

Julian's *Contra Galilaeos* and Cyril's *Contra Iulianum*: Two Witnesses to the Short Ending of Mark¹

John Granger Cook
LaGrange College

Abstract: A Syriac MS (British Museum Add. 17214, fol. 65a–65b) preserves an excerpt from Julian's *Contra Galilaeos* and Cyril's response (the *Contra Iulianum*), which indicates that both authors either did not know the longer ending of Mark (16:9–20) or regarded it as spurious. The evidence has apparently been overlooked in studies of the longer ending of Mark. If the argument is sound, then Julian should be added to the apparatus criticus of Mark as a witness to the short ending (16:8). Cyril should be reevaluated as a patristic father who probably knew MSS that omitted the longer ending, but unlike Jerome and Eusebius, did not assert that fact about the MSS in the surviving text.

Keywords: Markan Short Ending; Julian; Cyril; Mark 16:8

Julian's attack on the NT and the Christian faith, which Cyril of Alexandria ably countered in his *Contra Iulianum*, included a stinging critique of the differences in the resurrection narratives of the Gospels. Julian's reference to Mark and Cyril's response indicate that they either did not know the longer ending (L.E.) or thought it was spurious. I will argue that it is more probable that Julian did not know the L.E. and that Cyril, who quotes Mark 16:20 in one text, probably viewed the L.E. as spurious. The critique of Julian and Cyril's reply survive in a Syriac MS and are an excerpt from the lost book 14 of Cyril's text. Below, I will establish the textual evidence of Julian and Cyril and compare it with the judgments of Jerome and Eusebius, who both responded to questions about discrepancies in the resurrection narratives and who both commented on the L.E. The evidence of Jerome and Eusebius is an important analogy, because Jerome included the L.E. in his Vulgate, even though he expressed doubts about its authenticity. Eusebius was bold enough to omit it from his canons and noted that it was not in the most accurate MSS. Cyril's relationship to Eusebius's *Quaestiones euangelicae* will be discussed.

¹ I owe a debt of gratitude to Jennifer Wright Knust who has discussed this article with me from its inception, and I thank her for pointing me to Eusebius, Jerome, and several modern treatments of the problem including the fine essay by James Kelhoffer. Many others have graciously offered me assistance along the way. Any mistakes are my own. Abbreviations are from S. Schwertner, *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete* (2nd ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), *The SBL Handbook of Style* (ed. P. H. Alexander et al.; Peabody, MA: Hendrikson 1999), *PGL*, and A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954).

1. The Short Ending of Mark

The manuscript evidence for the Short Ending of Mark is familiar to NT scholars.² Besides \aleph , B, 304, and sy^s, ninety-nine Armenian MSS lack the L.E.³ as do two old Georgian MSS.⁴ The L.E. is omitted in a MS in Sahidic from the fifth century.⁵ The notation in family 1 (1, 209, 1582) is also important: “In (on the one hand) some of the copies, the evangelist is finished here—and up to this point Eusebius of Pamphilus canonized—but in many [copies] these also are transmitted” (+Ἐν τισι μὲν τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕως ὧδε πληροῦται ὁ εὐαγγελιστῆς ἕως οὗ καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐκανόνισεν ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φέρεται [16:9–20]).⁶ Eusebius and

² A recent set of judicious essays on the problem may be found in *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark: Four Views* (ed. D. A. Black; Nashville: Broadman, 2008).

³ E. C. Colwell, “Mark 16 9–20 in the Armenian Version,” *JBL* 55 (1937): 369–86, esp. 373–75, 378. Thirty-three MSS express doubt on the part of scribes who marked the passage as spurious in various ways (ibid., 375–78), and eighty-eight (ibid., 371–73, 378) have the L.E. See B. O. Künzle, *Das altarmenische Evangelium*. Vol. 1, *Edition zweier altarmenischer Handschriften ...* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1984), 133 app. crit.: Codex Matenadaran 6200 (887 CE) has the short ending; codex Matenadaran 2347 (olim Ējmiacin 229; 989 CE) has “Ariston” between verses 8 and 9 followed by the rest of the L.E. For a review of research in the Armenian version of the NT, see S. P. Cowe, “The Armenian Version of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (ed. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes; 2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 253–92 (see 255–66 on the open question of the dependence of the Armenian version on the Syriac text).

⁴ R. P. Blake, ed. and trans., *The Old Georgian Version of the Gospel of Mark from the Adysh Gospels: With the Variants of the Opiza and Tbet' Gospels* (PO 20.3; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1928), 573, app. crit. (cf. 440, 443; the Adysh [897] and Opiza MSS [913] have the short ending only); and J. Molitor, “Das Adysh-Tetraevangelium: Neu übersetzt und mit altgeorgischen Paralleltextrn verglichen,” *OrChr* 43 (1959): 1–16, esp. 16. See J. W. Childers, “The Georgian Version of the New Testament,” in: Ehrman and Holmes, *Text of the New Testament*, 293–328, esp. 299–302. J. N. Birdsall has suggested that at least some Georgian translations were directly from the Greek (“Georgian Studies and the New Testament,” in J. N. Birdsall, *Collected Papers in Greek and Georgian Textual Criticism* [Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias 2006]) 197–214, esp. 202–4, 209–10).

⁵ H. Quecke, *Das Markusevangelium saïdisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv. Nr. 181 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569* (Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1972), 58 (picture of fol. 117 with the short ending), 179 (ΓΑΡ is the final word) = sa 1 (Schmitz/Mink). Quecke (ibid., 59) dates it to the first half of the fifth century. Paris MS Copte 129 (8) Fol. 162b (Trismegistos 61772; seventh century) stops at 16:8 and then has this notation before the intermediate ending: ἔν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων ταῦτα φέρεται. After the intermediate ending, there is this notation, ✠ ἔστιν δ[ὲ] ταῦτα φεράμε[να] (sic; see F. T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. 1, *Phonology* [Milano: Cisalpino-La goliardica, 1976], 286–89 [the α for ο is a scribal error due to Coptic phonology]), which is followed by the L. E. See G. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect Otherwise Called Sahidic and Thebaic* (vol. 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 640–41. My thanks to Jerker Blomkvist and Thomas Kraus for the grammatical insights.

⁶ See K. Aland and B. Aland, with K. Wachtel and K. Witte, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testament*. Vol. 4, *Die synoptischen Evangelien: 1. Das Markusevangelium* (ANTT 27; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998), 407, 417 (with slight variants). Various similar notations exist in MSS 15, 20 (+ ἐντεῦθεν ἕως τοῦ τέλους ἔν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐ κεῖται· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις πάντα ἀπαράλειπτα κεῖται), 22 (+ τέλος *Ἐν τισι μὲν τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕως ὧδε πληροῦται ὁ εὐαγγελιστῆς ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φέρεται), 199, 205, 215, 1110, 1192, and 1210 (see Aland, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften*, and *Nouum Testamentum graece se-*

Jerome both knew MSS that omit the L.E. Julian and Cyril were probably familiar with similar MSS.⁷

2. Julian and Cyril

Cyril wrote his twenty books against Julian, because, as Wolfram Kinzig has argued, there was continuing debate between Christians and pagans in the fifth century.⁸ In one of the Syriac fragments from book 14 of Cyril's response to Julian, the philosopher attacks the resurrection narratives.⁹ The fragment is part of a MS that is dated to seventh century and that is a florilegium of excerpts from the patristic writers on "various Biblical passages and subjects." Three of the excerpts are from Cyril's treatise against Julian.¹⁰ The critique of Julian and Cyril's answer have apparently been overlooked in the *apparatus critici* of the various modern editions of the NT and in the examinations of the L.E. of Mark.¹¹

cundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Marcum (ed. S. C. E. Legg; Oxford: Clarendon, 1935), app. crit. to 16:8; MSS 137 and 138 have asterisks before 16:9–20).

⁷ On the importance of patristic citations in NT textual criticism, see G. D. Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Text Criticism* (ed. E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 344–59. Fee also studies the text of John 4 in Cyril in the same volume ("The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," 301–34).

⁸ W. Kinzig, "Zur Notwendigkeit einer Neuedition von Kyrill von Alexandrien, *Contra Iulianum*," in *StPatr* 29:484–94, esp. 488–89.

⁹ Julian, *C. Gal.* 96 (Julian, *Contra Galilaeos* [ed., trans., and comm. by E. Masaracchia; *Testi e Commenti* 9; Roma: Ateneo, 1990], 187); Cyril, *C. Iul.* 18 (C. J. Neumann and E. Nestle, *Iuliani Imperatoris librorum contra Christianos quae supersunt* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1880], 54 [Syriac], 70 [Latin]); J. G. Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco Roman Paganism* (STAC 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 300–301 (English trans. of Julian's objection). W. Kinzig, C. Riedweg, and T. Brüggeman are producing an *editio maior* of the Greek text of Cyril's *Contra Iulianum* for the GCS series (the *Kyrillprojekt*), and H. Kaufhold is editing the Syriac fragments (a German trans. will be made also). M.-O. Boulnois, in collaboration with the *Kyrillprojekt*, is doing an *editio minor* with a translation for books 3–10 (completing the SC series: *Cyrille d'Alexandrie, Contre Julien*. Vol. 1, *Livres I–II* (ed. and trans. P. Burguière and P. Éviex; SC 322; Paris: Cerf, 1985).

