

# The Freer-Logion (Mark 16:14): GA 032, Jerome, and Erasmus

Régis Burnet and Claire Clivaz, *Université catholique de Louvain and SIB Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics*

**Abstract:** As regularly noted, the Freer-Logion has not often been studied until today. Its reference by Jerome in *Pelag.* 2.15 is mentioned, but New Testament scholars have overlooked its first modern commentator, Erasmus, until three 2022 and 2023 articles by Krans, Yi, and Burnet. As a next step, this article presents the first French and English translations of the complete *Annotationes* of Erasmus on Mark 16:14 next to the Latin text edited by Hovingh (2000). We demonstrate that his philological notes are particularly fruitful for understanding the history of Mark's ending. Using the term *coronis*, in the sense of the end of a given unit, Erasmus asserts that the sentences quoted by Jerome have been inserted into chapter 16 and may have come from an apocryphal source. We suggest that the addition after Mark 16:3 in VL 1 can also be seen as a *coronis* inserted in Mark 16. Finally, we discuss the *κορωνίς* drawn at the end of Mark in GA 032: this editorial decoration adds supplementary evidence for a fifth-century date for the copy of Mark in W, as proposed by Orsini (2019).

## Introduction: Reading the Freer-Logion with Jerome and Erasmus

Since its discovery in Gizeh in 1906 by Charles Lang Freer, the Codex Washingtonianus, W or GA 032, has not stopped drawing the interest of scholars, including an ongoing discussion of its date.<sup>1</sup> It notably contains the so-called Freer-Logion, a supplementary passage in

<sup>1</sup> René Caspar Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908). In this article, we use Gregory's term, "Freer-Logion." A selection of scholarly discussion in chronological order: Henry A. Sanders, "New Manuscripts of the Bible from Egypt," *AJA* 12 (1908): 49–55; Sanders, *The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels*, part 1 of *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, UMSHS 9 (New York: Macmillan, 1912); Sanders, *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1912); Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Freer Gospels*, vol. 3 of *Greek Gospel Texts in America*, HSLNT (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914); Herman C. Hoskier, "The New Codex W," *Exp* 7 (1913): 467–80, 515–31; F. C. Burkitt, "W and Θ: Studies in the Western Text of St Mark," *JThS* 17 (1916): 1–21, 139–52; Paul E. Kretzmann, "The Freer Manuscripts and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri," *TMo* 1 (1921): 255–59; Larry W. Hurtado, *Codex Washingtonianus in the Gospel of Mark: Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981); Larry W. Hurtado, ed., *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, TCS 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006); Ulrich Schmid, "Reassessing the Palaeography and Codicology of the Freer Gospel Manuscript," in Hurtado, *Freer Biblical Manuscript*, 227–49; Zachary J. Cole, "Evaluating Scribal Freedom and Fidelity: Number-Writing Techniques in Codex Washingtonianus (W 032)," *BASP* 52 (2015): 225–38; Brent Nongbri, *God's Library: The Archaeology of the Earliest Christian Manuscripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), part. 1–10, 115–7; Paolo Orsini, *Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule Scripts and Books*, *Studies in Manuscript Cultures* 15 (Berlin: de

Mark 16:14, available only in this manuscript, and partly quoted by Jerome in his *Dialogus Adversus Pelagianos* 2.15 (*Pelag.*).<sup>2</sup> As regularly noted, this logion has, until today, not been studied often.<sup>3</sup> There has only been one published monograph by René Caspar Gregory in 1908, an unpublished PhD by Eugen Helzle in 1959, and some book chapters or articles, such as the detailed analysis by Jörg Frey in 2002.<sup>4</sup>

The analysis of Jerome's quotation greatly matters in this discussion, but, as surprising as it is, New Testament scholars in general, and text-critics in particular, have never integrated the first modern commentator, Erasmus, into their discussions of the Freer-Logion.<sup>5</sup> In Mark's *Annotationes*, edited by P. F. Hovingh in 2000, Erasmus comments on Mark 16:14 in a passage that has never been completely translated into a vernacular language.<sup>6</sup> Whereas Erasmus's more theological *Paraphrase on Mark* was translated into English in 1988 by Erika Rummel,<sup>7</sup>

---

Gruyter, 2019), 135, 155–57 (we thank Patrick Andrist for this reference); Georg Gäbel, “Additions in the Latin Text of Mark in Old Latin Text Types, K and C and Longer Additions in Diverse Old Latin witnesses, including the Freer Logion,” in *Studien*, vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior*, ed. H. Strutwolf et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2021), 174–84; Megan L. Burnett, *Codex Washingtonianus: An Analysis of the Textual Affiliations of the Freer Gospels Manuscript*, Texts and Series 27 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2022). See section 3 below for a discussion of the date.

<sup>2</sup> Claudio Moreschini, ed., *Opera Polemica: Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*, part 3.2 of *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1990), 73. For an English translation, see John R. Hritz, *Saint Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works*, FC 53 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1965), 317.

<sup>3</sup> Research on the Freer-Logion stays “ziemlich ruhig” since its discovery (Klaus Haacker, “Bemerkungen zum Freer-Logion,” *ZNW* 63 [1972]: 125–29, here 125) and has found “nur marginales Interesse” (Jörg Frey, “Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion,” *ZNW* 93 [2002]: 13–34, here 13).

<sup>4</sup> Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*; Eugen Helzle, “Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums und das Freer-Logion (Mk 16,14 W)” (PhD diss, University of Tübingen, 1959). Summary of the author: Eugen Helzle, “Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums (Mk 16,9–20) und das Freer-Logion (Mk 16,14 W),” *ThL* 6 (1960): 470–72. For a selection of book chapters and articles, see Sanders, “New Manuscripts”; Henry B. Swete, *Zwei neue Evangelienfragmente*, 2nd ed., *Kleine Texte* 31 (Bonn: Marcus & Weber's Verlag, 1924), 9–12; Haacker, “Bemerkungen”; as exemplary commentary: William L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 606–11; Günther Schwarz, “Zum Freer-Logion: Ein Nachtrag,” *ZNW* 70 (1979): 119; John K. Elliott, “Agrapha,” in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in English*, ed. J. K. Elliott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 26–30; Frey, “Zu Text”; Timothy R. Shepherd, “Narrative Analysis as a Text Critical Tool: Mark 16 in Codex W as a Test Case,” *JSNT* 32 (2009): 77–98.

<sup>5</sup> As potential exception, see this brief allusion by Eberhard Nestle, “Zum Freer Logion,” *TLB* 30 (1908): 353–55, here 355: “Wenn Hieronymus schreibt: *in quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime in graecis codicibus*, so ist auf diesem Plural und dies *maxime* nicht viel zu geben. Man vergleiche nur, wie beispielsweise noch Erasmus von den griechischen Handschriften (in der Mehrzahl) redet, auch wo er nur eine einzige kennt.”

<sup>6</sup> P. F. Hovingh, ed., *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami: Ordinis sexti, tomus quintus; Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*, part 1 (Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, 2000), 434–37. For a Dutch translation of a few lines, see Bart L. F. Kamphuis, “Hoe ‘Want ze waren bang’ het slot van Markus werd,” *Schrift* 45 (2013): 173a–177b. For an English translation of a few lines, see Jan Krans and An-Ting Yi, “Trajectories in the History of Textual Scholarship on Mark's Ending: A Reconsideration,” *COMSt Bulletin* 8 (2022): 712–30, here 711–12. See the joint annex for French and English translations of the passage.

<sup>7</sup> The *Paraphrase on Mark* does not add the *Annotationes* on Mark 16:14 (see Rummel, *Paraphrase*, 174–76). See also Robert D. Sider: “Erasmus's interpretation of the biblical text in this paraphrase

his historical and exegetical work in the *Annotationes* on Mark is available only in Latin. When Erasmus comments on the ending of Mark, he considers Jerome's work, since he is the first modern editor of the letters of Jerome and the second modern editor of the *Dialogus Adversus Pelagianos* in Basel in 1524, after Giovanni Andrea de' Bussi in Rome in 1468.<sup>8</sup> However, Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, in his twelfth-century commentary on the harmony of the gospels titled *Super unum ex quattuor*, invokes the doubts of the monk of Bethlehem in the *Letter to Hedibia* 120.3.<sup>9</sup> Erasmus revisits and amplifies these concerns, but, as far as we have read, he seems to be the first one to point to the quotation by Jerome of the Freer-Logion in *Pelag.* 2.15.

The lack of engagement with Erasmus's *Annotationes* has recently started to be remedied thanks to three scholars: Jan Krans, An-Ting Yi, and Régis Burnet, who mention it in three 2022 and 2023 articles, written in the dynamic of the SNSF MARK16 project, led by Claire Clivaz.<sup>10</sup> From these articles, it is clear that Erasmus sheds new light on the Freer-Logion and on the content of Jerome's quotation, and we therefore think that his notes deserve further study and a translation, providing material for further inquiries.<sup>11</sup> Section 1 demonstrates that

---

should arouse our interest, particularly in the light of the strongly contextual, grammatical, and historical method he prefers in the *Annotationes*. For in the *Paraphrase on Mark* Erasmus frequently expounds the text tropologically, finding contemporary relevance in the gospel through the application of a methodology implied by the medieval notion of the 'senses' of Scripture' (Robert D. Sider, preface to *Paraphrase on Mark*, trans. E. Rummel, CWE 49 [Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1988], ix).

<sup>8</sup> Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum Divi Hieronymi* (Germaniae Basileam [Basel]: Froben, 1515). For Erasmus's editing work, see Hilmar Pabel, *Herculean Labours: Erasmus and the Editing of St. Jerome's Letters in the Renaissance*, LWW 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2008). See also Cajetan's 1530 commentary about Mark 16:14 and Jerome, quoted and analyzed by Krans and Yi, "Trajectories"; Régis Burnet, "Mark 16 from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century: Why Were the Doubts Not Expressed Earlier?," *COMSt Bulletin* 8 (2022): 731–45; Burnet, "Why 'Reception History' Is Not Just Another Exegetical Method: The Case Of Mark's Ending," *NTS* 69 (2023): 277–90. For Erasmus as the second modern editor of the *Dialogus Adversus Pelagianos*, see the introduction of Moreschini, *Opera Polemica*, xxvi and xxxii.

<sup>9</sup> Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, *In unum ex quattuor siue de concordia euangelistarum, libri quattuor* (Köln: Eucharius Cervicornus, Hirschhorn 1535), 364.

