a separate page opposite the original; and so we should get exactly such a literal rendering as we have in the old Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and other renderings of the New Testament. In the Codex Bezae we have the Greek and Latin thus written on opposite pages. It would be quite consistent with analogy, if we suppose the Armenian rendering of the Scriptures to have thus originated; and it would explain its extreme literalness if it thus grew up gradually out of interlinear glosses, written of course in Greek or Syriac characters. For the existing Armenian alphabet was not used, at any rate for writing Christian books, much before the beginning of the fifth century of our era.

3. Did then the last twelve verses of Mark belong to the Armenian version of the Gospel as it stood after the final revision of Mesrop early in the fifth century?

Here is one question; and here is another which treads closely upon its heels, namely:

Why did the Armenians, having had these verses in their original Bible, afterwards erase them from it, so that the earliest text in which we find them is the Edschmiadzin copy of A.D. 989, in which their attribution to Ariston the the Elder or Presbyter actually occurs?

Now the first of these questions must be answered with a yes. The twelve verses were certainly part of the original Armenian version of the Gospel. The proofs are these:

Eznik, a fifth century Father of the Armenian Church, knew of these twelve verses; and in his first book on *Heresies*, p. 89 of the Venice edition, we get vv. 17 and 18 quoted almost verbatim in a way that proves that he had in his hands the same Armenian version which survives to-day. Eznik was a fellow-worker with S. Sahak and S. Mesrop, and must have made this citation A.D. 420-430.

In the second place we find plentiful citation of these twelve verses in the Armenian version of the Acts of Pilate,

and this version of the Acts of Pilate, which is given in two Paris codices of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, must be almost as early as the sixth century. For the style in which it is composed precludes any other judgment. Now in it Mark xvi. 15-19 are cited according to the established Armenian version or Vulgate text, as we find it in the tenth century Armenian codex of Edschmiadzin, and in any other manuscripts of the Armenian Bible or Gospels which may happen to contain it.

Either of these grounds would by itself prove that the twelve verses were part of the fifth century Armenian version. Taken together they prove the point conclusively.

4. An examination, moreover, of old copies of the Armenian Gospels amply bears out this statement. In the Mechitarist library in the island of San Lazaro at Venice, is a codex of the Gospels dated A.D. 902, by consequence nearly a hundred years earlier than the Edschmiadzin copy. In this codex verse 8 ends the second column of a verso. The same marginal writing was continued on the recto side of the next folio, but there is not more of it than would amount to verses 9-13. It is, however, too obliterated to be read without chemical treatment. I examined it carefully, and satisfied myself that the writing so erased was *not* any part of the twelve verses—a very curious and important fact. There is too much of it for it to have been the alternative ending of Mark found in the Greek uncial codex L. Perhaps the scribe herein gave his reasons for omitting the last twelve verses. The verso side of the folio is left blank, and the entire pericope could hardly have been contained even on both sides.

In an Armenian codex of the four Gospels belonging to the Bodleian library and dated 1304, the scribe seems to have originally written the last twelve verses in the second column of the recto of fol. 141, and in both of the verso, but to have himself afterwards effaced them, adding the last

line of verse 8 at the bottom of the right-hand column of the recto side of fol. 141.

In more than one Armenian codex, where these verses occupied a folio by themselves, that folio has simply been cut out. In a 13th or 14th codex at San Lazaro in Venice there is prefixed to the verses the notice, "This is unauthentic." In the Bodleian Armenian codex of the four Gospels, dated A.D. 1335, a notice is prefixed as follows: "This is an addition." Many codices of the four Gospels, and also of the entire Bible, end the Gospel according to Mark at verse 8, and then after a space proceed with the twelve verses. This is so in the case of the oldest San Lazaro Bible, dated 1220, and of a Bible in the collection of Lord Zouche, later in date, but copied from an early archetype. In such cases the words, "The end of Mark (*or* of Mark's Gospel)" is added after *v.* 8.

The evidence of the Armenian lectionaries is only modern. The oldest one known, probably of the ninth century, an uncial codex of the Paris collection, does not give the lection Mark xvi. 9-20. We may hence infer that in the Armenian Church these verses were not read at that early time on Ascension Day in the Armenian as they were in other churches. However this may be, the lection in question has been usual ever since the twelfth century in the Armenian Church, and in Armenian MSS. written since that age one commonly finds the equivalent of "For Ascension Day" written against verse 9.