¹⁰ British Museum Add. 17214, fol. 65a–65b; W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum: Part II* (London: British Museum, 1871), 915–16. See also Neumann and Nestle, *Iuliani Imperatoris*, 1880, 42, A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur mit Ausschluß der christlich-palästinensischen Texte* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1922), 161–62, and I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia syriaca* (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1958), 228, and CPG 5233. I thank the museum for making a reproduction of the folio available to me. Small fragments of Cyril's reply are in British Museum Add. 17191, fol. 53b, and Add. 17193, fol. 5a.

¹¹ It would be tedious to list them here. Julian's and Cyril's discussions will presumably be included in the volume dedicated to Mark of *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung* (ed. B. Aland and A. Juckel; Berlin, 1986–); so far only the Pauline and Catholic epistles have been edited. In *ibid.*, 2.1:603, one of the sources listed is Nestle's edition of the Syriac fragments of Cyril's *Contra Iulianum*. The editors argue that (*hypothetisch*) if a full Syriac translation of Cyril's *C. Iulianum* existed (other than the *florilegia* and *catenae* in which it has survived), then it would have been made in the sixth century or earlier, before the creation of the Harklensis (615/616; see G. A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshittâ and Harklean Versions* [4 vols.; NTTS 22.1; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 1:xxxii [A. Juckel, "Introduction to the Harklean Text," xxxi–lxxxii]).

If Julian knew the L.E., he rejected it as spurious. It is far more likely that he did not know the L.E.²² He probably obtained MSS of the NT from the Alexandrian library of Bishop George, since he had written letters asking for George's library. His copies of Mark, wherever he obtained them, almost certainly did not include the L.E. and so corresponded with the ending found in Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. Otherwise he would not have written the text above, and he could have attacked the Galilaeans using texts such as Mark 16:16–18 with glee, as did an anonymous pagan philosopher, probably to be identified with Porphyry.²³ Clearly Julian assumes that there was only one visit to the tomb by the women, and this corresponds to evidence in a text of John of Thessalonica (seventh century), who thought that the women made four journeys to the tomb (i.e., one in each Gospel):

And not, as the atheists and polytheists who were despots and apostates said, that there was one arrival of the women to the tomb, and that the evangelists disagreed about the history.

καὶ οὐχ ὡς φασιν ἄθεοι καὶ πολύθεοι γινόμενοι τύραννοι καὶ παραβάται μία γέγονεν ἄφιξις τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ διεφώνησαν.²⁴

John, in his homily, clearly is referring to Julian (the Apostate). Cyril's and John's texts indicate that Julian was attacking the apparent inconsistency of the resurrection narratives.

The MSS of the NT that Julian used were diverse, according to the reconstruction of his treatise by Emanuela Masaracchia, who reexamined the MSS of the *Contra Iulianum*. His quotation of Matt 23:27b is the same version found in D, I^{lat}, and (Cl): (ἔξωθεν ὁ τάφος φαίνεται ὠραῖος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμει ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας).²⁵ Julian's version of Matt 28:19 begins πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε, omitting οὖν as do **Ⲙ**, A, K, Γ, and various other MSS, including **Ⲙ**. In a reference to Mark 6:40, Julian writes ἀνὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα, following **Ⲙ**⁸⁴, A, K, L, and many other MSS (with **Ⲙ**), against the reading in **Ⲙ**, B, and D.²⁶ Luke

²² The brief comments on the text have concentrated on the nature of Julian's critique, his sources, and relationships with Eusebius's *Quaestiones euangelicae* and other Christian writers. For a helpful summary, see G. Rinaldi, *La Bibbia dei pagani*. Vol. 2, *Testi e Documenti* (Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1998), 437–38. Most important are the brief remarks of Claudio Zamagni in Eusèbe de Césarée, *Questions évangéliques* (ed. and trans. C. Zamagni; SC 523; Paris: Cerf, 2008), 196–97 (referred to as *Questions évangéliques* below).

²³ I develop this theme in the second part of the article, forthcoming in *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*. See Macarius, *Monogenes* 3.16.1–3 (Macarios de Magnésie, *Le Monogénès: Édition critique et traduction française*. Vol. 2, *Édition critique, traduction et commentaire* [ed. R. Goulet; Textes et traditions 7; Paris: Vrin, 2003], 2:142,23–144,10). The philosopher challenges candidates for the priesthood and bishopric to drink fatal poison in order to test the genuineness of their faith.

²⁴ John of Thessalonica, *Mul. ung.* 4 (CPG 7922). Text in F. Combefis, *S. patris nostri Asterii Amaseae episcopi Aliorumque plurium dissertissimorum ecclesiae Graecae patrum* (Paris: Bertier, 1648), 813E–16A [cod. Paris gr. 724, fol. 321–335; cp. 812C–813E for mention of the four arrivals, etc.] = PG 59:641.

²⁵ Most of the textual data below are from NA²⁸. He quotes the entire verse. See Julian, *C. Gal.* 81.11–3 (Masaracchia, *Contra Galilaeos*, 175). Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3.9.47: ἔξωθεν ὁ τάφος φαίνεται ὠραῖος, ἔνδον δὲ γέμει ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.18.3: *A foris enim sepulchrum apparet formosum, intus autem plenum est ossibus mortuorum et universa immunditia*. See Macarios de Magnésie, *Monogénès* 1:142 on Julian's use of D in Matt 23:27 and Luke 22:47 and Macarios de Magnésie, *Monogénès* 1:95–99 on the anonymous Hellenic philosopher's use of D (a philosopher Goulet identifies with Porphyry).

²⁶ Julian, *C. Gal.* 105 (Masaracchia, *Contra Galilaeos*, 190). There could be scribal interference in the last two examples (because of the presence of the variant in **Ⲙ**).

is significant, given the Syriac tradition of the *Contra Iulianum*, that Cyril does not also refer to Mark 16:9 in his commentary, when faced with the necessity of harmonizing the apparent discrepancies in the appearances to Mary Magdalene. The same conclusion for the commentary and the *Contra Iulianum* is warranted: had Cyril regarded the L.E. as authentic, he would have incorporated it into his argument.³⁹ Since he does not challenge Nestorius's reference to Mark 16:20 (to be discussed below), it is difficult to believe that he did not know the L.E. The conclusion, however, is nearly inescapable: Cyril's neglect of the L.E. in controversy with Julian and in his commentary on John indicate that he had serious doubts about the authenticity of the text. Earlier Christians such as Eusebius had to offer responses to questions or objections drawn from the discrepancies in the resurrection appearances, and suppressing a text such as Mark 16:9 was not an option, if the questioner (in the case of the Christians) or critic (in the case of the pagans) were aware of the tradition. Cyril's answers to Julian, who expressly denies that the women in Mark's Gospel made any announcement to the disciples about the resurrection, are closely related to those in Eusebius's *Quaestiones*, and the relationship will be discussed below.

Cyril is not an unambiguous witness to the short ending of Mark. He knew one of Nestorius's *Sermones*, in which Nestorius quoted Mark 16:20 in full. In a discussion of the origin of the glory of the only begotten one (Ἡ γοῦν τοῦ μονογενοῦς εὐδοξία), Nestorius argued that at times it is attributed to the Father (John 8:54), the Holy Spirit (John 16:13–14), and the son (Mark 16:20): ἐξεληθόντες γάρ φησι, διεκήρυσσον τὸν λόγον πανταχοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων (They went out, [Scripture] says, and proclaimed the word everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming the word through the accompanying signs).⁴⁰ Cyril responds that according to Nestorius's assumptions, there is a Christ different from the only begotten one:

For if, as you say, the glory of the Only-begotten is to be attributed to him, and the divine disciples, using the authority that came from him, proclaimed the word and worked wonders, how is it that what I have said is not true?

εἰ γὰρ περιῆπται μὲν αὐτῶι, καθὰ φῆς, ἡ τοῦ μονογενοῦς εὐδοξία, τῆι δὲ παρ' αὐτοῦ δυναστείαι χρώμενοι διεκήρυττον τὸν «λόγον» καὶ ἠργάζοντο τὰς θεοσημείας οἱ θεσπέσιοι μαθηταί, πῶς οὐκ ἀληθὲς ὅπερ ἔφη;⁴¹

Cyril does not use the language of Mark 16:20 here, but he does not charge Nestorius with quoting a spurious text. Like Jerome, to be discussed below, he was willing to let an opponent use a doubtful passage. His rejection (or, less probably, ignorance) of the L.E. in the *Contra*

tion of the fragmentary Syriac text of the *Comm. in Lucam, Serm. 153* (S. Cyril, *A Commentary upon the Gospel of S. Luke* [trans. by R. Payne Smith; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1859], 2:725) does not include a Syriac version of the material in the *catena* extract (*Serm. 153* ends with a comment on the unbelief of Pilate's soldiers; see Cyril, *Commentarii in Lucae evangelium* [ed. R. Payne Smith; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1858], 447). The question is a transformation of Nicetas Marinus 3. See Eusebius of Caesarea, *Gospel Problems and Solutions: Quaestiones ad Stephanum et Marinum* (CPG 3470) (ed. R. Pearse; trans. D. J. D. Miller et al.; Ipswich: Chieftain, 2010), 186.