<sup>10</sup> Two papers have been presented at the second MARK16 online conference (Lausanne, 2–3 June 2022), and one at the annual SNTS annual conference (Leuven, 25–29 July 2022); for the references of the published versions, see note 8 above. The writing of the present article has been supported by the SNSF Mark16 project, grant 179755. Team of the project (2023): Claire Clivaz (PI), Priscille Marschall (Post-doc), Elisa Nury (DH Researcher), with Silvano Aldà, IT Group (software developer). Virtual research environment: SNSF MARK16 VRE, DH+, SIB, Lausanne 2020, ISSN 2673-9836, <https://mark16.sib.swiss>. Warm thanks are due to Mina Monier (post-doc) and Jonathan Barda (software developer) for their previous contributions to the project until December 2022. Mina Monier has now been proudly appointed at the Norwegian School of Theology, Oslo (SE). The oversight of Erasmus's *Annotationes* is partly due to the absence of a vernacular translation in Erasmus's studies themselves. For example, Adela Yarbro Collins refers only to Erasmus's *Paraphrase on Mark* in her Mark commentary, quoting Rummel's translation (Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia, 2nd ed. [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 113–15 and 823). Some of Erasmus's annotations have been translated in French, but not this one on Mark 16 (see Jacques Chomarat, *Érasme: Œuvres choisies; Présentation, traduction et annotations* [Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 1991], 465–598).

<sup>11</sup> For example, it clearly invites the creation of a critical edition of Theophylact's commentary on Mark, as already claimed by Brown in 2007 (Andrew J. Brown, "The Gospel Commentary on Theophylact, a Neglected Manuscript in Oxford," *NovT* 49 [2007]: 185–96, here 185). See section 2 below.

Erasmus considers the Freer-Logion—in Jerome’s quotation—as a *coronis*, a *conclusion* or conclusive *clausula*, added to Mark 16:14. Section 2 will then discuss the issue of the proportion of Mark’s manuscripts with the Freer-Logion and the fact that Erasmus considered this *coronis* apocryphal, a label extended by other authors to the entire long ending, from Sixtus of Siena (1520–1569) to Heinrich Meyer or Alfred Loisy.<sup>12</sup> Section 3 will finally return to the Freer-Logion in GA 032 to emphasize new elements to consider in the discussion of when it was written, as well as a reevaluation of its multilingualism asserted by Jerome.

## 1. Erasmus and the Freer-Logion: An Added Conclusion (*coronis*) to Mark 16:14

At the end of this article, we provide the first complete vernacular translation of Erasmus’s *Annotationes* on Mark 16:14, in French and in English, together with the Latin text edited by Hovingh, with our editorial notes.<sup>13</sup> An initial summary of this passage of Erasmus has been done by Krans and Yi, signaling that, “although the annotation is located at verse 14, Erasmus also discusses verse 9.”<sup>14</sup> They summarize it in this way:

In short, Erasmus does not question the canonicity of the traditional ending of Mark. Instead, what is important for him is how to tackle the various narratives after Jesus’s resurrection. His annotations on Mark 16:14 typify his way to approach exegetical problems, namely returning to the Greek to find better “solutions.” As will be shown in our exploration below, the references to Jerome and his response would then become a “hub” for subsequent scholars interested in this issue. Another minor but noteworthy aspect is Erasmus’s appeal to manuscript attestation by personal inspection.<sup>15</sup>

In a follow-up, Krans and Yi remind the reader, as previously argued, that the mention of the ending in Mark 16:8 in GA 03 could have been missing in the list of the 365 remarks transmitted by Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1494–1573) to Erasmus, which are now lost.<sup>16</sup>

[Erasmus] thinks that the addition comes from some apocryphal gospels. There is an intriguing side remark here: ... “Further since this final chapter of Mark is today found in all Greek copies that I consulted...” This remark could imply that Erasmus did not find any additions in all the manuscripts he consulted.<sup>17</sup>

Indeed, Erasmus distinguishes between this last chapter in Mark (*hoc extremum caput*) and the added clause to Mark 16:14 (*coronis*). He has seen the long ending everywhere, according to the meaning of *in omnibus quae sane viderim*:

<sup>12</sup> Sixtus Senensis, *Bibliotheca sancta*, vol. 2 (Coloniae: Maternus Cholinus, 1576), 511; Heinrich A. W. Meyer, *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 2nd ed., KEK 1.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1846), 179: “Es wäre auch für ein σημεῖον der Gläubigen zu gaukelhaft, und verräth ganz den Charakter der apokryphischen Legende”; quoted in Burnet, “Why ‘Reception History,’” 285; Alfred Loisy, “Recension: *Das Freer-Logion* by C.-R. Gregory,” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 60 (1909): 368–70, here 368: “On sait que la finale du second Évangile (Mc 16,9–20) est apocryphe.”

<sup>13</sup> We warmly thank Brill for granting permission to use the Latin edition for this article.

<sup>14</sup> See Krans and Yi, “Trajectories,” 710, note 10.

<sup>15</sup> See Krans and Yi, “Trajectories,” 712.

<sup>16</sup> See Jan Krans, “Erasmus and Codex Vaticanus. An Overview and an Evaluation,” *ASE* 37 (2020): 447–70; Krans and Yi, “Trajectories,” 712.

<sup>17</sup> See Krans and Yi, “Trajectories,” 712.

Caeterum vt hoc extremum Marci caput hodie habetur in omnibus quae sane viderim, Graecorum exemplaribus...<sup>18</sup>

Moreover, since this last chapter of Mark is found today in all in all the Greek copies I have actually consulted.... (*Annotationes* §175)<sup>19</sup>

Whether or not Erasmus was informed by Sepúlveda about the ending of Mark in 16:8 in GA 03 here, he makes the scholarly choice to speak only about the manuscripts he has “actually consulted” (*sane viderim*). This sentence confirms that GA 03 was not considered by Erasmus in his analysis of Mark 16 in the *Annotationes*. All the manuscripts he has seen for himself presented the long ending. In this framework, Erasmus qualifies the special words reported by Jerome after Mark 16:14 twice as *coronis*. We can confirm that *coronis* means *conclusion* for him, specifically a conclusion to the preceding sentences, not to the entire chapter or Gospel of Mark. To demonstrate this, let us start by reading the two mentions of *coronis* in the text:

Idem Hieronymus in secundo Dialogo aduersus Pelagium disputans narrat in fine Euangelii iuxta Marcum in nonnullis exemplaribus, maxime Graecorum, coronidem fuisse adiectam hisce Marci verbis: *Postea*.<sup>20</sup>

The same Jerome in the second *Dialogue*, fighting against Pelagius, tells us that at the end of Mark’s Gospel, in some copies—mainly Greek—, a conclusion was added to these words by Mark: *After*. (*Annotationes* §167)

Caeterum vt hoc extremum Marci caput hodie habetur in omnibus quae sane viderim, Graecorum exemplaribus, quod enarrat etiam Theophylactus, ita coronidem hanc ex apocrypho quopiam Euangelio asscriptam apparet a lectore nimium audaci.<sup>21</sup>

Moreover, since this last chapter of Mark is found today in all the Greek copies I have actually consulted, which Theophylact also recounts, this conclusion [*coronidem*] appears to be inserted from some apocryphal gospel to the least daring reader. (*Annotationes* §175)

These two occurrences of *coronis* are in concordance with other uses in the *Annotationes*. Krans gives four examples of the translation of *coronis* meaning “conclusion” or “end” in his 2006 monograph on the *Annotationes*.<sup>22</sup> The case regarding the addition or conclusion of the Lord’s Prayer is closed from the case of the Freer-Logion. Commenting on the addition on Rom 9:5 in the *Annotationes*, Erasmus compares it with the clause at the end of the Lord’s Prayer and signals the existence of *huiusmodi clausulae locis* (“clauses of this kind”):

Reperiuntur autem huiusmodi clausulae locis aliquot additae, velut ad finiendam lectionem, quemadmodum apud nos solenne est addere “Tu autem domine, gloria patri, gloria tibi domine”, sic apud Graecos ad calcem orationis dominicae hanc adiecerunt coronidem, “Quia tuum est regnum, et potentia, et gloria in secula seculorum, amen.”<sup>23</sup>

However, in some places, clauses of this kind are found to be added, for example at the conclusion of a reading, just as it is customary for us to add “You, O Lord, glory to the Father, glory to you, Lord,” so among the Greeks, at the end of the Lord’s Prayer, there is added as a conclusion

<sup>18</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436.

<sup>19</sup> All the translations of Erasmus’s *Annotationes on Mk 16:14* are ours (see annex).

<sup>20</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436.

<sup>21</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436, ll. 175–178.

<sup>22</sup> Jan Krans, *Beyond What Is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament*, NTTSD 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 56, 117, and 118 nn. 87 and 88.

<sup>23</sup> Erasmus, *Annotationes*, 1519-edition; quoted by Krans, *Beyond*, 117 n. 83. Krans signals that this passage has been left out in the 1535 edition.

[*hanc adiecerunt coronidem*] “Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.”<sup>24</sup>

Erasmus has the same meaning in mind of conclusive *clausula* for the Freer-Logion, and he distinguishes this addition (*coronidem fuisse adiectam*) from the last chapter of Mark (*hoc extremum Marci*). The Freer-Logion as an addition to Mark 16:14 was reaffirmed by Kurt Aland in 1970 and in 2002 by Frey: “Das Freer-Logion ist daher wahrscheinlich erst zur Erweiterung des langen Markusschlusses komponiert worden.”<sup>25</sup> Moreover, it should be noted that Erasmus does not use *coronis* to refer to an editorial or critical mark in the text, according to the usual meaning of the Greek *κορωνίς*.<sup>26</sup> In section 3, we will come back to this question, because GA 032, p. 372 shows a particularly developed *κορωνίς*—as editorial mark—at the end of the Gospel of Mark.<sup>27</sup>

Erasmus’s choice to distinguish between *caput* and *coronis* clarifies what Jerome was more imprecisely presenting as being *juxta Marcum in fine Euangelii eius* (“according to Mark, at the end of his gospel”).<sup>28</sup> For example, in 1981, this expression puzzled Bruce Metzger, who prudently reformulated Jerome by describing the Freer-Logion as “a remarkable addition *near the close* of the Gospel according to Mark.”<sup>29</sup> But it remains difficult to understand what proportion of Mark’s manuscripts was seen by Jerome in the transmission of the Freer-Logion, as the next section will highlight. Here, Erasmus also brings clues that encourage another rereading of Jerome.

<sup>24</sup> Translation by John B. Payne et al., eds., *Annotations on Romans*, CWE 56 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1994), 251; quoted by Krans, *Beyond*, 117.

<sup>25</sup> Frey, “Zu Text,” 24; referring to Kurt Aland, “Der wiedergefundene Markusschluß? Eine methodologische Bemerkung zur textkritischen Arbeit,” *ZThK* 67 (1970): 3–11, here 11.