5. We may thus attribute the Armenian translation of these twelve verses to the beginning of the fifth century. The question remains: For what reason did the Armenians exclude from their Gospels a pericope which in most other churches passed unchallenged, and also constituted the lection for one of the greatest of the Christian feasts, namely, Ascension Day?

It will help us to answer this question, if we can ascer-

tain the reasons which led the Armenians to exclude certain other passages from their copies of the Gospels, which yet almost certainly were comprised in their earliest version.

6. Take we first the passage Luke xxii. 43-44. These are absent in many ancient copies, *e.g.*, in an uncial of at least the tenth century in a church at Tiflis, in the Moscow codex of A.D. 887, in the San Lazaro codex of A.D. 1006, in the Edschmiadzin codex of A.D. 989. In the San Lazaro codex of A.D. 902 alone is verse 44 preserved. Even it omits verse 43.

Yet these verses were part of the original Armenian version, and we know why and when they were omitted. For Theodore Chrthenavor, early in the eighth century, records that they had stood in the *first translation* of the New Testament, and that some heretics, called the Phantasiastæ, or Docetes, had cut them out; for it was deemed unworthy of the omnipotent Word of God to be in agony, and to sweat drops of blood, and to require an angel to reassure him. Tischendorf also, in his eighth edition, quotes old Greek authorities to the effect that the Armenian heretics had here mutilated the Scriptures; and St. Athanasius seems to have rowed in the same boat with these heretics, for, as Tischendorf remarks, "Quum sæpe posset adhibere non adhibuit." With good reason, for these two verses were the stronghold of Arius and his friends.

The reason for this omission was therefore doctrinal.

7. We have next to consider the episode of the woman taken in adultery (John viii. 1-11). This is absent from most old Armenian codices of the Gospels; *e.g.* from the two San Lazaro codices, written in 902 and 1006 respectively, from the Moscow codex of 887 A.D., and from the Tiflis codex. The Edschmiadzin codex of A.D. 989 is the only ancient codex of the Gospels which not only gives the episode, but gives it in its place; for, as we shall see,

Armenian codices of the entire Bible usually add it, but at the end of the Gospel. The form in which in this codex it is given is so truly remarkable that I venture to translate it. It immediately follows the words *οὐκ ἐγγίρεται* of John vii. 52, and runs as follows :

“A certain woman was taken in sins (=malitiis), against whom all bore witness that she was deserving of death. They brought her to Jesus (to see) what he would command, in order that they might malign him. Jesus made answer, and said, ‘Come ye, who are without sin, cast stones and stone her to death (*lit. βάλλετε λίθους καὶ λιθοβόλησον ποιεῖτε*).’ But he himself, bowing his head, was writing with his finger on the earth, to declare their sins; and they were seeing their several sins on the stones. And, filled with shame, they departed, and no one remained, but only the woman. Saith Jesus, ‘Go in peace, and present the offering for sins, as in their law is written.’”

Against this pericope is written, by the first hand, in the margin, the title, “The things of the adulteress”—*τὰ τῆς μοιχαλίδος*. The same title is usually affixed in Armenian MSS. to the rival text of the episode. For in all other texts of the Armenian Bible the pericope is given in a form agreeing with the Greek text of Stephanus.<sup>1</sup> I have nowhere met with it in the more archaic form in which the Edschmiadzin codex gives it. One of the two distinctive features, however, of this more archaic form, the circumstance, namely, that their sins were written by Jesus on the stones, is preserved in some other sources, *e.g.*, in the uncial *U* which, after *εἰς τὴν γῆν*, in *v.* 8, adds: *ἐνὸς ἐκάστου αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*. Also Jerome, *Pelag.*, 2, 17, writes thus: “Jesus inclinans digito, scribebat in terra, eorum uidelicet qui accusabant et omnium peccata mortalium, secundum quod scriptum est in propheta; *Relinquentes autem Te in terra scribentur.*” Bar-Hebræus (see *Assem.*

<sup>1</sup> With the following insignificant changes: in *v.* 2 some texts omit *καθίσας*; *v.* 3 thus, “*Ἀγουσιν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι γυναῖκα κατεῖλ. ἐν μοιχ. κ.τ.λ.*”; *v.* 4 omit *αὐτῶ*; *v.* 5, after *λέγεις* add *περὶ αὐτῆς*; *v.* 9 omit *καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνευδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι*; *v.* 9, for *πρεσβυτέρων* read *πρώτων*; *v.* 10, *ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ ἡ γυνὴ, ποῦ κ.τ.λ.*; *v.* 11 omit *αὐτῇ*.