³⁹ Here I have adopted a suggestion by Anthony Briggman (personal communication).

⁴⁰ Nestorius, *Serm. 1* ([CPG 5690] F. Loofs, ed., *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius* [Halle: Niemeyer, 1905], 225 = Cyril, *Nest.* [CPG 5217] §166 [E. Schwartz, ACO 1.1.6:43] and cp. *ibid.*, §165 Kephalaion 7 [Nestorius's statement; Schwartz, ACO 1.1.6:7]). The uncritical edition is Cyril, *Nest.* 2.6 (PG 76:85BC). Nestorius's text (and Cyril's response) is translated by Russell, *Cyril*, 150 and in S. Cyril, *Five Tomes against Nestorius* (trans. by members of the English Church; Oxford: Parker, 1881), 61–62.

⁴¹ Cyril, *Nest.* (Schwartz, ACO 1.1.6:43), trans. of Russell, *Cyril*, 151.

Iulianum implies that his *Contra Nestorium* should probably be regarded more as a witness to Nestorius's use of Mark 16:20 and not as a witness to Cyril's acceptance of the authenticity of the L.E. of Mark.⁴² The dating of the *Contra Iulianum* and the *Contra Nestorium* is somewhat important. Cyril published the *Contra Iulianum* in the 430s, almost certainly after 433.⁴³ Norman Russell repeats the common view that the *Contra Nestorium* "was composed in spring of 430."⁴⁴ The chronology demonstrates that in a *published* text several years after Cyril referred to Nestorius's quotation of Mark 16:20, he either did not regard the L.E. as authentic or was unfamiliar with it. He could, however, and probably did, compose the *Contra Iulianum* long before he published it. Pierre Éviéux notes that it was undoubtedly written for the most part before 429, since the text bears only a few traces of Cyril's controversies of the 430s.⁴⁵ At this point a few remarks are appropriate concerning the value of the Syriac tradition of the *Contra Iulianum*.

3. The Authenticity of the Syriac Text of Julian and Cyril

The Greek text of John of Thessalonica shows that the Syrian tradition of Julian's objection to the resurrection narratives is reliable.⁴⁶ Isho'dad of Merv attributes a similar objection against the resurrection narratives to Julian and Porphyry that was focused on the time of the events.⁴⁷ Theodore bar Koni attributes the same objection to Julian.⁴⁸ Eberhard Nestle published fragments of seven Syriac MSS in the British Museum that have texts of the *Contra Iulianum*. Of the twenty-seven Syriac fragments that Nestle edited and translated, fourteen correspond to

⁴² See B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort ("Notes on Select Readings [an appendix]," in: *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction. Appendix* [New York: Harper, 1882], 1–140, esp. 37) who, although they did not know the Syriac text of the *Contra Iulianum*, argued that Cyril "transcribes without remark Nestorius's quotation of v. 20; for, unlike the other quotations in the extract from Nestorius, it does not affect Cyril's argument."

⁴³ Neumann and Nestle, *Iuliani Imperatoris*, 36–37 dates the work (at least the first ten books) between 429 and 441 because of Theodoret's mention of Bishop John of Antioch in *Ep.* 83 (Y. Azéma, SC 98:216,9–19). Cyril had sent John a copy of his work, who in turn had sent it to Theodoret. P. Éviéux dates the publication of the text between 434–437 or 439–441 (Cyrille, *Contre Julien*, 10–15). Using his arguments, Russell (*Cyril*, 190) mentions John's death in 441/442 (the *terminus ante quem*) and states that the *terminus post quem* (of publication) must be after 433, when "Cyril was reconciled with John after the bitter events of 431." 437–438 "mark a cooling of relations between Alexandria and Antioch," due to Cyril's attack on Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. See Cook, *Interpretation of the New Testament*, 285.

⁴⁴ Russell, *Cyril*, 130 with reference to Loofs, *Nestoriana*, 21 and G. M. de Durand's edition of Cyrille d'Alexandrie, *Deux dialogues christologiques* (SC 97; Paris: Cerf, 1964), 24 [a reference to Loofs].

⁴⁵ Burguière and Éviéux, *Contre Julien*, 15.

⁴⁶ Fee, "Greek Patristic Citations," 351 advocates using bold type for the patristic witness in a critical apparatus "when there is absolute certainty as to the actual text used" by a patristic source. One can be certain that Julian rejected the L.E., if he knew it. This is the case since Julian's discussion of Mark (one of Fee's criteria) indicates his rejection of the text of the L.E.

⁴⁷ Isho'dad of Merv, *Comm. in Ioh.* 20.1. See *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv bishop of Haddatha (c. 850 A.D.)* (ed. and tr. by M. D. Gibson; 5 vols., *Horae Semiticae* 5, 6, 7, 10, 11; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911–1916), 1:278–279 (trans.), 3:211 (Syriac text). I discuss this text in part two of the article.

⁴⁸ Theodorus bar Koni, *Liber scholiorum* Mimrā 7.33.proem, 7.33.10 (ed. A. Scher; CSCO.S 69/26; Louvain: Durbecq, 1954), 90 (the question), 93–94; idem, *Livre des scolies* (trans. R. Hesperi and R. Draguet; CSCO.S 432/188; Louvain: Peeters, 1982), 67–68 (likewise discussed in the second part of the article).

the Greek text of Cyril. Nestle was able to indicate at what precise points the Syriac follows the Greek of the *editio princeps* of Jean Aubert.⁴⁹ Nestle included a fragment from MS 17214 that is a nearly word for word translation of the fragment from Eupolemus that Cyril quotes.⁵⁰ The overwhelming impression the reader has is that the Syriac tradition of the *Contra Iulianum* is reliable. It is possible that Cyril wrote more in response to Julian's objection about the resurrection, since the Greek text of the first ten books comprises more extensive replies to Julian's objections.⁵¹ Cyril's affirmative statements in his response to Julian, however, show that for him Mark did not contain any announcement by the women to the disciples concerning Jesus's resurrection ("He did not say that the Messiah appeared to them, nor that they said anything to the disciples; for they told no one anything"). That statement precludes an appearance to Mary Magdalene. Cyril's silence about the L.E. in the Syriac text is deafening. According to the Syriac translator, Cyril did not use it in his polemic against Julian. The best explanation for that state of affairs is that he viewed it as spurious.

4. Hedybia and Jerome

Cyril's evidence is comparable to that of Jerome with regard to the L.E. of Mark.⁵² An aristocratic woman named Hedybia, from "the extreme boundaries of Gaul (*de extremis Galliae finibus*)," who could read Greek (at least three of her twelve questions were from the second part of Eusebius's *Questions and Solutions concerning the Gospels* [the so-called *Eklogē ad Mari-*

⁴⁹ Neumann and Nestle, *Iuliani Imperatoris*, 43–44. Cyrillus, *Opera* (ed. J. Aubert; vol. 6; Lutetiae: Regii Typis, 1638). PG 76 is nearly identical with Aubert's edition (with a few changes made by E. Spanheim [Leipzig 1696]). See Burguière and Évieux, *Contre Julien*, 78–79.

⁵⁰ Neumann and Nestle, *Iuliani Imperatoris*, text 11 (p. 51) = Cyril, *C. Iul.* 7.231 (PG 76.853B5–B14) = Eupolemus, frag. 1 (C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. Vol. 1, *Historians* [SBL.PS 20/10; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983], 112, 136 [the text in Cyril]).

⁵¹ Cyril, *C. Iul.*, Text 22 (Neumann and Nestle, *Iuliani Imperatoris*, 56–59), e.g., is a Syriac fragment of book 16 that comprises a reply to Julian, which is substantially longer than text 18, an excerpt of which is printed above. Books 11–20 of Cyril's text survive only in fragments. I thank Christoph Riedweg for his comments on this problem.