<sup>26</sup> See notably, in chronological order: Gwendolen M. Stephen, “The Coronis,” *Scriptorium* 13 (1959): 3–14; Eric Gardner Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987): 10–18; Kathleen MacNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary, Papyri Papyrologica Bruxellensia* 26 (Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth, 1992), 24; Franscesca Schironi, *Tò Μέγα Βιβλίον: Book-Ends, End-Titles, and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry*, The American Society of Papyrologists (Exeter: Short Run Press, 2010), 80; Antonio Ricciardetto, “La ponctuation dans les papyrus grecs de médecine,” *EA* 11 (2019): 121–60, here 127–28 and 146.

<sup>27</sup> See GA 032, page 372; visible on the SNSF VRE MARK16, ISSN 2673-9836, <https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss>.

<sup>28</sup> Jerome, *Pelag.* 2.15.1–9 (Moreschini, S. Hieronymi, 73): “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. 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 certer renuere non audebitis: Mundus in maligno positus est.” Hritzu, *Saint Jerome*, 317: “In some copies, and, especially, in the Greek codices, it is written according to Mark, at the end of his Gospel: ‘At length, Jesus appeared to the Eleven as they were at table; and he upbraided them for their lack of faith and hardness of heart, in that they did not believe those who had seen him after he had risen. And they began to apologize, saying: ‘This world is the substance of iniquity and incredulity, which does not allow the true virtue of God to be understood because of unclean spirits; therefore, now reveal your justice.’ If you contradict this passage, you certainly will not dare to refute the following: ‘The world is in the power of the evil one’ [1 John 5:19].”

<sup>29</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 82 (emphasis added).

## 2. With or without the Freer-Logion? Manuscripts and Vocabulary at Stake

As explained in section 1, Erasmus affirms that, in all the manuscripts actually consulted (*in omnibus quae sane viderim*), he found the long ending (*hoc extremum Marci caput hodie habetur*). In the 1535 edition, Erasmus even adds a clause to reinforce this statement, *quod enarrat etiam Theophylactus* (“which Theophylact also relates”):

Caeterum vt hoc extremum Marci caput hodie habetur in omnibus quae sane viderim, Graecorum exemplaribus, quod enarrat etiam Theophylactus.<sup>30</sup>

Moreover, since this last chapter of Mark is found today in all the Greek copies I have actually consulted, which Theophylactus also recounts.

It remains to be seen exactly which passage of Theophylact’s Erasmus refers to here. As A. J. Brown complained in 2007, no critical edition of the *Enarrationes in Marcum* still exists today, and nothing has changed since Hovingh was relying on the edition of Theophylact published by de Rubeis in 1754, republished by Migne in 1864, and translated into English by Stade in 1993.<sup>31</sup> We agree with Hovingh that, in Migne’s edition, the only potential candidate to give context for *quod enarrat etiam Theophylactus* would be a statement reported in a footnote by de Rubeis and commented on by Hovingh: “Erasmus aims at a passage that occurs in Codex 26 of Theophylact’s *Enarr.* in the library of San Marco in Venice (v. Migne PG 123, 677, n. 90, cf. 135 sq.).”<sup>32</sup> In this Venice Codex 26, Theophylact affirms that “some commentators claim that the Gospel of Mark ends here and that the rest was added later. We must, however, interpret it so as not to offend the truth.”<sup>33</sup>

But this passage is totally absent from the Basel manuscript of Theophylact used by Erasmus, MS A 3.15 or GA 817, f. 97v, as one can see in the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, the Venice Codex 26 does not belong to the manuscripts usually listed among those consulted by Erasmus.<sup>35</sup> GA 2879 (Corpus Christi College, Oxford)—unfortunately not consultable online—could be a potential candidate, because Erasmus stayed in England in 1511–1514, but Brown does not think he was influenced by this manuscript in his

<sup>30</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436, ll. 175–176.

<sup>31</sup> Theophylact, *Enarr. in Mc.* 16, 9–13, Migne PG 123:677C; Christopher Stade, trans., *The Explanation of the Holy Gospel according to Mark by Blessed Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrid and Bulgaria, Blessed Theophylact’s Explanation of the New Testament*, vol. 2, 5th ed. (House Springs: Chrysostom Press, 2008).

<sup>32</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 437, note on l. 176: “This passage reads that according to some persons Mc. 16, 9–20 was added at a later time, but that Theophyl. wants to explain it all the same without straining the truth.”

<sup>33</sup> Φασί τινες τῶν ἐξηγητῶν ἐνταῦθα συμπληροῦσθαι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγέλιον· τὰ δὲ ἐφεξῆς προσθήκη ἐῖναι μεταγενεστέρων. Χρή δὲ καὶ ταύτην ἐρμηνεῦσαι μηδὲν τῆ ἀληθείᾳ λυμαιομένου (PG 123:677D). Original edition: Jo. Fran. Bernardo Maria de Rubeis, ed., *Theophylacti Bulgariae archiepiscopi ... Opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Venice, 1754), 797.

<sup>34</sup> <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de>. Hovingh signals that Erasmus used this manuscript (see Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 15).

<sup>35</sup> Krans, *Beyond*, 335–38; Patrick Andrist, “Structure and History of the Biblical Manuscripts” sed by Erasmus for His 1516 Edition,” in *Basel 1516: Erasmus’ Edition of the New Testament, Spätmitelalter, Humanismus (Reformation 91)*, ed. Martin Wallraff et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 81–124.

reading of Theophylact.<sup>36</sup> A manuscript should exist somewhere that has this passage and that was potentially consulted by Erasmus. The database *Biblissima* proposes a list of thirty-six manuscripts for the *Enarrationes in Marcum*, to which the Basel GA 817 should still be added.<sup>37</sup> There is an ongoing quest to find the missing clue to fully understand Erasmus's statement *quod enarrat etiam Theophylactus*, made in 1535.<sup>38</sup>

This addition underlines Erasmus's difficulty to understand why Jerome mentions only in *Pelag.* 2.15 the Freer-Logion and does not include it in his edition of the Vulgate.<sup>39</sup> Erasmus discusses the case in twenty lines (ll. 175–194) and finally concludes with this statement: Jerome “himself was careless about what he transmitted. For what I indicate here is frequent in this work” (ll. 193–194). Before reaching this conclusion, Erasmus tried to look for possible sources of transmission of the *coronis* in Mark 16:14, alluding to a lost *Commentary of Mark* by Ambrose mentioned by Beda (ll. 183–185)—but neither Hovingh nor we have been able to identify this quotation in Beda's work.<sup>40</sup> Another potential source for Erasmus could be the Pseudo-Jerome *Commentary on Mark* (ll. 185–190), but not a line of this text mentions the Freer-Logion or discusses the different Markan endings.<sup>41</sup>

In fact, for Erasmus, the *coronis* has a definitively apocryphal flavor: “this conclusion [*coronidem*], appears to be inserted from some apocryphal gospel to the least daring reader” (ll. 176–177), starting by explaining the general case of Mark 16:9–20 (ll. 126–167). The label of apocryphal will be extended by further authors to the long ending itself, as described below. In a more restricted way, Metzger affirmed in 1981, like Erasmus, that the Freer-Logion was “doubtless of apocryphal origin.”<sup>42</sup> It has been often classified among the *agrapha*.<sup>43</sup> More balanced opinions consider the Freer-Logion an ancient Christian production using “Palestinian language,”<sup>44</sup> or, similar to precanonical traditions, including terms and notions borrowed from Jewish apocalypticism.<sup>45</sup> However, for James A. Kelhoffer and Frey, the Freer-Logion is an auctorial or scribal addition similar to the writing process of the shorter and longer endings.<sup>46</sup> Erasmus would certainly not have imagined such a scholarly interest for this *coronis*. For him, “this piece, since it has nothing of the seriousness of the Gospel, but rather smacks of Mani-

<sup>36</sup> Brown, “Gospel Commentary,” 192–93.

<sup>37</sup> <https://portail.biblissima.fr/fr/ark:/43093/oedata886497dc272691914b717a113643e32c13e1976f>.

<sup>38</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436.

<sup>39</sup> See a similar opinion—but without a deprecative opinion about Jerome, see Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. 2.2 (Erlangen: Hinrichs, 1892), 936.

<sup>40</sup> See Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 437: “Beda ... *decerpisse*: I could not find such a remark in Beda *Venerabilis*, not even with the help of CLCLT or PLD.”

<sup>41</sup> Michael Cahill, *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 127–31.

<sup>42</sup> Metzger, *Manuscripts*, 82.

<sup>43</sup> Elliott, “Agrapha,” 29.

<sup>44</sup> Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 611.

<sup>45</sup> Enrico Norelli and Claudio Zamagni, “Alcuni esempi delle forme e dei modi in cui la tradizione su Gesù si è fissata in testi che non sono divenuti canonici,” in *Gli apocrifi cristiani: Biblia; Associazione laica di cultura biblica; Seminari Estivi 1998* (Frascati: Villa Campitelli 1998): 23–50, here 41; Daniel A. Bertrand, “Fragments évangéliques,” in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I*, ed. François Bovon and Pierre Geoltrain, *Pléiade* 442 (Paris: Gallimard, 1997), 404.

<sup>46</sup> James A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark*, *WUNT* 2/112 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 155; Frey, “Zu Text,” 34: “Das Freer-Logion ist ein theologisch nicht allzu tiefgründiger, singulärer, vielleicht von einem einzelnen Schreiber in die Textüberlieferung eingetragener Einschub in den langen Markus-Schluß.”



chean dogma, was rightly refuted, and rejected by both Greeks and Latins” (ll. 181–183). Just before this rhetorical association to a “Manichean dogma,”<sup>47</sup> Erasmus also reminds his reader that Jerome has read and translated the Gospel of the Hebrews, a potential source for this logion (ll. 176–181):

This conclusion [*coronidem*] appears to be inserted from some apocryphal gospel to the least daring reader. Indeed, the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, which was read by both the Nazarenes and the Essenians [Ebionites], written in Hebrew letters, but composed in the Chaldean [Aramaic] language, Jerome testifies that he himself translated it into Greek, and he extracts some quotations from it, in which we read something quite similar [*quaedam his non dissimilia*].