*bibl. orient.*, 2, 170) mentions an Alexandrine codex which contained a similar account. No other source, however, than the Edschmiadzin MS. states that the accusers saw their sins in the stones, or that Jesus bade the woman make the offering prescribed in their law for sins. Jerome may have based his remark on the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which he had in his hands.

Another important feature in the account, as given in this manuscript, is that it states that "a certain woman was taken in sins (in malis or in malitiis = ἐν πονηροῖς), and that they all bore witness against her. D has ἐπὶ ἁμαρτία.

Here we have an account closely related to that which Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, 3, 39) gives us from Papias. Of Papias he says, ἐκτέθειται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναῖκός ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει. This passage in Eusebius has led critics to refer the entire episode to Papias as its author. In an Arm. MS. of San Lazaro, dated A.D. 1313, there is a scholion on this passage referring to Eusebius' history. Gregory of Narek, about 950, read the passage in its longer form as Stephanus' text gives it. Vartan, a 14th century writer, in his commentary on John, declares that it came out of Papias. Stephanus Dashtetzi says that his countrymen had excluded it from their copies for no good reason. It is not certain in which form these last two Armenian fathers read it in their copies. The Armenian Bible of A.D. 1220, at San Lazaro, writes against the episode, which it sets at the end of John's Gospel and gives in the longer form the title equivalent to τὰ τῆς μοιχαλίδος, and adds: "This passage belongs to the 86th number." This notice undoubtedly refers, says Father Carekin (*Catalogue des anciennes traductions Arméniennes*, p. 138) to the list of the concordance.<sup>1</sup> The Armenian MS. Bible of the

<sup>1</sup> Tischendorf (ed. N. T. octava) notes: "Zacharias Episc. Meletinensis in chronico sic: Exstat autem in Evglio S. Marae Episcopi can. 89 caput

British and Foreign Bible Society includes the episode of the woman taken in adultery in the text of John, instead of setting it at the end like most MSS. It however gives to it no Armenian number, and varies somewhat from other copies, *e.g.*, in adding *καθίσας* in *v.* 2.

10. Many questions arise in connection with the shorter text of this episode alone found in the Edschmiadzin codex. I have only space now to summarise without discussion the conclusions which seem to me probable in regard to it.

(i.) It confirms the judgment of Westcott and Hort, of Mr. E. B. Nicholson and others, who, as against Hilgenfeld, have contended that the pericope contained in texts of John is the same account as that to which Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, 3, 39) refers as being given by Papias and contained in the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

(ii.) The shorter text of the Edschmiadzin codex represents the form in which Papias and the Hebrew Gospel gave the episode. The longer form current is the same story edited, so to speak, for inclusion in the Greek Gospels at some very remote epoch.

(iii.) The longer Armenian text is a translation later than the rest of the Gospel of John; but certainly as early as the middle of the ninth century.

(iv.) The shorter form found in the Edschmiadzin codex of A.D. 989, is coeval with the rest of the Armenian version.

(v.) The Armenians excluded it from the Gospel, because the name of Papias being somehow associated with it, they knew that it was not properly part of the Gospel of John.

(vi.) The Armenians knew that it was Papias' and not John's, either because Papias' name was written against it in some of their codices, or because they recognised in the shorter form of text preserved in the Edschmiadzin codex the episode referred to by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, 3, 39).

singulare ev. Ioh. quod in aliis exx. non habetur." Dionysius Barsalibæus repeats this notice.



11. The foregoing is a digression; but I hope my readers will excuse it because of the interest attaching to the verses John viii. 1-12. What I was concerned to arrive at, when I entered upon it, were the reasons for which the Armenians rejected various parts of the Evangelical text at various times. We saw that Luke xxii. 43, 44 was excluded more or less completely on Docetic grounds, and its absence from so many of the oldest codices proves a great incursion of Docetic heresy in the Armenian Church, sometime in the 6th and 7th centuries. But a similar reason will not account for the omission of the episode of the adulteress. This last omission was almost certainly due to the reason I have given, that the Armenians recognised it as the work of Papias, or as part of the Hebrew Gospel. But if so, we may almost certainly infer that the end of Mark was cut out of their Gospels for a similar reason; namely, because having the title "of Ariston the Elder" prefixed, they knew it was not the work of Mark. This is the conclusion I wished to arrive at. It explains fully the notices affixed to the twelve verses in codices of respectable age, *e.g.*, "This is not genuine," "This is an addition." It is to be hoped that yet another codex may be found containing the ascription to Ariston. My friend, Archdeacon Ter Galoust Mkerttchian, of Edschmiadzin, has searched all the codices in his library, but found no other instance of it; nor does it occur in any of the many codices in Venice and in Paris, London and Oxford.