⁵² J. W. Burgon's (*The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark Vindicated against Recent Critical Objectors and Established* [Oxford: Parker, 1871], 27–28) review of Jerome's evidence is still useful, although his conclusions need revision. See also the unjustly neglected work of J. P. P. Martin, *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament: Partie pratique*. Vol. 2, *Leçons professées à l'École supérieure de théologie de Paris, en 1883–1884* (Paris: Leclerc, n.d. [1884]), 127–36 (on Jerome), which is a 554 page tour de force defending the L.E. (available on the Hathi Trust Digital Library: <http://www.hathitrust.org/home>) that in the words of B. B. Warfield (a conservative Calvinist) is "a marvel of ingenuity and a complete failure" (rev. of Martin, *The Presbyterian Review* 6 [1885]: 348–52). N. P. Lunn (*The Original Ending of Mark: A New Case for the Authenticity of Mark 16:9–20* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock 2014], 101–5) also has made a good collection of the evidence, but for the most part repeats (and updates) Burgon's material. His interpretation of Jerome's texts is questionable. M. A. Robinson, "The Long Ending of Mark as Canonical Verity," in Black, *Perspectives*, 40–79 defends the L.E., but his arguments are traditional. In my view, he does not refute J. K. Elliott's observation that "the contents and theology of vv. 9–20 are uncharacteristic of Mark elsewhere" (idem, "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark: Original or Not?" in Black, *Perspectives*, 80–102 esp. 87).

num]),⁵³ wrote Jerome while he was in Bethlehem.⁵⁴ Some of her other questions also resemble those in the fragments from the second part of the *Quaestiones*, which comprised questions on the resurrection and appearances of Jesus. The first part (often called the *ad Stephanum*) comprised questions on the genealogy and birth.⁵⁵ Consequently, not all of Hedybia's questions were from Eusebius's text.⁵⁶ This argument, and those of Andrew Cain, vitiate the thesis that Hedybia was fictional. That in turn implies the falsehood of William Farmer's thesis that the "letter to Hedibia is secondary to the text attributed to Eusebius."⁵⁷

Jerome responded to Hedybia in ca. 407, in a letter in which he used Greek four times.⁵⁸

-
- ⁵³ Abbreviated as *E.Mar.* below. See Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 11–13; and idem, *Les Questions et réponses sur les évangiles d'Eusèbe de Césarée: Étude et édition du résumé grec* (Ph.D. diss., University of Lausanne and École Pratique des Hautes Études, Lausanne/Paris 2003), 3 (http://doc.rero.ch/record/4926/files/these_Zamagni_hauteResolution.pdf, accessed 4 Dec. 2014). This will be referred to as *Questions et réponses* below.
- ⁵⁴ CPL §620. Jerome, *Epist.* 120, praef.1 (I. Hilberg, CSEL 55: 472,10–11). See A. Cain, "Defending Hedibia and Detecting Eusebius: Jerome's Correspondence with Two Gallic Women (*Epp.*, 120–21)," *Medieval Prosopography* 24 (2003): 15–34 (on 22 he argues that Jerome's phrase refers to Bordeaux). Cain's arguments against the thesis of D. Bruyne ("Lettres fictives de s. Jérôme," *ZNW* 28 [1929]: 229–34) that Hedybia is fictional are cogent. Jerome, *Epist.* 120.3, 4, 5 (Hilberg, CSEL 55:481,3–4; 482,1–3; 483,25–484,2) corresponds to *E. Mar.* 1, 2, 3 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 194, 200, 216), respectively. *Epist.* 120.7 (Hilberg, CSEL 55:488,12–15) is close to Nicetas Marinus 10–11 (Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 208–12).
- ⁵⁵ Abbreviated as *E.St.* below. Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 11–12. There was, apparently, a question about the discrepancy concerning the hour of the crucifixion. See *Fr. Mar. Supp.* 4 (Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 218; from Corderius's *catena*): ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Μαρίνον ἐπὶ τοῦ Σωτηρίου πάθους καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως *Ζητήσεσι καὶ ἐπιλύσεσι*, and *Fr. Syr.* 13 (Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 344; a letter of Severus of Antioch). J. A. Cramer, *Catena graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum* (vol. 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1841), 389 (*Catena in Iohannem* [Paris. Coislin. 23 and Oxon. Bodl. Auct. T.1.4]) has the text, which is from the letter of Severus to Bishop Thomas (Σευήρου Ἀντιοχείας ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Θωμᾶν Ἐπίσκοπον Γερμανικίας Ἐπιστολῆς). On Corderius [CPG C145], see C. Guignard, *La lettre de Julius Africanus à Aristide sur la généalogie du Christ: Analyse de la tradition textuelle, édition, traduction et étude critique* (TU 167; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 77. See Cook, *Interpretation of the New Testament*, 147, for other references to this discrepancy and its possible use by Porphyry.
- ⁵⁶ Cf. Jerome, *Epist.* 120 (Hilberg, CSEL 55:470–72) for the editor's convenient list of all twelve questions. *Quaest.* 6 (concerning John 20:6–10) and 8 (Matt 27:52–53) may have come from Eusebius. *Quaest.* 9 refers to John 20:22 and has no corresponding text in the fragments of Eusebius. Her *Quaest.* 1 is about how a childless widow should live. *Quaest.* 2 is about Matt 26:29. *Quaest.* 10–12 are on the Pauline epistles. These last five are not from Eusebius and likely derive from Hedybia's own scholarship (as do all twelve, although six or seven are probably from her reading of Eusebius).
- ⁵⁷ W. Farmer, *Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 22, quoted with approval by J. A. Kelhoffer, "The Witness of Eusebius's *ad Marinum* and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark's Gospel," in Kelhoffer, *Conceptions of "Gospel" and Legitimacy in Early Christianity* (WUNT 324; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 121–66 (a revision of his article in *ZNW* 92 [2001]: 78–112), 148. Farmer's thesis is based on the work of Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses*, 52–56 (who attempted to argue that the words of *Epist.* 120 are really those of Eusebius and not Jerome's views). Farmer's view is an unacceptable position, because one can be indebted to another scholar and adopt that scholar's views as one's own, based on one's inspection of the necessary evidence.
- ⁵⁸ She is mentioned in another letter along with Artemia, Rusticus's wife (*Epist.* 122.1.1 [Hilberg, CSEL 56: 56,2]): *sancta ancilla Christi Hedybia* (Hebydia, the holy slave of Christ). For Greek

Cain argues that “in all likelihood she was a diligent student of the Bible who was puzzled by certain problematic passages treated by Eusebius and wanted to consult the opinion of a reputed contemporary biblical exegete.”⁵⁹ He also notes that “fluency in Greek is a well-attested phenomenon among Latin-speaking women of the late fourth- and early fifth-century Christian aristocracy.”⁶⁰ Hedybia's third question was, “What is the reason why the evangelists told diverse things about the resurrection and appearance of the Lord?” (*quae causa sit, ut de resurrectione et apparitione Domini euangelistae diuersa narrauerint*). She apparently emphasized the discrepancy between Matt 28:1 and Mark 16:9–11.⁶¹ Jerome's answer was, “For which question there is a twofold solution” (*cuius quaestionis duplex solutio est*):

For either we do not accept the testimony of Mark, because it is only transmitted in some rare Gospels—almost all the books in Greek not having this text at the end—especially since it appears to say things that are diverse and contrary to the other Gospels ...

aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur euangelis omnibus graeciae libris paene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, praesertim cum diuersa atque contraria euangelistis ceteris narrare uideatur ...

The other option is, “... or this should be the response—that each told the truth” (... *aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque uerum dixerit*).⁶²

Despite Jerome's probable dependence on Eusebius for some of his responses to Hedybia, he is a witness for the state of the Markan ending's transmission in the MSS.⁶³ It is clear that when preparing the Vulgate he emended the Old Latin Gospels by collating them only with old Greek MSS (*igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quattuor tantum euangelia, quorum ordo iste est Mattheus Marcus Lucas Iohannes, codicum Graecorum emendata conlatione sed ueterum*).⁶⁴ The “revision of the Gospels” dates to 383.⁶⁵ If he had felt that the best Greek

words, see *Epist.* 120.8.5, 120.11.10, 120.12.5, 120.12.9 [Hilberg, CSEL 55:490,14, 509,12, 512,21, 514,13] and Cain, “Defending,” 29–30.

⁵⁹ Cain, “Defending,” 26 (with reference to Jerome's statement that her questions are a “test” (*experimentum*; *Epist.* 120.proem.1 [Hilberg, CSEL 55:472,15]).

⁶⁰ Cain, “Defending,” 28–29.

⁶¹ Jerome, *Epist.* 120.3.1–3 (Hilberg, CSEL 55:481,3–12)

⁶² Jerome, *Epist.* 120.3.2 (Hilberg, CSEL 55:481,12–17).

⁶³ Kelhoffer, “Witness,” 147, notes (in regard to the MS tradition) the optative moods in Eusebius, which are in contrast with the indicative moods in Jerome, and remarks that the difference may not be very significant, since Eusebius's optatives may be taken to be equivalent to Jerome's *aut*. He argues reasonably that since Jerome's letter responds to twelve questions (rather than the four of the epitome), Jerome knew the text upon which the epitome was based. But the reality of Hedybia and the fact that at least five of her questions probably could not have come from Eusebius show that his letter is not “secondary to Eusebius” (148). Kelhoffer (148) makes the questionable claim that Jerome “betrays no indication that he himself possessed, independently of the *ad Marinum*, any knowledge of the Longer Ending's textual history,” but admits Jerome may have seen MSS of that type. He fails to address Jerome, *Pelag.* 2.15 and *Praefatio in Euangelio*. He also doubts “the author” of the *ad Marinum* had “first hand” knowledge of the MSS. Kelhoffer (125) gives no reasons for questioning the attribution to Eusebius. See Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 11 (with regard to Kelhoffer and several other scholars) and Guignard, *La lettre*, 41 (with regard to Kelhoffer).