Erasmus’s suggestion can be set aside, since Jerome, when he quotes the Gospel of the Hebrews, always does it explicitly.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, Jerome is aware that the addition to Mark 16:14, which is specific to certain manuscripts, can be contradicted, and he completes his argument by another quotation: “If you contradict this passage, you certainly will not dare to refute the following: ‘The world is in the power of the evil one’ [1 John 5:19].”<sup>49</sup> Jerome does not mention a potential source of the Mark 16:14 *coronis*, and scholars have remained, until today, just as perplexed as Erasmus regarding this contradiction: Jerome reports that *both* the long ending (see *Letter to Hedibia* 120.3) *and* the addition to Mark 16:14 are found in a minority of manuscripts. Today, whereas the long ending is present in almost all the extant manuscripts of Mark, the Freer-Logion is found only in GA 032. The manuscripts’ materiality is therefore one of the main difficulties we face in trying to understand Jerome’s and Erasmus’s comments. For example, we still do not know in which of Theophylact’s manuscripts Erasmus would have read the passage he appealed to in lines 176–177, as discussed above. If uncertainties remain about the situation of the manuscripts in the sixteenth century, it is even more the case in the fifth century.

A second difficulty lies in the evolution of the vocabulary used by the commentators through the centuries. This is notably the case for the word *capitulum* that Jerome uses in his *Letter to Hedibia* 120.3. Indeed, as Nicholas Dames’s remarkable article on the history of the chapter shows, partitions were introduced into the text even before the invention of the codex. However, this practice was not universal, and several systems coexisted. This included the announcement of the subjects concerned (this is the meaning of the word *capitulum*) in an introductory paragraph to the modern system of blanks, numbering, and a summary title. As Dames summarizes:

The confusion is constitutive: as the mediation point between a text’s segmentation (its appearance to a continuous reading) and its navigability (its appearance to a discontinuous reading), the head encompasses both index and unit.<sup>50</sup>

Jerome, who lived at the time of the implementation of these practices, does not use *capitulum* to describe the modern chapter head but rather *argumentum*. He reserves the term *capitulum*, a cognate of the Greek term κεφάλαιον, for a passage or unit of texts.<sup>51</sup> With the development of the codex and even more so with the rise of printing, the term *capitulum* came to be a specific

<sup>47</sup> See the annex, note 36, for a comment.

<sup>48</sup> See, notably, twice in *Pelag.* 3.2. Jerome refers explicitly to the Gospel of the Hebrews in all his other quotations of it (see Bertrand, “Fragments évangéliques,” 438–45).

<sup>49</sup> Hritz, *Saint Jerome*, 317. Quoted in note 28 above.

<sup>50</sup> Nicholas Dames, “Chapter Heads,” in *Book Parts*, ed. Dennis Duncan and Adam Smyth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 151–64, here 158.

<sup>51</sup> Pierre Petitmengin, “Capitula païens et chrétiens,” in *Titres et articulation du texte dans les ouvrages antiques*, ed. Jean-Claude Fredouille, Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, Philippe Hoffmann, and Pierre Petitmengin (Paris: Institut d’Études augustiniennes, 1997), 491–507.

designation of what we call chapter, the unit of text demarcated by blanks and typographical marks. It was therefore easy for commentators to misunderstand Jerome's words. Many authors have made this anachronistic reading since the Renaissance, sometimes for strategic reasons. It seems certain that Cajetan, for example, pretends to know that it is the whole end of an apocryphal chapter. He was indeed embarrassed by the promises made by the Risen One to the Eleven, which contradicted his miracle's conception inherited from Aquinas:

At this point I would add [arguments] in order that we understand how diverse this chapter is. And, indeed, there are some points in this chapter that are not found in any other evangelist. However, I do not see anything manifestly adverse to the other evangelists.... Personally, I would consider this chapter, which is present in many Greeks, to be suspect because of the addition of I do not know which of these terms that Jerome reports in the Dialogue [*Dialogus Adversus Pelagianos*] and even because of the promise that follows: "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils," etc. Whatever the truth, the suspicion toward these verses is demonstrated because these words do not have the sound authority to strengthen the faith as the rest of Mark's unquestionable writings do.<sup>52</sup>

Cajetan wishes to cast doubt on several elements of the chapter, such as Mark 16:17–18, beyond the Freer-Logion, whereas Erasmus focused on this logion as apocryphal. The Protestant Driesche (Johannes van den Driesche, 1550–1616) does not seem any more comfortable with the passage (he does not say so explicitly, but his position is apparent with the more than minimal notes he makes on chapter 16). He does not hesitate to say that it is the whole chapter that is absent from *all* the Greek books: "The Greek books did not have this chapter in the past."<sup>53</sup> Others seek to defend the chapter, along with Grotius, who asserts that it is not possible for Mark to have omitted the entire story of the resurrection from his gospel, which neither Jerome nor Erasmus seems to say.<sup>54</sup> Finally, Sixtus of Siena (1520–1569) finds the explanation that the exegetes will retain, notably Cornelius a Lapide: what Jerome says does not apply to the text found in the Bible as we know it today but to ancient versions that were fortunately later expunged of the ferment of the apocryphal error:

What Jerome implied—that this chapter was not in the copies of the past and that it seems to contain things contrary to what the other evangelists say—he does not intend as a reference to the whole chapter but to certain apocryphal chapters of this period that were added by unknown authors to certain codices and that, because they were considered doubtful or contrary to the other evangelists, were expunged from the Greek codices by the fathers.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Thomas de Vio [Cajetan], *Evangelia cum Commen. Caietani* (Florentini: in ædibus Luceantonii Iunctæ, 1530), 83 v<sup>o</sup>: "Quae ideo attulerim, ut intellegamus quam varie habeatur capitulum hoc. Et revera nonnulla sunt in hoc capitulo, quae in nullo alio Evangelista habentur: nihil tamen ego video contrarium manifeste alii Evangelistis.... Crediderim ego suspectum apud multos Graecos habitum hoc capitulum propter admixtionem a nescio quibus illorum verborum quae Hieronymus retulit in Dialogo: & etiam propter promissionem subjunctam. Signa autem eos qui crediderint hac sequentur: in nomine meo daemonia eijicient, &c. Quicquid autem sit de veritate, suspicionum tamen istarum effectus est, quod haec scripta non sunt solidae autoritatis ad firmandam fidem sicut sunt reliqua Marci indubitata."

<sup>53</sup> Johannes van den Driesche, *Annotationum in totum Iesu Christi Testamentum*, Franekeræ (Franeker, Friesland: Ægidius Radæus, 1612), 76: "Hoc caput libri Græciæ olim non habebant."

<sup>54</sup> Henricus Grotius, *Annotationes in libros Evangeliorum* (Amsterdami: Blaeu, 1641), 587.

<sup>55</sup> Senensis, *Bibliotheca sancta*, 511: "Quod subtexit Hieronymus olim caput istud in exemplaribus non fuisse & ob id ab aliquibus eo quod aliis Euangelistis videretur continere non de tota huius capituli intellexit sed de quibusdam apocryphis capituli huius periodis ab incertis autoribus in codicibus immissis quæ quia vel dubiae vel aliis Euangelistis contrariæ viderentur idcirco a patribus de Græcis codicibus subducta sunt."

Cajetan and Sixtus of Siena have an extended understanding of what should not stand in the last chapter of Mark, whereas Erasmus kept his appreciation of apocryphal only for the Freer-Logion. In the next century, Richard Simon joins them by stating that certain passages would have been added in Mark 16. Moreover, he highlights what he considers an anachronism:

Il ne faut pas entendre, comme ont fait la plupart des Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, par ce mot *capitulum* qui est dans St. Jérôme, le dernier Chapitre de St. Marc entier ... les anciens Ecrivains Ecclesiastiques ont marqué toute autre chose par le mot de *capitulum*, *chapitre*, que ce nous entendons aujourd'huy par les Chapitres du Nouveau Testament & même de toute la Bible.<sup>56</sup>

And with surprising modernity, he hypothesizes that the ending was not fixed in all the churches, which explains why we can find alternative versions:

Les Copistes Grecs ont crû faire paroître leur exactitude en les inserant dans leurs Exemplaires. Ce qu'ils ont d'abord fait en forme de remarque; et il y en a eu d'autres ensuite qui ont laissé ces additions dans le Texte, sans y joindre ce qui designoit qu'elles n'y étoient que comme des observations.<sup>57</sup>

As we see, Cajetan, Siena, and Simon provide all possible arguments to classify several passages of the last chapter of Mark as dubious. Siena extends the term apocryphal to a broader unspecified content, whereas Cajetan was not so keen on Mark 16:17–18. The way is paved for a final extension at the modern period: Meyer (1846) and Loisy (1905) both describe the long Mark ending as apocryphal.<sup>58</sup> In the end, one must recognize that Jerome was also considering at a glance all the long ending's elements, without separating the Freer-Logion from the rest. While Erasmus made the distinction between the Freer-Logion “out of the text” or “apocryphal” *versus* a long ending “in the text” or “non apocryphal” in the *Annotationes*, subsequent readers did not keep this distinction. The question of whether to keep the long ending in or out has remained the same from Jerome to Loisy, with diverse answers.

### 3. Back to GA 032: *χωρώνίς*, Date and Multilingualism

In this history of reception, codex GA 032 raises specific questions. Frey, like Gregory, considers that “sicher war das Segment der Textüberlieferung mit diesem Zusatz außerordentlich schmal.”<sup>59</sup> But he also concludes his article by prudently underlining that GA 032 shows how much our knowledge of the textual tradition of the New Testament remains fragmentary.<sup>60</sup> In our opinion, prudence should indeed be the rule in evaluating seldom occurrences. Gregory usefully reminds us that New Testament manuscripts present other examples of isolated words of Jesus that are simply less known, for example, the “surprising addition” in Matt 17:26, 27 in GA 713, the complement to Matt 20:28 or Luke 22:28 in GA 05, or the story after Luke 6:4 in

<sup>56</sup> Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam: Reinier Leers, 1689), 114.

<sup>57</sup> Simon, *Histoire critique*, 119.

<sup>58</sup> See note 12 above.

<sup>59</sup> Frey, “Zu Text,” 25; see Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 27.

<sup>60</sup> Frey, “Zu Text,” 34: “Bedenkt man, daß der Zusatz im sekundären Markusschluß uns heute nur in einer einzigen griechischen Handschrift des Neuen Testaments erhalten ist, obwohl er in einem schmalen Segment der Textüberlieferung wohl über 200 Jahre vor der Anfertigung von Codex W existiert haben muß, dann wird deutlich, wie fragmentarisch unsere Kenntnis der neutestamentlichen Textüberlieferung trotz der Vielzahl von Handschriften ist.”