12. I will now turn to the consideration of the two theories in regard to the meaning of the title "of Ariston the Elder" which have been proposed by Dr. Resch and Prof. Zahn, of which I made a translation for an earlier number of the EXPOSITOR. More recently, Prof. Harnack has given his views in a long criticism of Rohrbach's recent work on the last verses of Mark. (See the *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1894, Heft iv.).

Dr. Resch suggests that the Ariston Elder was the same person who wrote an account mentioned by Eusebius of the siege and sack of Jerusalem by Hadrian. This Ariston was of Pella, a Jewish Christian and author of a dialogue between Jason (a Jewish Christian), and PapisCUS (an Alexandrine Jew). Both dialogue and history of Ariston having perished, we have no means of deciding whether the twelve verses are in the style of that author. We do hear that some people mistook his dialogue for a work of Luke the Evangelist; and as that was so, it is likely that Ariston of Pella could have written the twelve verses. That he was the first editor of the Gospel canon is equally possible, but equally hypothetical; I regard it as a very large hypothesis indeed to base on the words "of Ariston Elder." The most that can be said for Dr. Resch's theory is that it accounts very satisfactorily for the diffusion and time of appearance of the end of Mark. For Ariston, if he added it in the course of his supposed editorial activity, must have done so about 140 A.D. Now we find that from the earliest Syriac text, as given in the new Sinaitic codex just published at Cambridge, the last twelve verses of Mark are absent. Prof. R. Harris puts the date of this oldest Syriac version early in the second century. But as early as the sixth or seventh decade of that century the Syriac version had contracted the ending, for it figures in the Diatessaron of Tatian. The Bobbio old Latin version (\*) of the Gospels, which agrees with the new Syriac text in regard to the first chapter of Matthew in so striking a manner, also omits the last twelve verses of Mark. It also must have been made early in the second century. We can infer that the twelve verses were added about 130-150 A.D. to the Greek text. But there is really no ground, other than pure conjecture, for supposing that Ariston of Pella was their author. Had he himself been their author and had he added them, they would hardly present the appear-

ance which they do of being part of a longer and connected narrative. Westcott and Hort rightly insist on this point, and I think that the abrupt beginning *ἀναστὰς δὲ*, without any subject being supplied for the verb *ἐφάνη*, shows conclusively that we have here a fragment divorced from its context.

It is possible of course that Ariston of Pella, as first editor of the Gospel canon, may have taken the pericope from a longer work of his own. But it is very unlikely. As editor he would have had all the four Gospels before him, and would not have chosen as the end of Mark a piece which, as Westcott and Hort point out, agrees but imperfectly with much in the other Gospels. This want of harmony is good proof that the entire pericope was added before Mark's Gospel had been brought into one corpus with the other three Gospels. The entire tone and style of it is also, I must confess, rather more primitive than I should expect from Ariston of Pella writing as late as 140 A.D.

13. Prof. Zahn divides the twelve verses into two parts, a narrative portion consisting of *vv.* 9-13 and 19-20, and a doctrinal portion, *vv.* 14-18. The latter only he ascribes to Ariston's recitals (*διηγήσεις*) of the Lord's words (*τῶν τοῦ κυρίου λόγων*). The rest he regards as a compilation by some one from the other Gospels of Luke and John. He thinks that a learned man of the fourth or fifth century recognised *vv.* 14-18 as the work of Ariston, because he had seen it so headed in the work of Papias, and wrote a scholion against it in the margin "of Ariston the Elder," which was afterwards affixed as a title to the entire section of twelve verses.