⁶⁴ Jerome, *Praef. in Euangelio (Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* [ed. R. Gryson et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994], 1515). CPL 591 E.

⁶⁵ Gryson, *Biblia sacra*, xxix; M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* (vol. 4.1; HAW 8; München: Beck, 1914), 217, 453–54, and S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 251.

MSS had the L.E., then he would never have made the statement in his letter to Hedybia. His inclusion of Mark 16:9–20 in the Vulgate, despite his belief that it was not in the majority of MSS, coheres with his translations of Judith and Tobit that he made “under protest.”⁶⁶ Jerome also was aware that there was no Eusebian canon for the L.E.

He does quote Mark 16:14 and the addition in his *Adversus Pelagianos dialogi*, a treatise that he wrote in the winter of 415/416 in Bethlehem.⁶⁷

In certain copies, and especially in certain Greek codices, is written in Mark at the end of his Gospel: “Afterward, when the eleven had reclined at table, he appeared to them and reproached their incredulity and hardness of heart, because they had not believed those who had seen him arisen.”

*In quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime graecis codicibus, iuxta Marcum in fine euangelii eius scribitur: postea, cum accubuissent undecim, apparuit eis, et exprobrauit incredulitati et duritiae cordis eorum, quia his qui eum uiderant resurgentem non crediderunt.*⁶⁸

Resurgentem is an interesting example of the present participle to denote action prior to the verb.⁶⁹ Jerome’s usage is translation Latin (for ἐγγεγερμένον in 16:14).⁷⁰ He continues,

And they defended themselves saying, “This age of iniquity and incredulity is under Satan, who by means of impure spirits does not allow the true power of God to be comprehended; therefore reveal your justice.” If you object to that, this you still cannot deny: “The world is subjected to the evil one.”

⁶⁶ Kelhoffer, “Witness,” 148 makes this important argument about the Vulgate, although he insists that Jerome’s *Ep.* 120 is not evidence that he had inspected MSS. See *Prol. Tobiae*, *Prol. Iudith* (Gryson, *Biblia sacra*, 676 [CPL 591 V], 691 [CPL 591 I]). See also *Prol. in libris Salomonis* (Gryson, *Biblia sacra*, 957 [CPL 591 S]): Judith, Tobit, Maccabees, Sirach, and Wisdom are read, but are not canonical scriptures (*canonicas scripturas*); *Prol. in libro Regum* (Gryson, *Biblia sacra*, 365 [CPL 591 R]): Wisdom, Sirach, Judith, Tobit, the Maccabees and the Shepherd are not in the church’s canon and are apocrypha (*apocrypha*); and *Prol. in libro Dan.* (Gryson, *Biblia sacra*, 1341–42 [CPL 591 A]), where he apparently concedes the argument of Jewish critics that what Jerome himself called “fables” (*fabulas*), such as Susanna and the Elders and Bel and the Dragon, are “apocryphal fables in the book of the Church” (*apocryphas in libro ecclesiae fabulas*). Despite his reservations, Jerome included all these texts in the Vulgate.

⁶⁷ P. Nautin, “Hieronymus,” *TRE* 15 (1986) 304–15, esp. 308 and Schanz, *Geschichte*, 4.1:481–82; CPL 615.

⁶⁸ Jerome, *Pelag.* 2.15 (C. Moerschini, CChr.SL 80:73,1–5).

⁶⁹ See J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik* (2nd ed.; HAW 2.2.2, München: Beck, 1972), 386–87.

⁷⁰ Hofmann and Szantyr (*Lateinische Syntax*, 386–87) note the frequency of the usage in late Latin and translation Latin. It does appear in certain classical texts (e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.48.1; Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 15.6.3, which is Cicero’s trans. of Homer, *Il.* 7.89–91, where *linquens* is the equivalent of κατατεθνηῶτος). See also G. Calboli, “Latin Syntax and Greek,” in *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax 1: Syntax of the Sentence* (ed. P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin; Trends in Linguistics; Studies and Monographs 180.1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 65–194, esp. 162 (a section entitled, “Graecisms collected by Hofmann & Szantyr, p. 387”). See Augustine, *Serm.* 8 (C. Lambot, CChr. SL 41:84,137–38; 142–43) *in ecclesia loquuntur haerentes ueritati ueritatem ... passum, crucifixum, resurgentem, ascendentem*. This should be contrasted with the classical use of the present participle to denote action simultaneous with that of the main verb (e.g. Apuleius, *Metam.* 8.5.9 *aper ... mox ipsum resurgentem multo dente laniauuit* (“next, as he tried to get up, the boar gored him with many slashes from his tusks” [see Hofmann and Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax*, 161–62]). I thank Kathleen M. Coleman for her suggestions with regard to this issue (personal communication of 29 Dec. 2014).

*et illi satisfaciebant dicentes: saeculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis sub Satana est, qui non sinit per immundos spiritus ueram Dei apprehendi uirtutem: idcirco iam nunc reuela iustitiam tuam. cui si contradicitis, illud certe renuere non audebitis: mundus in maligno positus est.*⁷¹

But the quotation of 16:14 is of little significance in establishing Jerome's view of the authenticity of the L.E., since he concedes that "if you oppose it, this you still cannot deny—that the world is subjected to the evil one," a reference to 1 John 5:19. In other words, "Atticus" admits that his Pelagian opponent ("Critobulus") can deny the tradition, and he does not specifically restrict the denial to the logion itself.⁷²

There is more strong evidence (besides the use of *resurgentem*) that Jerome was translating from a Greek original. Jan Dochhorn, adopting an argument of Adolf Harnack, states that Jerome's translation of Mark 16:14 (and the Freer logion) was done using Greek MSS, since it is clear that Jerome did not use either the Vetus Latina or the Vulgate. The Vetus Latina's text is:

Last also, when the eleven were reclining at table, he reproached their incredulity and hardness of heart, because they had not believed those who had seen that he had risen.

*Nouissime autem recumbentibus illis undecim apparuit et exprobrauit incredulitatem ipsorum et duritiam cordis illorum, quoniam qui uiderant illum resurrexisse, non crediderunt.*⁷³

The Vulgate's text is: *nouissime recumbentibus illis undecim apparuit et exprobrauit incredulitatem illorum et duritiam cordis quia his qui uiderant eum resurrexisse non crediderant*, which is clearly a revision of the Vetus Latina.⁷⁴ Therefore, it is apparent that Jerome consulted Greek MSS when translating Mark 16:14 in the *Dialogue*.⁷⁵

Consequently, the reliability of Jerome's statement that he had personally inspected MSS and had discovered that at least one "copy" (presumably in Latin) and one Greek MS, which had the logion, is demonstrated. His letter to Hedybia, his preface to the Gospels, and his dialogue against the Pelagians together indicate that he had carefully examined the problem of the Markan ending. NA²⁸, therefore, is fully justified in its inclusion of Hier^{mss} in its apparatus to the short ending. The similarity between Cyril and Jerome with regard to the status of the

⁷¹ Jerome, *Pelag.* 2.15 (Moreschini, CChr.SL 80: 73,5–9). J. Dochhorn (*Schriftgelehrte Prophetie: Der eschatologische Teufelsfall in Apc Joh 12 und seine Bedeutung für das Verständnis der Johannesoffenbarung* [WUNT 268, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 286) notes that the text in the apparatus of NA²⁸ (which has *substantia* [*sub satana?*]) is based on older editions of the treatise. *Sub Satana*, according to Moreschini's apparatus, is from group b of the MS tradition, and *substantia* is from group a (which was adopted by Vallarsi and others, although Moreschini notes that Vallarsi approved the reading *sub Satana* [*quod iam probauerat Vall.*]).

⁷² One can make a similar point about Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* 4,1857 [27:55] (D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, CChr.SL 77:277), where he describes Mary Magdalene as "one from whom Jesus had cast out seven demons" (*Mariam Magdalenam a qua septem daemonia eiecerat*). He uses Mark's *eiecerat* (16:9) instead of Luke's *exierant* ("went out") in 8:2. Jerome in this text does not admit anything about the MS tradition, but merely indicates he knows it.

⁷³ A. Jülicher and M. Matzkow, ed. *Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*. Vol. 2, *Markus-evangelium* (2nd ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1970), 159.

⁷⁴ Gryson, *Biblia Sacra*, 1605.