GA 05.<sup>61</sup> It is worth also keeping in mind the example of the minor evidence of Mark 15:34 in GA 05—εἰς τί ὠνειδίσας με (“why do you have reviled / taunted me?”)—attested in unique indirect external evidence by Macarius Magnes in the *Apocriticus* 2.23.6.<sup>62</sup>

Regarding the end of Mark, one has in mind the case of the *conclusio brevior*, or shorter ending: the Codex Bobbiensis (VL 1) remains the only manuscript concluded by the shorter ending with nothing else afterwards or in the margins, even if numerous and multilingual attestations demonstrate that the shorter ending was quite widely spread from an early time.<sup>63</sup> In an interesting but not well known 1981 study, Patrick Skehan had presented arguments to demonstrate that the textual tradition represented by the Codex Bobbiensis was probably quite well known, at least in regions as different as North Africa and Ireland.<sup>64</sup> Such an observation can only invite us to prudently evaluate the distribution of traditions in ancient times that seem marginal today. From that perspective, we can highlight a forgotten tradition reported in the Codex Bobbiensis that echoes a comment by Erasmus (ll. 145–147): “And I see no reason why Gregory or Bernard mention angels, who would have been the only ones to see the Lord resurrecting.” Hovingh proposed two quotations of Gregory and Bernard to understand Erasmus’s allusion but does not seem fully convinced, introducing them by a tentative “perhaps.”<sup>65</sup> But it is nevertheless possible to find a clear mention of the tradition read by Erasmus by the two medieval authors: “I see no reason ... [why the] angels would have been the only ones to see the Lord resurrecting.” This scene is, in fact, reported by the Codex Bobbiensis in an added passage after Mark 16:3, according to the French translation of Daniel A. Bernard:

Tout à coup, à la troisième heure du jour, les ténèbres se firent sur toute la terre et des anges descendirent des cieux au moment où Jésus ressuscitait avec l'éclat du Dieu vivant; ils s'élevèrent à l'instant avec lui, et aussitôt la lumière se fit.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 25–26.

<sup>62</sup> See for example F. C. Burkitt, “On St. Mark XV 34 in ‘Codex Bobiensis,’” *JTS* 1.2 (1900): 278–79; Adolf von Harnack, “Probleme im Texte der Leidengeschichte Jesu,” in *Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik*, vol. 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 86–104; Adolf von Harnack, ed., *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts: die im ‘Apocriticus’ des Macarius Magnes enthaltene Streitschrift* (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1911); Bart D. Ehrman, “The Text of Mark in the Hands of the Orthodox,” in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 142–55.

<sup>63</sup> See Aland, “Der wiedergefundene Markusschluss,” 5. The VL 1 images are visible on <https://bobbiensis.sib.swiss>.

<sup>64</sup> Patrick Skehan, “St. Patrick und Elijah,” in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélémy*, ed. Paolo Casetti et al., OBO 38 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 471–83.

<sup>65</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “Er. perhaps means ... Gregorius, *Hom. in Ev.* II, 21, 3, about Mc 16, 1–7, Migne *PL* 76, 1171 B; Bernardus, *In ascensione Domini sermo*, I, I, Migne *PL* 183, 299 D–300 C.”

<sup>66</sup> Bernard, “Fragments évangéliques,” 403. Bernard claims here to refer to the Latin edition of VL 1 by Aland in his *Synopsis*, but Aland had left open this difficult Latin passage: “et descenderunt de caelis et surgent (-ntes ? -nte eo ? surgit ?) in claritate vivi Deo (viri duo ? + et ?) simul ascenderunt cum eo” (Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis edidit*, 14th ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1995], 495). In a paper for the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in 2022, Clivaz demonstrated that the manuscript supports Bertrand’s translation, pushing also further the convincing analysis of J. Harold Helderman, “Die Engel bei der Auferstehung und das lebendige Kreuz. Mk 16,3 in K einem Vergleich unterzogen,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. Franz van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, Guillaume van Belle, and Joseph Verheyden, vol. 3, BETL 100 (Louvain: Presses universitaires, 1992), 2321–42. See VL 1 f. 40r and f. 40v on <https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss/manuscript/VL1>.

With the mention of the descent of angels when the Lord is resurrecting (*Dominum resurgentem*), one has an interesting second example of an addition in Mark 16, here after 16:3. It is also present in only one New Testament manuscript (VL 1), but that could have been spread widely until it was mentioned by Gregory and Bernard. When considering the Freer-Logion and the addition after Mark 16:3, it must be concluded that the last chapter of Mark was, for a long time, quite a flexible text, including minor variants continually copied and transmitted. Erasmus's commentary provides clues to help scholars look for Mark's textual history. As argued in section 2, Erasmus also teaches us a lot with his use of the Latin word *coronis* to designate the addition of some lines in Mark 16:14, a phenomenon similar to the addition to Mark 16:3 in the Codex Bobbiensis. Our inquiry about this Latin word has also led us to pay attention to the Greek word *κορωνίς*. The Greek term refers not only to the end of a unit of meaning but also to the graphic way of representing it: a vertical line, a horizontal line, or any other sign (small drawing, colored dots, hatching). As summarized in 2019 by Antonio Ricciardetto,

tracée dans la marge de gauche de la colonne d'écriture, la *corônis* apparaît le plus souvent à l'intérieur du texte, pour signaler la fin d'un paragraphe contenant un développement constituant un tout (on parle dès lors de *corônis* interne). Elle marque donc une pause plus forte que celle impliquée par la *paragraphos*.<sup>67</sup>

There are several examples of *coronis* looking like a bird, and the sign was evolving in the first centuries CE. Francesca Schironi noted in 2010 that “in codices, the *coronis* gradually evolves toward being a purely ornamental design,” and “in codices with Christian literature the *coronis* becomes extremely stylized.”<sup>68</sup> She refers in a footnote to Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Alexandrinus for Christian uses of stylized *coronis* but does not mention GA 032.<sup>69</sup> But in the very last folio of Mark in Codex Washingtonianus (p. 372), one can see a particularly large *κορωνίς*.<sup>70</sup> Does it have some meaning or importance?

As surprising as it is, scholars who discuss the date of the manuscript have not paid attention to it, not even Gregory (1908) and Henry A. Sanders (1912), who comment on the sentence added below the final title on page 372, embedded in a prayer, the unique remark about the owner of the codex and/or scribe.<sup>71</sup> Gregory notes that a second owner (Timotheus) had

<sup>67</sup> Ricciardetto, “La punctuation,” 127. See also MacNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia*, 24: “The paragraphus and coronis, for marking divisions in the text, are also familiar.”

<sup>68</sup> Schironi, *Tò Μέγα Βιβλίον*, 80.

<sup>69</sup> Turner does not give any details on the uses of *coronis* in Christian codices but signals Stephen's 1959 article (*Greek Manuscripts*, 14 n. 3). He also refers to an epigram by Meleager (*AP XII 257*), which gives the word to a *coronis* itself, translated by William R. Paton in *The Greek Anthology*, vol. 4 (London: Heinemann, 1926), 412–13: “I, the flourish that announces the last lap's finish, most trusty keeper of the bounds of written pages, say that he who hath completed his task, including in this roll the world of all poets gathered into one is Meleager, and that it was for Diocles he moves from flowers this wreath of verse, whose memory shall be evergreen. Curled in coils like the back of a snake, I am set here enthroned beside the last lines of his learned work.”

<sup>70</sup> See <https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss/manuscript/GA032>.

<sup>71</sup> Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 23: “Ich habe von Besitzern des Handschriftes gesprochen. Es ist aber nicht zu vergessen, dass irgendein des Schreibens Kundiger, der eine heilige Handschrift auch nur vorübergehend in die Hand bekam, leicht, wäre Tinte und Feder zur Hand, ein solches Gebet für sich einfügen konnte, einzufügen geneigt war. Häufig sieht man das in Handschriften.” The final sentence on page 379 seems to have disappeared afterwards from the scholarly minds. For example, neither Hurtado (*Codex Washingtonianus*), nor Nongbri (*God's Library*), nor Orsini (*Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule*) mention it. But recently see Megan L. Burnett, who reads Sanders on this point (Burnett, *Codex Washingtonianus*, 43–44). For the Codex Sinaiticus, see

replaced a first one (Dorotheus) and added the mention of “all of his.”<sup>72</sup> Sanders transcribes and translates the sentence in this way: *χριστὲ ἅγιε σὺ μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου τιμοθέου καὶ πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ* (“Holy Christ, be thou with thy servant Timothy and all of his”).<sup>73</sup> Moreover, Sanders uses this final subscription to determine the *terminus ante quem* of GA 032 by dating the two hands behind it:

An earlier *terminus ante quem* for the MS is given by the subscription to Mark.... As has been stated above (p. 2), the two lines of this were written by two fifth century semi-cursive hands and indicate two successive owners of the MS. The second was the head of a monastery. We may thus with safety date the whole MS as not later than the early part of the fifth century.<sup>74</sup>

Regarding Gregory and Sanders’s attention to this subscription, one can only be surprised that not even these two New Testament scholars commented on the final *κορωνίς* of the Gospel of Mark in GA 032. So far, the only author to devote attention its *κορωνίς* is a classical scholar, Gwendolen M. Stephen, in a 1959 article, apparently neglected in subsequent discussions. She interestingly notes the presence of “the three delightful coronides of the Freer Gospel Codex were without any doubt intended to look like birds,” showing one example in plate 1c at the end of the Gospel of John.<sup>75</sup> Stephen gives several examples of the ancient use of “bird coronis” in her plate 1, ranging from the fourth century BCE until the Freer Gospel Codex, her latest example. Based on the three examples of “bird *coronis*” and the stylized *κορωνίς* at the end of Mark, GA 032 can be considered as an intermediate step in the evolution of the *coronis*:

The three great biblical codices, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, are rather different: the design built out of a cross which concludes the text in these codices is quite unlike the normal *coronis* and is much more a part of the colophon, especially in the Alexandrinus, where it is merely a rectangular corner enclosing the title. Nevertheless, an intermediate stage may be seen in the Freer Gospel Codex, in which Matthew, John, and Luke end with the bird-like *coronis* already described (Pl. 1c), but Mark, the last gospel in the Codex, with a colophon similar to those in the Codex Sinaiticus.... Its comparative absence from Christian literature is surprising, in view of its otherwise apparently wide distribution; but we should note that there was in any case a general decline in its use after the fourth century. Thereafter the “explicit” provided a sufficient sign of termination in Latin books, and the revival of the *coronis* in Greek poetry by Triclinius [fourteenth century CE] was not enough to institute a general revival in its use.<sup>76</sup>

Stephen’s observations, as well as the subscription on page 372, must be integrated in the discussion of the date of copies of Mark in GA 032 from this point forward. First, the subscription concluding Mark serves of *ante quem* reference, as pointed out by Sanders, who was open to consider also the first half of the fifth century for GA 032 and not only the fourth, as often

---

Herbert J. M. Milne and Theodore C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938), 34.