It is certainly some confirmation of this view, that in the Acts of Pilate we find *vv.* 15-19 inclusive in quite a different setting. The passage is in ch. xiv. of those Acts and runs as follows :

“Now Phinees, a certain priest, and Adas, a teacher, and Aggæus, a Levite, went down from Galilee to Jerusalem and told to the rulers of the synagogue and to the priests and Levites, that we saw Jesus and his disciples sitting on the mountain called Mamelch, and He was saying to His disciples, Go ye into all the world and preach to all creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned. And these signs shall accompany them that believe . . . On the sick they shall lay hands and they shall be well.

“While Jesus was yet speaking to his disciples we saw Him taken up into heaven.”

It must be noticed however that this passage includes *v.* 19, which, according to Zahn, does not cohere with *vv.* 14-18. And I must confess that Zahn's analysis of the section seems to be somewhat hypercritical. Why, for example, should not Ariston have added a slight background of incident to the sayings of the Lord which he reported? I see no reason. Indeed, the probability is all the other way. For the discourses and sayings of Jesus were frequently called forth by circumstances and surroundings in which He found Himself. What more natural than that Ariston should furnish the setting of many a saying which would otherwise have been unintelligible. Nor can I agree with Zahn that *vv.* 9-13 do not cohere with 14-18, and that they are a mere compilation from the accounts of Luke and John. The gloss, if it be such, on *v.* 14, which Jerome gives, does not seem to me to prove anything in respect of the disconnection or otherwise of *vv.* 9-13 with 14-18. Is it impossible that Ariston should have composed the summary of events narrated in the other Gospels, especially in Luke, which *vv.* 9-13 supply? If he was living as late as 130-140, he may have had the other Gospels in his hands, and have compiled from them. There are competent scholars, however, like the late Dean Burgon, and Westcott and Hort, who virtually deny that the appendix of Mark is a compilation at all, and pronounce it to be an independent piece of narrative. The compiler, if such he was, used other

documents besides Matthew, Luke and John; for example, he had the documents which lie behind the pseudo-Petrine Gospel, as is clear if we compare *v.* 59 of this, *ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκλαίωμεν καὶ ἐλυπούμεθα* with the words in Mark xvi. 10, *τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις, πενθοῦσιν καὶ κλαίουσιν*. He may even have had access, as I believe the writer of the Acts of Pilate may have had, to early documents which Luke used up in his Gospel.

Neither have I much belief in the hypothesis of a learned man in the fourth or fifth century, who was interested in the question of the origin of Mark xvi. 9-20, and therefore added a scholion in the margin. For (1) no scribe would have given to a marginal scholion such a place of dignity as the title *Ariston Eritzu* occupies in the *Edschmiadzin* codex. When the writer of this codex did find such a scholion, *e.g.*, *τὰ τῆς μοιχαλίδος*, against John viii. 1, he wrote it as a marginal scholion in his copy in small letters, and did not write it in big red uncials in a line all by itself.

(2) A learned man of the fifth century would not have been in time, for the verses were in the Armenian version as early as 420; and the title was certainly there from the first, or the Armenian scribes and doctors would not have cut out the section so uniformly as being an "apocryphal addition." *Eznik* carefully abstains from quoting the verses as Mark's. And the whole theory of learned scholiasts in the fourth century is somewhat forced, even if possible. As I looked at the codex itself I felt sure that the title before me was coeval with the verses not only in the Armenian version, but in the copy from which it was made, whether Greek or Syriac. And on reconsideration of the matter I think the verses were translated from Greek. It was probably because the scribe of the Greek uncial *B* found the same title of "Aristion Elder" affixed to the verses, that he left a blank space for them and went on to write out Luke. He, like most Armenian scribes, regarded any verses as

unworthy of a place among the four Gospels which were not from the hand of one of the four canonical Evangelists.

14. I hesitate to dissent on these points from the opinion of Prof. Zahn, the greatest living authority on the history of the canon. But I cannot but consider that the introduction in the text of the Edschmiadzin codex of the archaic form of the episode of the woman taken in adultery somewhat strengthens my views. For if the writer of this codex, or of its archetype, or of the Greek original which it represents, had access to the work of Papias or to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and introduced in his text—probably from the former—this more archaic form of the episode, may not the same writer have added to Mark's Gospel, somehow or other and for some reason or another truncated, the last twelve verses, taking them direct out of Papias in whose *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις* they stood with the heading prefixed "of Aristion Elder"? That the twelve verses may have stood in Papias with such a heading is probable; for Eusebius says of him: *ὀνομαστί γοῦν πολλάκις αὐτῶν μνημονεύσας, ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγράμμασιν τίθησιν αὐτῶν παραδόσεις*, where *αὐτῶν* means "of Aristion and John the Presbyter." I suspect that the narrative of the woman taken in adultery was also taken by some editor of the Gospels out of Papias and that in Papias' *συγγράμματα* it bore the heading *τά τῆς μοιχαλίδος. Ἰωάννου*. My hypothetical editor then confounded between John the Elder and John the Evangelist, and therefore thrust the pericope into John's Gospel, where it stands both in the Edschmiadzin codex, and in the Codex Bezae at the end of ch. vii. and beginning of ch. viii.<sup>1</sup>