⁷⁵ Dochhorn, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, 286. See also A. Harnack, "Neues zum unechten Markusschluss," *ThLZ* 33 (1908): 168–70, esp. 168 (to whom Dochhorn refers for this argument and who hypothesized that Jerome may only have known one Greek codex with the logion). C. R. Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, Leipzig 1908, 27 agreed with Harnack. J. Frey, "Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion," *ZNW* 93 (2002): 13–34, esp. 15 thinks Harnack may have correctly believed that Jerome knew the entire text now known as the Freer logion in MS W.

L.E. is unmistakable. While Jerome openly expresses his reservations about the L.E., Cyril's inability to use it in his polemic against Julian probably demonstrates his doubts about the text.

5. Eusebius

As I have remarked above, the second part of Eusebius's *Quaestiones* (the *ad Marinum*) shares some of the concerns of Hedybia and Jerome, and Eusebius offers three different solutions to the question of the discrepancy between Matt 28:1 and Mark 16:2, 9 about the time of Christ's resurrection.⁷⁶ Eusebius clearly indicates that he wrote the first part of the treatise, the so-called *ad Stephanum*, around the same time as his *Demonstratio evangelica* (the 320s), in the following remark: ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν εἰς τὴν γενεαλογίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων (“in the first book of my *Questions and Solutions* concerning the genealogy of our savior”).⁷⁷ The *Quaestiones* were probably composed about the same time or possibly before the *Demonstratio evangelica*.⁷⁸ The title of the entire work is reconstructed from the text quoted from the *Demonstratio evangelica* and the superscript to *ad Stephanum* in Vat. Pal. Gr. 220, fol. 61r: ἐκλογή ἐν συντόμῳ ἐκ τῶν συντεθέντων ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου πρὸς Στέφανον περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων (“An abridged selection of what was composed by Eusebius for Stephanus about Questions and Solutions concerning the Gospels”).⁷⁹

The date of composition of the *eklogē* (an abridgement of the *Quaestiones*) is unknown (fourth–sixth century).⁸⁰ Claudio Zamagni mentions the doubts of a few scholars about the attribution of the *Quaestiones* (περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων) to Eusebi-

⁷⁶ Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 1.1–3, 4.1–4 (SC 523:194–98; Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 222–28). Zamagni only edited the *eklogē*. His dissertation (*Questions et réponses*) includes commentary not printed in the SC edition. The commentary will be published ca. 2015 by Brepols.

⁷⁷ Eusebius, *Dem. ev.* 7.3.18 and *E.St.* 1 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 80). *E.St.* 7.7 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 140) refers to *Dem. ev.* 1.2.1–16., 1.4.1–6, 1.6.76, 1.7.18, and 1.9.1. S. Morlet, *La Démonstration évangélique d'Eusèbe de Césarée: Étude sur l'apologétique chrétienne à l'époque de Constantin* (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2009), after many pages of precise argumentation (80–93), dates the *Demonstratio evangelica* to the 320s (93). But as Sébastien Morlet informs me (personal communication of 15 Jan. 2015), the reference to the *Dem. ev.* in the *eklogē* is itself from a late text. In addition [Morlet writes], “Eusebius was used to rewriting his works, and he may have included cross references to his works in later editions. I would tend to think that *QE* were composed roughly at the same time as the *DE*, maybe before, but I would not go further.”

⁷⁸ Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 42–46 (believes the *ad Marinum* was composed after the *Demonstratio evangelica*).

⁷⁹ See Zamagni, *Questions et réponses*, 66–67 on the title and his trans. in *Questions évangéliques*, 81. The title is also attested to in the Syriac *catena*, attributed to Severus of Edessa, in Vat. Syr. 103, fol. 302r (861 c.e.), digitized at http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.sir.103.pt.3, accessed 15 Dec. 2014 (ܩܘܥܬܘܢܐ, a loan word [ζήτημα] meaning “questions” or “accusations” in Syriac; Fr. Syr. 1 [Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 306]; see Payne Smith 115 ad loc.). See Baumstark, *Geschichte*, 279 on Severus. Jerome's titles are not the best evidence: *Comm. Matt.* 1.17 (E. Bonnard, SC 242: 76,54–55); *Eusebius Caesariensis in libris diaphonias euangeliorum*; and *Vir. ill.* 81.2 *de euangeliorum* διαφωνία (“Concerning the disagreement between the Gospels”; Hieronymus, *De viris illustribus: Berühmte Männer* [ed., trans., and comm. C. Barthold; Mülheim: Carthusianus, 2011], 232). As Zamagni insists (*Questions évangéliques*, 11), Eusebius's own evidence should be preferred to Jerome's indirect traditions.

⁸⁰ Zamagni (*Questions évangéliques*, 26–32, 42–46) notes that the *terminus ante quem* for the *eklogē* is the date of the MS (Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 220 [first half of X c.e.]).

us. He remarks simply that they offer no arguments for their doubts (“sans aucun argument”).⁸¹ The title resembles that of Macarius Magnes's dialogue between a Christian and Hellenic philosopher about problems in the NT (Τοῦ Μακαρίου Μά[γνητος Μονογεν]ῆς πρὸς Ἑλληνας περὶ τῶν ἀπορουμένων ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ζητημ[άτων καὶ λύσε]ων τοῦ εὐαγγελίου [“Discourse of a unique genre directed to the Hellenes concerning difficult questions in the beginning of the Gospel and their solutions”]).⁸²

Eusebius writes that one can reject Mark 16:9–20 as spurious, since that text does not appear in the accurate MSS (τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων), or insert a comma after ἀναστάς (with the result that Jesus rose late in the night, but appeared “early in the morning”), or assert that there were four different incidents (first Matthew, then John, Luke and finally Mark).⁸³ In another attempt at resolving the difference between the appearance to Mary Magdalene in Matt 28:10–19 and John 1:1–11, Eusebius argues that “late on the sabbath” in Matt 28:1 is “generally speaking” (πλατυκῶς) equivalent to the time in John 20:1, but expressed with different words.⁸⁴ He also mentions the four Marys named by Cyril and speculates that there may have been two Marys from Magdala.⁸⁵ He is obviously untroubled by the variety of his explanations and the fact that they do not cohere well with one another. The Greek fragments treat the same or similar questions with variations.⁸⁶ They probably are from the original text (and clearly not from the *eklogē*). Eusebius's first option is clear:

The solution to this question could be twofold. For, indeed, the one who rejects as spurious the object itself of the discussion, the pericope that makes this affirmation,⁸⁷ could say that it is not

⁸¹ Zamagni, *Questions et réponses*, 3; and see idem, *Questions évangéliques*, 11. See the similar judgment of Guignard, *La lettre*, 41. Morlet (communication of 15 Jan. 2015) notes that in his view, “the authenticity of the QE is absolutely certain.”

⁸² See Macarios de Magnésie, *Monogénès 2:2–3*.

⁸³ See Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 1 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 194–98) for the first two options and 4.1–4 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 222–28) for the third option. In *E.Mar.* 3.1–4 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 216–22), Eusebius places the resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene in John prior to that of Matthew to explain the discrepancy between Matt 28:9 and John 20:17.

⁸⁴ Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 2.1 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 200–202). In 2.4 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 206–8), he places Mary Magdalene at the tomb twice in John and the third time in Matthew.

⁸⁵ Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 2.6–9 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 210–14).

⁸⁶ Nicetas Marinus (the fragments are nominally from Eusebius) 5–8 (Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 190–202); Fr. Mar. Sup. 16 (Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 237–49; from the problematic work of J. A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum* [vol. 1; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1840] 251–56 [Paris Coislin. gr. 23]). In Fr. Mar. Sup. 16, the first resurrection appearance to Mary Magdalene is in John and the second (to both Marys) is in Matthew. Ambrose, *Exp. Luc.* 10.147–155, 161, 180–184 (Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 286–94) addresses many issues about the resurrection of Christ that are similar to those of Eusebius. Ambrose in *Exp. Luc.* 10.147 (Hurst and Adriaen CChrSL 19:387,1390–92) quotes Luke 24:1 and then remarks: *magna oritur hoc loco plerisque dubitatio; nam etsi non uidentur euangelistae dixisse contraria, tamen diuersa dixerunt* (“Great doubt arises in reference to this topic for many; for even if the evangelists do not appear to have said contrary things, nevertheless they said diverse things”). He then refers to the different times of arrival of the women to the tomb in the four Gospels. A Coptic *catena* and an Arabic *catena*, which is a translation of the Coptic, refer to Eusebius who, in that tradition, asserts that Matt 28:1 and Mark 16:2 occurred at different times (Fr. Copt. 4 and Fr. Ar. 5 [Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 358, 392]). The excerpts of Nicetas's *catena* on Luke are from Vat. gr. 1611 = Aland 1821 (1116–1117 CE, still unedited). See CPG C135 and the updated bibliography in B. Roosen, “The Works of Nicetas Heracleensis (ὁ τοῦ Σεραπῶν),” *Byz.* 69 (1999): 120–44, esp. 136.