<sup>72</sup> Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 22–3.

<sup>73</sup> Sanders, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 1–2.

<sup>74</sup> Sanders, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 135.

<sup>75</sup> Stephen, “Coronis,” 4. Carl Nordenfalk has read Stephen’s article but does not discuss her position on the *coronis* in GA 032 (Carl Nordenfalk, *Die Spätantiken Zierbuchstaben*, vol. 1 [Stockholm: Röder, 1970], 1:101, note 2 and 102, note 1). He just mentions the *coronis* of this manuscript in another note, adding the example of Codex Marchalianus, sixth century, with three *coronis* (116 n. 1). Codex Marchalianus can be seen at [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.gr.2125](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.2125), with *coronis* on f. 84, f. 118 and f. 338. In her 2022 monograph, Megan L. Brunett does not mention the *coronis* at all (Brunett, *Codex Washingtonianus*). We thank Tommy Wasserman for these two references.

<sup>76</sup> Stephen, “Coronis,” 9 and 11.

argued.<sup>77</sup> Secondly, GA 032 represents an intermediate stage in the use of *coronis*, mixing up bird *coronis* and final cross *coronis*, as highlighted by Stephen. The second point makes GA 032 closer to the codices Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus. These elements agree with the date as convincingly argued by Paolo Orsini in 2019: the first or the second half of the fifth century for the scribe A, who copied Mark.<sup>78</sup> One can even claim this fact for the first half, based on the arguments of this section 3. The sixth century should not be claimed as a date for Mark in W any longer.

Beyond the question of the date, the final *coronis* and the subscription on page 372, considered together with the Freer-Logion, further support that there is still more to discover about the end of Mark in GA 032. Sanders presented the specificity of the manuscript in an acute way, underlining its proximity to Codex Bobbiensis and its possible multilingual context: “W will then represent the Greek column of a trilingual, which had come to Egypt in the form Greek-Latin-Syriac, but the Syriac column had then been replaced by a Coptic (Sahidic) version.”<sup>79</sup> If this possibility remains undemonstrated, it was notably transmitted by Metzger under the form of a “patchwork ancestor” promoted by Sanders.<sup>80</sup> Recently, Cole tried to “solve” Sanders’s case by demonstrating that the copyist of W would have been very faithful in following the exemplar he was reading.<sup>81</sup>

The potential multilingual framework, or ancestor, of W remains inaccessible to scholars, but to know if the Freer-Logion existed in other languages than Greek has fascinated them since the discovery of GA 032. Whereas Sanders researched this idea, Eberhard Nestle was already strongly opposed to it in his review of Gregory’s monograph from 1908.<sup>82</sup> He actively

<sup>77</sup> See, for example, Nongbri, *God’s Library*, 5: “While Sanders ultimately concluded that the Freer manuscript of the gospels was most likely copied in the fourth century.” But Sanders remained more flexible in his 1912 monograph, in a passage republished in the same way in 1918: “In determining the date of W, most of the evidence thus seems to point to the fourth century, though the beginning of the fifth must still be admitted as a possibility” (*New Testament Manuscripts*, 139). For similar contemporaneous opinions, see Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 13; Hoskier, “New Codex W,” 468.

<sup>78</sup> Orsini, *Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule*, 56. In 2006, Ulrich Schmid was cautious with the date of GA 032 and was asking for radiocarbon dating (Schmid, “Reassessing,” 249). But Orsini has clarified.

<sup>79</sup> Sanders, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 74: “A comparison to a single Old Latin MS, we find that k now stands nearest, with just under 75 agreements or partial agreements.”

<sup>80</sup> Metzger, *Manuscripts*, 84: “The stratification of text is matched by similar variations in paragraphing. According to Sanders, this variation is to be explained by the theory that the codex is derived from a patchwork ancestor made up of fragments from different manuscripts pieced together after the attempt made by the Emperor Diocletian in 303 to crush Christianity by destroying its sacred books. One of the most noteworthy of the variant readings in codex W is a remarkable addition near the close of the Gospel according to Mark (following 16:14), part of which was known to Jerome, who declares that it was present ‘in certain copies and especially in Greek codices.’ The logion, which is doubtless of apocryphal origin, comprises lines 9–24 of the Plate.”

<sup>81</sup> Cole, “Evaluating Scribal Freedom,” 225: “The mysterious relationship of Codex Washingtonianus (W 032) to its parent text(s) has been a matter of some debate among textual critics, primarily because of the manuscripts startling block mixture of ‘text-types.’ This study brings to light an overlooked scribal feature that suggests W is a strict copy of its exemplar(s) rather than the customized text of a scrupulous redactor.”

<sup>82</sup> Nestle, “Zum Freer Logion,” 355: “Ob das Stück je in einer lateinischen (oder syrischen oder ägyptischen) Ueberstetzung stand, darf man vorerst bezweifeln.”

looked for all Greek equivalents for the Latin translation of Jerome.<sup>83</sup> Although Frey does not refer to Nestle, he nevertheless expresses this same opinion in 2002 and strongly contradicts the tentative attempt by Klaus Haacker and Günther Schwarz to solve the *crux interpretum* concerning the phrase ἀλλὰ ἐγγίξει ἄλλα δ[ε]ῖνά by looking for a Hebrew (Haacker) or Aramean (Schwarz) expression; Frey considers the passage to be “sinnvoll” and in need of no conjecture.<sup>84</sup> In fact, the clear opposition of Nestle and Frey to a multilingual solution of the Freer-Logion is surprising, especially since Jerome informs us clearly that the passage exists *in quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime Graecis codicibus*.<sup>85</sup> In the fourth century, the Freer-Logion existed in at least two languages, according to Jerome.

Second, the Hebrew or Aramean expression suggested by Haacker and Schwarz is interesting on a narrative level: the expression ἀλλὰ ἐγγίξει ἄλλα δ[ε]ῖνά should be read as “das Ende der Schrecken,” “the end of the fear/terror is approaching,” as *Urform*.<sup>86</sup> This reading makes sense regarding the impact on the early readers of Mark of the fear of the women mentioned in 16:8. This fear is amplified and redundant in VL 1 (Codex Bobbiensis): *tenebat enim illas tremor et pauor propter timore*.<sup>87</sup> Later commentators have sometimes questioned this fear (see the scribe in arm 724, f. 110v) or even asked if the women were afraid of the Jews (see, e.g., GA 304, f. 241r, ll. 18–20).<sup>88</sup> From a narrative point of view, it would make sense to announce the “end of the fear” in Mark 16. Moreover, a Hebrew background would fit with the Jewish apocalypticism framework suggested by Daniel A. Bertrand for the Freer-Logion or with the messianic expectations suggested by William L. Lane.<sup>89</sup> Frey himself underlines that the relationship between Satan and the *exousia* is close to LXX expressions or to Barn. 18.2.<sup>90</sup> The specificity of the Freer-Logion, which sounded “apocryphal” to Erasmus, must be fully considered.

Finally, a point seldom noted must be highlighted. It is generally considered that Jerome was consulting a text like GA 032,<sup>91</sup> but Mark 16:14 on page 372 contains a detail that Jerome does not state. It mentions *twelve* disciples at the start of Mark 16:14, whereas Jerome mentions *eleven* disciples (*Postea, cum accubuissent undecim, apparuit eis*).<sup>92</sup> The number *twelve* relates Mark 16:14 to the rest of the gospel more smoothly; indeed, Mark neither focuses on Judas at the Last Supper nor narrates his death. These two different numbers (twelve/eleven) and the expression ἀλλὰ ἐγγίξει ἄλλα δ[ε]ῖνά prevent us from concluding that Jerome was simply translating an exemplar similar to GA 032 into Latin.

<sup>83</sup> Nestle, “Zum Freer Logion,” 354.

<sup>84</sup> Frey, “Zu Text,” 19–20.

<sup>85</sup> *Pelag.* 2.15. Georg Gäbel considers that Jerome translated himself the Greek Freer-Logion in Latin (Gäbel, “Additions,” 183), but no element in Jerome’s quotation supports this claim.

<sup>86</sup> See Haacker, “Bemerkungen,” 126–27; see also Schwarz, “Zum Freer-Logion.”

<sup>87</sup> VL 1, f. 41r, Mark 16:8, <https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss/manuscript/VL1>.

<sup>88</sup> See <https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss/manuscript/ARM724> and <https://mr-mark16.sib.swiss/manuscript/GA304>.

<sup>89</sup> Bertrand, “Fragments évangéliques,” 404; Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 611: “The Freer Logion reflects on the experience of the community in the Days of the Messiah not in terms of restoration, as in Acts, but in the categories of a heavenly inheritance. The Freer Logion and Acts 3:19–21 are independent witnesses to a tradition of the periodization of inherited eschatological hopes by the early Palestinian Church.”

<sup>90</sup> Frey, “Zu Text,” 28 and note 78.

<sup>91</sup> See, for example, Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, 28: “Wir haben daher keinen Grund zu glauben, dass Hieronymus die übrigen Worte dieses Einschlebsels nicht kannte”; Frey, “Zu Text,” 34.

<sup>92</sup> See Cole, “Evaluating Scribal Freedom,” 235; Shepherd, “Narrative Analysis,” 89. But neither Cole nor Shepherd is looking here for the history of traditions.



## 4. Concluding Summary

The examination of the philological notes that Erasmus adds to his *Novum Instrumentum Omne* is particularly helpful in understanding the history of Mark's ending. Although Erasmus does not have all the manuscripts known today, he tries to understand as best he can Jerome's statements according to which certain manuscripts do not contain this *capitulum* at the end. Using the term *coronis*, in the sense of the end of a given unit, he seems to hypothesize that the sentences Jerome quoted (which correspond to a part of the so-called Freer-Logion) have been inserted somewhere at the end of our present chapter 16. And he interprets this as a borrowing from some apocryphal gospel.

This attestation is of twofold interest to contemporary scholars. On the one hand, it plays a great role in the reception of this last chapter. Even before the discovery of manuscripts with alternative endings, chapter 16 seemed suspect. On the one hand, with several scholars before them, nineteenth-century exegetes were prepared to find something wrong in this chapter. On the other hand, Erasmus allows us to understand how Jerome comments at the same time on the long ending and the Freer-Logion.