15. I suspect that in the earliest age of Christianity there were two opinions or more about the Ascension of Jesus. According to one form of belief reflected in the Acts, it took

<sup>1</sup> After I wrote the above I found the same view put forward by Mr. E. B. Nicholson, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 54.

place from the Mount of Olives; according to another from the Mount Mamelch, in Galilee, which Jesus before His death appointed as a *rendezvous* for His disciples. This form of the story we find in the Gospel of Matthew and in the Acts of Pilate.<sup>1</sup> According to a third form of belief reflected in the Gospel of Peter, Jesus was taken up into heaven at the close of the crucifixion scene itself, and there was no final and definite ascension. I cannot but believe that these differences of opinion in the earliest age are responsible in some way for the loss of the true end of Mark and its replacement by a *διήγησις* of Aristion, which was neutral and did not say whence He ascended. I think it is also important to notice that, although the Greek editions of Eusebius (*H. E.*, 136) make both Aristion and John the Presbyter *disciples of the Lord*, the old Latin and Armenian versions do nothing of the sort. Ruffinus renders "quæue Aristion vel Joannes presbyter ceterique discipuli," while the Armenian omits the words *οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί*. Perhaps therefore both of Papias' direct teachers were only pupils of the disciples and had not themselves seen the Lord. The importance of the scholion in a Bodleian codex of Ruffinus' version of Eusebius has been overrated by Zahn and others. It is a very ragged and late bit of writing.

16. Looked at as to their contents and ideas implied, both the last twelve verses and the account of the adulteress in its new form strike me as very archaic. The idea of immunity from the bite of vipers being secured by faith meets us in Acts xxiii. 6. So in the Vita Pythagoræ of

<sup>1</sup> The composer of these Acts seems to have used the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. For example, we read in them i. 4 (of the triumphant entry of Jesus): *λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· πῶς δὲ ἔκραζον Ἑβραῖοι; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ὡσαννὰ μενβρονῆ βαρουχαννά ἄδωνά*. Compare *Jerome ad Dam.* (Martianay's ed., iv. 148): "Denique Matthæus, qui evangelium Hebræo sermone conscripsit, ita posuit Osanna Barrama, id est, Osanna in Excelsis. (See *The Gospel according to the Hebrews* by E. B. Nicholson, p. 51). The utterance (Ps. 31. 6) of Jesus on the cross *βαδδὰχ ἐφκιδ βουέλ* reported in the same Acts of Pilate may also have been taken from the Hebrew Gospel.

Iamblichus, which is very likely a repetition of that which Apollonius of Tyana wrote, we read that the great mystical teacher of Greece, in Sybaris and in Tyrrhenia, took up deadly vipers without being hurt. The Bacchæ of Euripides in their transports had the same power (Eurip., *Bacchæ*, 698), and the same idea meets us in other profane authors.

17. In the new form of the story of the adulteress, the words of Jesus, "Go in peace and present the offering for sins, as in *their* law is written," are remarkable for the objective attitude implied towards the law of the Jews, for the contradiction with the received text, according to which the woman's accusers declared that Moses in his law commanded that such offenders should be stoned; and, lastly, for its contrast in tone with the ordinary text, which has, "Neither do I condemn thee. Go, and sin no more." This latter seems to me in tone and sentiment much the finer way of ending the episode. It is remarkable that in the *Protevangelium Iacobi* almost the same words are addressed by the priest to Joseph and Mary, when he is acquitted of the charge of having neglected to guard the virgin committed to his keeping, and she of the charge of having lost her purity. The priest gives them each the cup of ordeal (τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ἐλέγξεως κυρίου), and then acquits them, saying, "Since the Lord God hath not made manifest your sins, neither do I condemn you." "And he released them" (*Protev.*, xvi.). In the Greek texts of the *Protevangelium* there is the same variation between κρίνω and κατακρίνω as in the MSS. at John viii. 11.