⁸⁷ Mark 16:9–20.

transmitted in all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark. The accurate copies, in effect, fix the end of the narration according to Mark with the words of the young man who appeared to the women and who said to them, “Do not fear, you seek Jesus the Nazarene,” and what follows,⁸⁸ after which it says, in addition, “And having heard, they fled, and said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid.”⁸⁹ For it is in this place in almost all copies of the Gospel of Mark that the end is marked. The things that follow,⁹⁰ which are transmitted in rare copies and not in all, could be superfluous, particularly if it is true that they could contradict the witness of the other Gospels.

Τούτου διττῆ ἄν εἴη ἡ λύσις· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ τὴν τοῦτο φάσκουσιν περικοπὴν ἀθετῶν, εἶποι ἄν μὴ ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτὴν φέρεσθαι τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγελίου· τὰ γοῦν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων τὸ τέλος περιγράφει τῆς κατὰ τὸν Μάρκον ἱστορίας ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ὀφθέντος νεανίσκου ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ εἰρηκότος αὐταῖς, «Μὴ φοβείσθε, Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνόν» καὶ τοῖς ἐξῆς, οἷς ἐπιλέγει· «καὶ ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.» Ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγελίου περιγράφεται τὸ τέλος· τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς σπανίως ἐν τισὶν ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι φερόμενα περιττὰ ἄν εἴη, καὶ μάλιστα εἴπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῆ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρία.⁹¹

Eusebius claims to have a great deal of knowledge about “the accurate MSS” (τὰ ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων) that lack the L.E. and the rare MSS that actually have it. It is an expression whose origin is probably the Alexandrian philologists.⁹² The scholar who wants to doubt the veracity of Eusebius’s statement needs to argue extensively for his or her position.⁹³ Zamagni has admirably commented on Eusebius’s text at length.⁹⁴ Eusebius’s use of λύσις may be contrasted with one of the few Greek quotations of Porphyry’s *Contra Christianos* by an author who had

⁸⁸ Mark 16:6–7.

⁸⁹ Mark 16:8.

⁹⁰ Mark 16:9–20.

⁹¹ *EMar.* 1.1 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 195–97). Translation done with regard to that of Zamagni.

⁹² τὰ ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων (in various cases) also appears in Eusebius, *Comm. Ps.* Hypothesis and ad Ps. 77:1 (PG 23:66, 901 [where Eusebius appeals to the most accurate MSS to delete “Isaiah” from Matt 13:34]), *Dem. Ev.* 8.2.12, 10.5.2, *Ecl. proph.* 4.20 (*Eusebii Pamphili episcopi Caesariensis eclogae propheticae* [ed. T. Gaisford; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1842], 200, 23–24). The Alexandrian grammarian, Tryphon I, 2.12 (*Tryphonis grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta* [ed. A. von Velsen; Berlin: Nikolaus, 1853], 20) has τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις ἀντιγράφοις. Another Alexandrian grammarian, Herodianus, also uses the expression. See τοῖς ἀκριβεστέροις ἀντιγράφοις in idem, (Ps. Herodianus?), *De prosodia catholica* (*Grammatici graeci* 3.1:324, 16 Lentz). It appears in texts of Galen, *In Hippocratis librum iii epidemiarum commentarii iii* (Claudii Galeni, *Opera Omnia* [ed. C. G. Kühn; vol. 17a; Hildesheim: Olms, 1986], 602, 751) and so forth. Origen uses it several times. In *Comm. Jo.* 6.6.40 (ἐν τοῖς ἀκριβέσιν ἀντιγράφοις; he discusses the text of Ps 10:7 in the LXX and other Greek versions and in the Hebrew. See idem, *Hom. Jer.* 8.1, 14.4 (Origen, *Jeremiahomilien* [ed. E. Klostermann; GCS Origenes Werke 3; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1983], 55, 19; 108, 21–22). In *Hom. Jer.* 14.3 (Klostermann, *Jeremiahomilien*, 107, 25–26), Origen contrasts the reading of the most careful MSS of the LXX that agree with the Hebrew versions (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις καὶ συμφωνοῦσι τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς) with the majority reading (ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς πλείστοις ἀντιγράφοις). For the larger issue of canonization, see C. Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen: Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 322.

⁹³ One such scholar is Kelhoffer, who offers no argument for this statement (“Witness, 148”): “Nor can it be proven that the author of the *ad Marinum* possessed such first-hand knowledge of Markan MSS.” The burden of proof is on the skeptic in this case, since Eusebius insists that he does know the MS tradition of the L.E.

⁹⁴ Zamagni, *Questions et réponses*, 165–76.

actually read it (i.e., Eusebius). Porphyry criticized Origen and similar interpreters for their allegorizations of the LXX and began an argument with this phrase: “Some, in their eagerness to find a solution for the wickedness of the Jewish writings, rather than give them up ...” (τῆς δὴ μοχθηρίας τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν γραφῶν οὐκ ἀπόστασιν, λύσιν δὲ τινες εὐρεῖν προθυμηθέντες ...).⁹⁵ There were numerous pagan objections to the resurrection traditions in the NT, but there is little need to postulate such a source for the question to Eusebius about Matthew and Mark.⁹⁶

Eusebius's second option is preceded by his statement describing an individual unwilling to “athetize” any text, no matter how it is transmitted:

But another, not having the audacity to reject anything whatsoever of those matters that are recorded in whatever way in the text of the Gospels, says that the reading is twofold, as in many other places, and that each is to be received, because among faithful and pious people, one does not accept this as more canonical than that, or that as more canonical than this.

Ἄλλος δὲ τις οὐδ' ὅτιοῦν τολμῶν ἀθετεῖν⁹⁷ τῶν ὁπωσοῦν ἐν τῇ τῶν Εὐαγγελίων γραφῇ φερομένων,⁹⁸ διπλὴν εἶναί φησι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν,⁹⁹ ὡς καὶ ἐν ἑτέροις πολλοῖς, ἑκατέραν τε παραδεκτέαν ὑπάρχειν, τῷ μὴ μᾶλλον ταύτην ἐκείνης, ἢ ἐκείνην ταύτης, παρὰ τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ εὐλαβέσιν ἐγκρίνεσθαι.¹⁰⁰

This text of Eusebius may be compared with a similar passage in his *Historia*,

Among the books which are not genuine must be reckoned the Acts of Paul, the work entitled the Shepherd, the Apocalypse of Peter, and in addition to them the letter called of Barnabas and the so-called Teachings of the Apostles. And in addition, as I said, the Revelation of John, if this view prevail. For, as I said, some reject it, but others count it among the Recognized Books.

⁹⁵ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.19.4, trans. modified of trans. of Oulton, Eusebius, 2:57. See the author's “Porphyry's Attempted Demolition of Christian Allegory,” *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 2 (2008) 1–27.

⁹⁶ See Cook, *Interpretation of the New Testament*, 154, 300–301; and S. Morlet, “Comment le problème du *Contra Christianos* peut-il se poser aujourd'hui?” in *Le traité de Porphyre contre les Chrétiens: Un siècle de recherches, nouvelles questions; Actes du colloque international organisé les 8 et 9 septembre 2009 à l'Université de Paris IV-Sorbonne* (ed. S. Morlet; CEAug.A 190; Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2011), 1–49, esp. 42–43, 49.

⁹⁷ PGL s.v. §6 “reject a. as spurious, uncanonical” with reference to, among other texts, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.25.4, 4.29.5, and Dionysius of Alex. in *Hist. Eccl.* 7.29.1 (some reject the canonicity of the Apocalypse).

⁹⁸ PGL s.v. §9 (“be recorded, written”), with reference to Eusebius, *Dem. Ev.* 1.3.42 ταῦτα δ' ἦν τὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις αὐτοῦ φερόμενα ([after a quotation of Matt 28:20] these matters that were recorded in the Gospels concerning him).

⁹⁹ See Eusebius's willingness to accept the LXX version of Mic 3:12, “like a hut of a garden-watcher” (ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον), although he affirms “rather [Jerusalem] is a ‘stone heap,’ according to the Hebrew reading” (μᾶλλον δὲ εἰς λιθολογίαν, κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραϊκὴν ἀνάγνωσιν). As an alternative to the LXX's ὀπωροφυλάκιον of Ps 78:1, Eusebius gives Aquila's (λιθολογίαν) and Theodotion's (δρυμούς) translations, in *Comm. Psalm.* 78.1–4 (PG 23:944B), without expressing a preference. Morlet, *La Démonstration*, 461–62 discusses Eusebius's views about the destruction of Jerusalem and the misfortunes of the Jews.

¹⁰⁰ Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 1.2 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 196–97). See 197 for the trans., slightly modified. For ἐγκρίνεσθαι, see LSJ, s.v. §3 “regard as genuine” and PGL s.v. § 2 “accept, approve ... scripture as canonical” with reference to Origen, *Fr. Ezech.* (PG 13:664B) Τοιοῦτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἷτε τὴν μὲν Καινὴν ἐγκρίνοντες, τὴν δὲ Παλαιὰν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες Διαθήκην (These are the individuals who accept [as canonical] the NT, but who reject the OT).