Finally, Erasmus leads us back to the observation of the materiality of the codices themselves. First, we noticed that GA 032, the only direct witness so far of the Freer-Logion, presents at the end of Mark a specific *coronis* that looks like the final *coronis* of Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Alexandrinus. This particularity has been noted essentially by Stephen and reinforces a date of the fifth century for the copy of Mark in W. Erasmus's considerations about the *coronis* to Mark 16:14 also helps us better understand the similar presence of an added passage in the last chapter of Mark, but in Codex Bobbiensis, which presents an addition after Mark 16:3, narrating the resurrection of Jesus, witnessed by angels accompanying him to the heavens. Gregory and Bernard apparently still knew this story, as we hear about it, thanks to Erasmus's notice about Mark 16:14 (ll. 146–147, Hovingh's edition). Let's bet on the fact that Erasmus's commentary on Mark 16:14 still has a lot to teach us.

# ANNEX

## French and English translations of Erasmus's *Annotationes* on Mark 16:14 by Régis Burnet and Claire Clivaz

NB: In the Latin text below, edited by P. F. Hovingh,<sup>1</sup> the letters refer to selected editions of the *Annotationes* in Basel, by Froben ([A] 1516; [B] 1519; [C] 1522; [D] 1527; and by Froben and Episcopus ([E] 1535); the numbers refer to the lines of the Hovingh edition and the “LB” paragraphs to the edition by Pieter van der Aa, 1705.<sup>2</sup> We would like to warmly thank Brill for granting permission to use the Latin edition in this article. The notes are ours, with several quotations from Hovingh's edition.

<p><b>126</b> [14] [D] <i>Novissime recumbentibus illis.</i> Augustinus de concordia euangelistarum lib. 3<sup>3</sup> torquet seipsum quaestione qui consistat quod Marcus dicit hic Iesum novissime apparuisse, quum Ioannes referat illum post apparuisse suis ad mare Tiberiadis. Hunc nodum sic explicat, vt <i>novissime</i> referatur non ad <b>130</b> numerum apparitionum simpliciter; sed ad apparitiones eodie factas. Atqui quum Graece sit ὕστερον, quod sonat ‘deinde’ siue ‘postea,’ non erat quur moueret quaestionem, si Graecos consuluisset codices; quanquam nolim dissimulare comparatiua nonnunquam vsurpari vice superlatiuorum; quoniam itaque dixerat: ‘primum; interpres hic maluit dicere: ‘postremum.’</p>	<p><b>126</b> [14] [D] <i>En dernier lieu, alors qu'ils étaient à table.</i> Augustin, dans sa <i>Concordance des Évangiles</i> livre 3, se tourmente en se demandant pourquoi Marc dit ici que Jésus est apparu <i>en dernier lieu</i>, tandis que Jean rapporte son apparition aux siens au bord de la mer de Tibériade. Il explique ainsi cet embarras: <i>en dernier lieu</i> ne renvoie pas au <b>130</b> nombre des apparitions prises séparément, mais aux apparitions faites ce même jour. Et donc, alors qu'il y a en grec ὕστερον, qui veut dire ‘ensuite’ ou ‘après cela,’ il n'aurait pas soulevé la question, s'il avait consulté des codex grecs. Même si je ne voudrais pas dissimuler que le comparatif puisse être employé à la place du superlatif; puisqu'il avait donc dit: ‘d'abord; cet interprète a préféré écrire: ‘pour la dernière fois.’</p>	<p><b>126</b> [14] [D] <i>Finally, while they were at the table.</i> Augustin, in his <i>Concordance of the Gospels</i> book 3, torments himself by asking why Mark tells here that Jesus appeared <i>finally</i>, while John reports his apparition to his [disciples] at Lake Tiberias. He explained this problem as follows: <i>finally</i> does not simply refer to <b>130</b> the number of individual apparitions, but to apparitions that happened on that day. And yet, while the Greek [text] has ὕστερον, meaning “then” or “after that,” he would have had no reason to raise the issue if he had consulted the Greek texts. However, I would by no means wish to conceal the fact that the comparative can be used as a substitute for the superlative. Therefore, since he said “first,” this interpreter preferred to write, “for the last time.”</p>
<p><i>Illis vndecim.</i> Ἀὐτοῖς <b>135</b> τοῖς ἑνδέκα. Diuus Augustinus<sup>5</sup> ex addito pronomine <i>illis</i> et ex articulo Graeco colligit hunc locum non posse accipi nisi de apostolis. Atqui Graece non est ἐξείκοις, sed αὐτοῖς,<sup>6</sup> quod si relatiue<sup>7</sup> sumatur, sonat Iesum iisdem duodecim<sup>8</sup> apostolis apparuisse quibus prius apparuerat. Sin discretiue, sensus erit Iesum apparuisse non mulieribus aut quibuslibet discipulis de quibus ante dictum erat, sed ipsis <b>140</b> vndecim nimirum apostolis qui narrantibus non crederant. Etiam si Marcus ita contexit, quasi hoc senserit. Primum</p>	<p><i>Ceux-là, les Onze.</i> Ἀὐτοῖς <b>135</b> τοῖς ἑνδέκα. Le divin Augustin, à partir du pronom <i>illis</i> ajouté et de l'article grec, conclut que ce passage ne peut être compris qu'à propos des apôtres. Mais en grec, il ne s'agit pas d'ἐξείκοις, mais d'αὐτοῖς, ce qui signifie, si cela renvoie à ce qui précède, que Jésus est apparu à ces mêmes douze apôtres auxquels il était apparu précédemment. Si, au contraire, [αὐτοῖς] sert à distinguer, le sens sera que Jésus n'est pas apparu aux femmes, ni à certains disciples dont il était question avant, mais aux <b>140</b> onze apôtres eux-mêmes, qui ne crurent pas ceux qui racontaient. Même si Marc a rédigé</p>	<p><i>Those, the eleven.</i> Ἀὐτοῖς <b>135</b> τοῖς ἑνδέκα. The divine Augustine, from the added pronoun <i>illis</i>, and from the Greek article, concluded that this passage can only be understood in relation to the apostles. And in Greek, it is not ἐξείκοις, but αὐτοῖς, which means, if it refers to the above, that Jesus has appeared to the same twelve apostles to whom he had previously appeared. If [αὐτοῖς] is used to distinguish the word, it means that Jesus did not appear to the women and specific disciples who were mentioned previously, but to <b>140</b> the eleven apostles, who did not believe those who</p>

<p>apparuit Mariae Magdaleneae, post haec duobus ambulans in villam,<sup>9</sup> postremo recumbentibus vndecim. Nec obstat huic sensui, si iam vni aut alteri ex apostolis apparuerat. Certe vndecim simul discumbentibus nondum apparuerat.</p>	<p>comme il l'a fait, c'est comme s'il l'avait compris ainsi. [Jésus] apparut d'abord à Marie Madeleine, ensuite aux deux qui marchaient vers le village [Emmaüs], en dernier lieu aux onze à table. Et rien ne s'oppose à cette compréhension, s'il était déjà apparu à l'un ou l'autre des apôtres. Il n'était certes pas en même temps apparu aux Onze couchés [à table].</p>	<p>narrated. Even if Mark wrote as he did, it's as if he understood that way. [Jesus] first appeared to Mary of Magdala, then to the two people working near the village [Emmaus], and, lastly, to the eleven at the table. And nothing challenged the understanding of if he had already appeared to one or more apostles. He had surely not appeared at the same time to the eleven sitting [at the table].</p>
<p><i>Qui viderant eum resurrexisse.</i><sup>10</sup> <b>145</b> Graece est ἐγγρημένον, 'suscitatum' siue 'excitatum'. Nec video causam quur hic Gregorius aut Bernardus<sup>11</sup> inducant angelos, qui soli viderint Dominum resurgentem. [E] Qui prius mortuum viderant ac mox viuum, vtique <b>LB 214</b> viderunt eum resurrexisse. Illi fortassis legebant 'qui viderant eum resurgentem', vt hic interpres frequenter participia praeteriti temporis vertit in participia praesentis temporis. <b>150</b> [A] Diuus Hieronymus<sup>12</sup> in epistola ad Hedibiam,<sup>13</sup> quaestione tertia, indicat hoc extremum Marci caput a plerisque non fuisse receptum, quod in raris Latinorum codicibus, Graecorum pene nullis habebatur, praesertim quum videatur narrare quaedam manifeste pugnantia cum aliis euangelistis. Velut illud, quod refert Dominum resurrexisse mane, <i>prima sabbati</i>, quum Matthaeus tradat eum resurrexisse <b>155</b> vespera sabbati, <i>quae lucescit in prima sabbati</i>. Pugnant autem inter sese <i>vespere</i> et <i>mane</i>. Huius difficultatis ostendit Hieronymus geminam solutionem, quarum prior haec est: <i>Aut enim</i>, inquit, <i>non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur Euangelis, omnibus Graeciae libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus</i>. Haec solutio impia erat, si tum temporis hoc capitulum idem habebat <b>160</b> autoritatis quod reliquum Marci Euangelium. Admonet autem et illud [E] Hieronymus, [A] subdistinctionem esse faciendam ante <i>mane</i>; ut intelligamus Christum vespere surrexisse,</p>	<p><i>Ceux qui l'avaient vu ressuscité.</i> <b>145</b> Le grec a ἐγγρημένον, 'levé' ou 'redressé'. Et je ne vois aucune raison pour laquelle Grégoire ou Bernard mentionnent des anges, qui auraient été les seuls à voir le Seigneur en train de ressusciter. [E] Ceux qui l'avaient vu mort d'abord et bientôt vivant, quoi qu'il en soit, <b>LB 214</b> virent qu'il était ressuscité. Ceux-là lisaient peut-être 'qu'ils l'avait vu en train de ressusciter', puisque cet interprète transforme fréquemment les participes passés en participes présents. <b>150</b> [A] Le divin Jérôme, dans sa lettre à Hédibia, dans la troisième question, indique que ce dernier chapitre de Marc n'a pas été reçu par la plupart, que de rares codex latins l'avaient, [et] presque aucun des codex grecs, surtout qu'il semble raconter quelque chose qui manifestement s'oppose aux autres évangélistes. Parce qu'il rapporte que le Seigneur est ressuscité le matin, le premier jour de la semaine, alors que Matthieu transmet qu'il est ressuscité <b>155</b> le soir du sabbat, [avant] que ne luisse le premier jour de la semaine. Mais le soir et le matin s'opposent. Face à cette difficulté, Jérôme propose une double solution, dont la première est celle-ci : Soit, dit-il, nous n'acceptons pas en effet le témoignage de Marc, qui est rapporté dans de rares évangiles, tandis que presque tous les livres grecs n'ont justement pas ce chapitre à la fin. Cette solution aurait été impie, si à cette époque ce chapitre avait la même <b>160</b> autorité que le reste de l'Évangile de Marc. Mais [E]</p>	<p><i>Those who had seen him resurrected.</i> <b>145</b> The Greek has the word ἐγγρημένον, meaning "raised" or "awakened." And I see no reason why Gregory or Bernard mention angels, who would have been the only ones who saw the Lord's resurrection. [E] Those who first saw him dead and then alive soon after, however it happened, <b>LB 214</b> saw that he was resurrected. Those may have read that "they had seen him resurrecting," since this interpreter often transforms the past participles into present participles. <b>150</b> [A] The divine Jerome, in his letter to Hedibia in the third section, indicates that this last chapter of Mark was not accepted by the majority of people. There are rare Latin codices containing it, [and] almost no Greek codices, and this is likely because it seems to say something clearly opposing the other evangelists. For he reports that the Lord rose in the morning, on the first day of the week, whereas Matthew transmits that he rose in the <b>155</b> evening of the Sabbath, [before] the first day of the week. But evening and morning are opposites. Confronted with this difficulty, Jerome proposes a dual solution, the first of which is this: Either, he says, we do not accept the testimony of Mark, which is only reported in a few Gospels, while almost all the Greek texts do not have this specific chapter at the end. This solution would have been impious if, at the time, this chapter had the same <b>160</b> authority as the rest of Mark's Gospel. But [E] Jerome [A] also reminds us that the sentence must</p>