18. The difference of form between the new and the current form of this episode of the adulteress presents a very curious problem. The current form is as old as the Codex Bezae in which it occurs, and underlies the *Apostolic Constitutions*, 2, 24, 4. The new Armenian form, on the other hand, resembles that with which Eusebius and



Jerome may have been familiar. The antiquity of the Edschmiadzin form, as I will style that which I now publish, is, I think, demonstrated by the fact that Gregory Narekatzi, who died A.D. 972, just before the Edschmiadzin codex was written, already had the other form of the episode, and in his commentary on the *Song of Songs* quotes the words, "Neither do I condemn thee. Go, and sin no more," in the same terms in which they are rendered in the Venice Bible of 1220 A.D., as well as in other Armenian texts. The Armenians, therefore, already had the ordinary text long before the end of the tenth century.

19. If the new form of the episode only occurred in a late MS., it would still be hardly reasonable to argue that it was a make-up of an Armenian scribe in order to stop a gap in his text. But since it occurs in a codex which is already notable for its ascription of the end of Mark to Ariston, the greatest weight must be attached to it. There are yet other instances where old codices of the Armenian version preserve very old features of the New Testament text. For example, in Matthew ii. 9, the Moscow codex of the year 887 reads: *ὁ ἀστὴρ . . . ἐστάθη ἐπάνω τοῦ σπηλαίου οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον*, "the star . . . stood still over the cave where was the child." This is a text testified to in a general way by Justin Martyr, by Origen, and by the *Prot-evangelium Iacobi*, xxi., which says of the star that it *ἔστη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ σπηλαίου*, where also some manuscripts read *ἐπάνω* for *ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν*, while others add *οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον*. Perhaps the Armenian here preserves an ancient form of reading which has vanished from every Greek manuscript. I do not think it is a mere gloss.

20. I cannot identify in St. Martin's introduction the passage in which, according to Prof. Zahn, he speaks of "a second Armenian version of Mark xvi. 9-20, which is not included in the printed Bibles," and as to which Prof. Zahn adds: "It is to be desired that Mr. Conybeare, who

has examined the MSS. of Edschmiadzin on the spot, should give us a full account of the relation of this text to the versions of the end of Mark which are already printed." I have never seen but one version in Armenian codices and editions of Mark xvi. 9-20, nor do I believe there ever was more than one.

In my first article in the EXPOSITOR (October, 1893), I gave a collation of the text of the Edschmiadzin codex with that of Westcott and Hort's N. T. The Venice (San Lazaro) Codex of the Gospels, No. 7. 6. 1635, dated A.D. 1193, has practically the same text, except that in v. 12 it has *ὑστερον ἐφανερῶθη αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐτ. μ.*, instead of *μετὰ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐφαν. ἐν ἐτ. μ.* This codex also adds *Ἰησοῦς* after *ἀναστάς* in v. 5.

The Venice MS. of four Gospels, 6. 5. 938, dated 1205 A.D., has the same text again as No. 7. 6. 1635 just described. The same text is also found in the Venice Codex of the four Gospels, 7. 2. 641, dated A.D. 1256, and also in another MS. 5. 6. 1196, of which I do not know the precise date; but it is probably a late thirteenth century MS.

Another San Lazaro codex 2. 6. 325, dated 1230, gives a text with very many variants from these three which I have mentioned. These variants, however, do not quite entitle it to be called another version, and they are not of sufficient interest for me to print them here. The Bibles of Lord Zouche and of the London British and Foreign Bible Society practically give the same text as the Edschmiadzin codex; so does the oldest Bodleian codex of the four Gospels, which contains the twelve verses.

I owe the above information about the San Lazaro codices to Father F. D. Galatosian, as also much of what follows.

21. In conclusion, I venture to give a translation of the colophons which usually occur at the end or beginning of each Gospel; not indeed in the oldest uncial MSS. containing the Gospels only and meant for church use, but in all

copies of the entire Bible and in most codices of the four Gospels later than 1100 A.D. In MSS. of the Bible, I may say that each Gospel is prefaced with a longer notice, consisting of an outline of its contents, followed by the shorter colophons or notices which I forthwith translate from the last edition of the Bible printed at Venice.

1. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Jerusalem in the Hebrew language in the eighth year after the Ascension of the Saviour at the request of the Church of Jerusalem.

2. Mark, at the command of Peter the Rock, wrote his Gospel in Alexandria in the Egyptian tongue in the fifteenth year after the Ascension of the Saviour.

The outline of contents includes the last twelve verses.

3. Luke, by profession a physician, became a disciple of the Saviour, and was reckoned and called to be of the number of the seventy. But afterwards he became a disciple of Paul; wherefore there is uttered an eulogy of the latter in the Gospel. He, at the command of Paul, wrote his Gospel in Antioch in the Syrian language in the seventeenth year after the Ascension of the Saviour.

4. John, who was Son of Thunder, thundering forth, related that which is heavenly to us. He, in the fifty-third year after the Ascension of the Saviour, wrote his Gospel in Ephesus, at the request of the Church of Asia, in the Greek tongue.

A number of thirteenth and fourteenth century codices of the Gospels in Venice, Paris, London and Oxford have these notices with slight variations, usually adding the number of headings, etc., in each Gospel, as follows :

1. Matthew has, Headings (*capita*), 355; Testimonies, 32; Gospels (passages for reading), 61; Verses, 2,600.

2. Mark has, Headings, 234; Testimonies, 15; Gospels (readings), 55; Verses, 1,600.

3. Luke has, Headings, 344 (or 342); Testimonies, 17; Lections, 64; Verses, 2,800.

4. John has, Headings, 232; Testimonies, 15; Lections, 50; Verses, 2,300.

In these notices there is a slight variation in some copies. For example, Luke is in a thirteenth century Ritual MS. in the Vatican, stated to have written his Gospel in Latin at Rome. In a MS. No. 2. 6. 190 of respectable age at Venice, it states that "Mark wrote his Gospel in Rome from the mouth of Peter in the Dalmatic tongue, which is the Hellenic." Dalmatic was the fourth century Armenian equivalent for Latin.

But these notices are exceptions, and there is a fair agreement among these old Armenian colophons, which seem to go back to the fifth century, that Luke and Mark both wrote in Syriac; so that the Fourth Gospel was the only one written from the first in Greek. One would like to know what underlies these notices, whence they came, and whether or no anything more than Armenian and Syrian rivalry with the Greeks originally prompted them.

A very old codex of the Georgian Gospels, at least as early as the beginning of the twelfth century, in the Pope's library at Rome, states in a colophon that Matthew was written at first in Hebrew, but says nothing about Mark and Luke.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

#### SUMMARY.

1. The title "Ariston Eritzu."
2. When were the last twelve verses of Mark translated into Armenian? Vernacular versions grew up out of inter-linear glosses.
3. Evidence that the appendix of Mark was translated early in the fifth century from Eznik and Armenian Acts of Pilate.
4. From an examination of old copies of the Armenian Gospels.

5. The question why the Armenian Church excluded the Appendix of Mark.

6. The evidence of other such exclusions, *e.g.*, Luke xxii. 43-44, was cut out for doctrinal reasons.

7. The episode of the woman taken in adultery alone contained among old codices in the Edschmiadzin copy, but in a new form.

8. The episode translated from that copy.

9. Papias and the Gospel according to the Hebrews probably gave it in the new form found in this MS.

10. Probabilities as to this new form of the text of John viii. 1-11.

11. The Armenians excluded this pericope because they knew it was due to Papias, not to John; and excluded Mark xvi. 9-20 because they knew it was Aristion's, and not Mark's writing.

12. Consideration of Dr. Resch's theory as to the title "Ariston Eritzu."

13. Of Professor Zahn's.

14. Bearing of the appearance in the same codex of the new form of John viii. 1-11, on the question of the origin of the title "Ariston Eritzu." They both came out of Papias.

15. Variety of opinion in the very earliest Church as to the scene of the Ascension explains the loss of the original end of Mark.

16. Tone of the appendix of Mark very primitive.

17. Contrast between the new, or Edschmiadzin, and the old form of John viii. 1-11.

18. Antiquity of both forms.

19. Other peculiarities of old Armenian copies of the Gospels, *e.g.*, Jesus born in a *cave*, according to the Moscow copy dated 887.

20. There was never but one Armenian version of Mark xvi. 9-20.

21. Colophons found at the ends of the Gospels in old Armenian copies.