ἐν τοῖς νόθοις κατατετάχθω καὶ τῶν Παύλου Πράξεων ἡ γραφή ὃ τε λεγόμενος Ποιμὴν καὶ ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἡ φερομένη Βαρναβᾶ ἐπιστολή καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι Διδαχαὶ ἔτι τε, ὡς ἔφην, ἡ Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψις, εἰ φανείη ἦν τινες, ὡς ἔφην, ἀθετοῦσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσιν τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις.¹⁰¹

In both texts, Eusebius is concerned with the issue of the canonicity of texts in the NT. He used two concepts from Greek philological scholarship, ἀθετεῖν and ἐγκρίνειν, but he appears to be only author in antiquity to combine those specific verbs. Each word was used in ancient scholarship to distinguish genuine from spurious texts.¹⁰² He was simply following in the footsteps of his Alexandrian predecessors. Franco Montanari has this succinct description: “Alexandrian scholars introduced a new idea in the sphere of scholarship formulating for the first time the problem of the correctness of classical authors’ texts as they could read them Such an approach involved collating different copies, examining and evaluating the variants of the textual tradition, deleting parts judged as spurious and emending errors.”¹⁰³

T. D. Barnes compares Eusebius’s position with the canons, which he thinks “may belong to Eusebius’ youth, for the canons boldly omitted the spurious last twelve verses of Mark.”¹⁰⁴ Claudio Zamagni makes a good case for the thesis that Eusebius used his canons in the composition of his *Quaestiones*.¹⁰⁵ In any case, with regard to the ending of the Gospel, the contents of Eusebius’s library at Caesarea enabled him to formulate his conclusions about the textual evidence in what he calls “accurate” MSS.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 3.25.4, trans. of Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* (ed. and trans. K. Lake and J. E. L. Oulton; 2 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926) 1:257.

¹⁰² Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Din.* 9 (with reference to spurious texts, [the reason] δι’ ἣν ἕκαστον ἀθετοῦμεν αὐτῶν on account of which we reject each of them as spurious). Cf. Diogenes Laertius 7.34. With regard to a textual problem in the *Iliad* (8.535–537 is marked by an antisigma and 8.538–541 by a stigma), Aristonicus (*De signis Iliadis* 8.541) refers to Aristarchus who regards both passages as genuine because the words are very boastful (ἐγκρίνει δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος τοὺς δευτέρους διὰ τὸ καυχηματικώτερος εἶναι τοὺς λόγους). On the meaning of the signs (obscure) in Aristarchus, see F. Schironi, “The Ambiguity of Signs: Critical σημεία from Zenodotus to Origen,” in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters* (ed. M. R. Niehoff; Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 16; Leiden, 2012), 87–112, esp. 90.

¹⁰³ F. Montanari, “Ancient Scholarship and Classical Studies,” in *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts* (ed. S. Matthaios, F. Montanari, and A. Rengakos; Trends in Classics Sup. 8; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 11–27, esp. 21–22. The bibliography on such issues is huge. See N. G. Wilson, “Scholarship, ancient, Greek,” ⁴*OCD*, 1425–1426.

¹⁰⁴ CPG 3465. See T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 122. Morlet, *La Démonstration*, 265 notes that the dating of the *Ep. ad Carpianum* is “purely conjectural,” however. But Morlet argues that the *Demonstratio evangelica* was probably composed after the letter, since he thinks *Dem. Ev.* 3.5.89–92 reflects a use of canons 10.167 (Matt 16:17–19) and 1.82 (Mark 8:27–29 par). This argument, along with Zamagni’s thesis (*Questions évangéliques*, 45–46) that Eusebius used the canons in his *Quaestiones*, is convincing.

¹⁰⁵ Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 45–46. The same MS (Vat. Pal. Gr. 220) contains both texts (the *Ep. ad Carp.* and *Canones evangeliorum* [fol. 1r–7r] and the *eklogē* [fol. 61r–96r]). It has been digitized, and is online (http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Pal.gr.220). Other texts it includes are *Explications of Hebrew Words in the Gospel of Matthew*; Ps.–Esdras; *De diebus fastis et nefastis*; the Gospel of Matthew with scholia; Mark, Luke, and John with scholia; and Fragments on the Genealogy of Christ. See Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 26–32.

¹⁰⁶ On the library and its history, see M. Frenschkowski, “Die Geschichte der Bibliothek von Cäsarea,” in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and World* (ed. T. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 2; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 53–104.

Perhaps the scholion attributed to Eusebius in MS Moscow, Syn. gr. 139 (now in the State Historical Museum), fol. 286¹⁰⁷ is from the *Quaestiones*: σχόλιον Εὐσεβίου: κατὰ Μάρκον· μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν οὐ λέγεται ὤφθαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς (“a scholion of Eusebius: ‘According to Mark: after the resurrection he is not said to have appeared to the disciples’”).¹⁰⁸ One may at least wonder whether Eusebius included the L.E. in the fifty MSS he prepared for Constantine, although it is thoroughly unclear, for example, if Sinaiticus was produced in his scriptorium in Caesarea.¹⁰⁹ NA²⁸ is thoroughly justified in its inclusion of Eus^{mss} in the apparatus to the short ending. The review of Eusebius’s approach to the L.E. of Mark makes some speculation about Cyril’s source appropriate, assuming that he did have one.

6. Cyril’s Source

It is possible that Cyril knew the *Quaestiones*, since one of his answers to Julian’s objections¹¹⁰ about the genealogies in Matthew and Luke is that Mary is from the tribe of Joseph—a response he based on Num 36:6–9. Eusebius referred to the same text in his *Quaestiones*.¹¹¹ Cyril’s reference (as noted above) to the four Marys corresponds to a passage in the same work of Eusebius.¹¹² His response to Julian that there were two journeys to the tomb, one in Matthew and one in Mark, corresponds fairly closely to Eusebius’s statement that there were four incidents in the resurrection narratives (first Matthew, then John, then Luke, and finally Mark) in his answer to a question about why there are four different angelophanies.¹¹³ However, if Cyril knew the entire text of the *Quaestiones*, he would have discussed the L.E. of Mark, as Eusebius did when exploring possible answers to the questions about the times of the resurrection in Matthew and Mark. Consequently, it is possible that Cyril knew some of the traditions from the *Quaestiones*, but certainty is elusive. Cyril may have simply used traditions that were common *topoi* of Christian antiquity. Julian’s objection to the differences in the resurrection narratives, however, was likely inspired by one of Porphyry’s arguments.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (vol. 1; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900), 172 numbers it as “25” (it has been dropped in the Gregory-Aland numeration).

¹⁰⁸ See Westcott and Hort, *New Testament*, 32–33 (appendix); Burgon, *Last Twelve Verses*, 320 (reference to the folio; citation of the full scholion, but an evasion of the evidence); Zamagni, *Questions et réponses*, 165 (the scholion and Nicetas Marinus 11 [Pearse, *Gospel Problems and Solutions*, 210] derive from the same source).

¹⁰⁹ Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4.36.1–4.37.1 (Eusebius, *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin* [ed. F. Winkelmann; GCS Eusebius Werke 1.1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008], 133,27–134,2). D. Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007), 252–54 has shown that T. C. Skeat’s arguments for a Caesarean origin are problematic (“The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine,” *JThS* 50 [1999]: 583–625). J. K. Elliott is more positive about Skeat’s hypothesis. See “T. C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus,” in Skeat, *New Testament Textual Criticism* (NT.S 137; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 65–78 (Elliott also defends the thesis that Ⲙ and B were produced in the same scriptorium).

¹¹⁰ F. 62 (158 Mas.).

¹¹¹ Cyril, *C. Iul.* 8.261 (PG 76:900A–B) and cf. Eusebius, *E.St.* 1.10 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 94–96). I thank Marie-Odile Boulnois for this point (personal communication of 19 Dec. 2014). Cyril quotes the entire text (with several variations from the modern editions of the LXX), but Eusebius summarizes the verses.

¹¹² Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 2.6–9 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 210–14).

¹¹³ Eusebius, *E.Mar.* 4.1–4 (Zamagni, *Questions évangéliques*, 222–28).

¹¹⁴ The second part of this article addresses this problem.

7. Conclusion

Julian probably did not know the L.E. of Mark. Cyril probably knew the L.E., but viewed it as spurious—given his awareness of Nestorius’s mistaken use of Mark 16:20. Cyril’s response to Julian resembles those found in Eusebius’s *Quaestiones*. The L.E. would have been of immense use to Cyril in his polemic against Julian, and in the Syriac version Cyril manifestly asserts that the text of Mark ended with “for they told no one anything.” If the argument is correct, then the significance for NT textual criticism is clear. Julian can be added to the apparatus as a witness for the short ending. Cyril was a patristic writer who, with a high degree of probability, doubted the authenticity of the text. In Cyril’s case, of course, holding such a view of the L.E. manifestly does not imply that he would have tried to “erase” it from the text of Mark.