<p>deinde <i>prima sabbati</i> visum<sup>14</sup> esse Mariae, hoc modo legentes: <i>quum surrexisset Iesus</i>—et<sup>15</sup> hic interposita hypostigme sequatur—, [E] <i>mane prima sabbati</i> [A] <i>apparuit</i> [E] <i>primo</i> [A] <i>Mariae</i>.<sup>16</sup> Hanc distinctionem<sup>17</sup> indicat <b>165</b> et Theophylactus.<sup>18</sup> Nos, quo dilucidior esset sermo, pro <i>ἀναστὰς</i>, quod interpret<sup>19</sup> vertit <i>surgens</i>, veritimus <i>quum surrexisset</i>.<sup>20</sup> Est enim participium praeteriti temporis, quod circumitione reddendum erat.</p>	<p>Jérôme [A] nous rappelle aussi qu'il faut terminer la phrase avant <i>au matin</i>; pour que l'on comprenne que le Christ est ressuscité le soir, puis qu'il est apparu à Marie le <i>premier jour de la semaine</i>, lisant ainsi: <i>alors que Jésus avait ressuscité</i>—et ici une virgule doit être placée— [E] <i>il est apparu le matin du premier jour de la semaine</i> [E] <i>d'abord</i> [A] à Marie. Cette marque de ponctuation est <b>165</b> également indiquée par Théophylacte. Quant à nous, pour que le discours soit plus clair, en ce qui concerne <i>ἀναστὰς</i> que le traducteur [Jérôme] rend par «ressuscitant», nous le traduisons «alors qu'il était ressuscité». Car c'est un participe passé, qui devait être rendu par une périphrase.</p>	<p>end before <i>in the morning</i>, so that we understand that Christ rose in the evening and then appeared to Mary on the first day of the week. Thus, it reads: <i>while Jesus had risen</i>—and here a comma must be placed—[E] <i>he [A] appeared on the morning of the first day of the week [E] first to [A] Mary</i>. This punctuation mark is also <b>165</b> indicated by Theophylact. As for us, to get a clearer discourse, regarding <i>ἀναστὰς</i>, which the translator [Jerome] renders as “resurrecting,” we translate it “when he had risen” This is because it is a past participle, which had to be rendered by a periphrasis.</p>
<p>Idem [E] Hieronymus<sup>21</sup> [A] in secundo Dialogo aduersus Pelagium<sup>22</sup> disputans narrat in fine Euangelii iuxta Marcum in nonnullis exemplaribus, maxime Graecorum,<sup>23</sup> coronidem<sup>24</sup> fuisse adiectam <b>170</b> hisce Marci verbis: <i>Postea quum accubuissent vndecim, apparuit illis Iesus, et exprobrauit incredulitatem et duriciem cordis eorum,</i><sup>25</sup> <i>quod multis</i><sup>26</sup> <i>qui viderant eum resurgentem, non crediderunt.</i> [E] <i>Hic additum erat:</i> [A] <i>Et illi satisfaciabant dicentes: seculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia</i><sup>27</sup> <i>est, quae non sinit per immundos spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem. Idcirco iam nunc reuela iustitiam tuam.</i></p>	<p>Le même [E] Jérôme [A] dans son second <i>Dialogue</i>, celui où il lutte contre Pélagé, raconte, qu'à la fin de l'Évangile selon Marc, dans quelques exemplaires, principalement grecs, une conclusion a été ajoutée <b>170</b> à ces paroles de Marc: <i>Après que les Onze se soient assis, Jésus leur apparut et leur reprocha leur incrédulité et l'endurcissement de leur cœur, car ils ne firent pas confiance aux nombreuses [personnes] qui l'avaient vu à la résurrection.</i> [E] Ici, il a été ajouté: [A] <i>Et eux se justifiaient, en disant: Ce siècle est en substance iniquité et incrédulité, qui ne permet pas que la vraie puissance de Dieu soit appréhendée par des esprits impurs. Maintenant donc, révèle ta justice.</i></p>	<p>The same [E] Jerome [A] in his second <i>Dialogue</i>, the one fighting against Pelagius, tells us that at the end of the Mark's Gospel, in some copies—mainly Greek—a conclusion was added <b>170</b> to these words by Mark: <i>After the eleven had sat down, Jesus appeared to them and reproached them for their unbelief and the hardness of their hearts, for they did not trust the numerous [people] who had seen him resurrecting.</i> [E] Here it is added: [A] “And they justified themselves, saying: <i>This age is iniquity and unbelief in substance, which does not allow the true power of God to be apprehended by unclean spirits. Now therefore, reveal your righteousness.</i>”</p>
<p><b>175</b> Caeterum vt hoc extremum<sup>28</sup> Marci caput<sup>29</sup> hodie habetur in omnibus quae sane viderim, Graecorum<sup>30</sup> exemplaribus, [E] quod enarrat etiam Theophylactus,<sup>31</sup> [A] ita coronidem hanc ex <b>LB 215</b> apocrypho quopiam Euangelio asscriptam apparet a lectore nimium<sup>32</sup> audaci. Nam Euangelium Hebraeorum, quod tum a Nazareis et Essenis<sup>33</sup> legebatur, Hebraicis scriptum literis, sed sermone Chaldaico, Hieronymus testatur<sup>34</sup> <b>180</b> a se versum in linguam Graecam et ex eo nonnulla profert testimonia<sup>35</sup>, in quo leguntur quaedam his non dissimilia. Hoc</p>	<p><b>175</b> Au reste, puisque ce dernier chapitre de Marc se retrouve aujourd'hui dans toutes les copies grecques que j'ai réellement consultées, [E] ce que Théophylacte raconte aussi, [A] cette conclusion [coronidem] paraît insérée à partir d'un évangile <b>LB 215</b> apocryphe au lecteur un minimum audacieux. En effet, l'<i>Évangile des Hébreux</i>, qui a été lu à la fois par les Nazaréens et les Esséniens [Ébionites], écrit en lettres hébraïques, mais [rédigé] en langue chaldéenne [araméenne], Jérôme atteste qu'il l'a lui-même <b>180</b> traduit en langue grecque, et il en extrait</p>	<p><b>175</b> Moreover, since this last chapter of Mark is found today in all the Greek copies I have actually consulted, [E] which Theophylact also recounts, [A] this conclusion [coronidem] appears to be inserted some <b>LB 215</b> apocryphal gospel to the least daring reader. Indeed, the Gospel of the Hebrews, which was read by both the Nazarenes and the Essenes [Ebionites], written in Hebrew letters but composed in the Chaldean [Aramaic] language, Jerome testifies that he himself translated <b>180</b> it into Greek, extracting some quotations</p>

<p>autem assummentum, quoniam nihil habet euangelisticae grauitatis, sed olet potius dogma Manicheorum,<sup>36</sup> merito reiectum ac reiectum est tam a Graecis quam a Latinis. Beda testatur<sup>37</sup> diuum Ambrosium accurate scripsisse in hunc euangelistam, e cuius commentariis fatetur <b>185</b> se multa decerpisse.</p>	<p>certaines citations, dans lesquels on lit des choses assez similaires. Mais ce morceau,—puisqu'il n'a rien de sérieux évangélique, mais sent plutôt le dogme manichéen—, a été à juste titre réfuté et rejeté à la fois par les Grecs et les Latins. Bède témoigne que le divin Ambroise a écrit il y a longtemps avec exactitude sur cet évangéliste, et il admet qu'il a beaucoup glané <b>185</b> dans ses commentaires.</p>	<p>from it, in which we read something quite similar. But this excerpt, not having the seriousness of the Gospel, but instead smacks of Manichean dogma, was rightly refuted, and rejected by both Greeks and Latins. Bede testifies that the divine Ambrose wrote long ago with accuracy on this evangelist, and he admits that he gleaned much <b>185</b> from his commentaries.</p>
<p>Hoc opus nobis intercidit, nisi forte Beda sensit <b>LB 216</b> commentarios in Marcum qui feruntur Hieronymi titulo,<sup>38</sup> esse Ambrosii. Quod ego nec refello nec asseuero. Videntur enim hominis nec infantis nec inruditi, cui illud certe cum Ambrosio commune quod multum est in allegoriis et affectibus. Praefationem autem inepetam et indoctam addidisse videntur librarii,<sup>39</sup> quo <b>190</b> gratiosi nominis lenocinio allicerent emptorem. Illud addam, quod Hieronymus aliis verbis<sup>40</sup> refert hunc locum quam habetur in Marco Latinae editionis, quum tamen aduersus Pelagianos scripserit admodum senex; unde coniectare licet aut hanc editionem non esse Hieronymi aut ipsum neglexisse quod tradiderat. Nam quod hic indico, perquam frequens est illi in eo opere.</p>	<p>Cet ouvrage nous est perdu, à moins que Bède n'estime peut-être que <b>LB 216</b> les commentaires sur Marc, qui portent le nom de Jérôme, sont ceux d'Ambroise, ce que je n'infirmes ni n'affirme. Car ils semblent provenir d'un homme, qui n'est ni un enfant ni un inculte, et qui a certainement en commun avec Ambroise de se plonger dans les allégories et les affects. Mais les libraires semblent avoir ajouté une préface maladroite et inculte, <b>190</b> afin d'attirer l'acheteur par l'attrait d'un nom populaire. J'ajouterai que Jérôme se réfère à ce passage en d'autres termes que ceux trouvés dans l'édition latine de Marc, alors qu'il a pourtant écrit contre les Pélagiens à un âge très avancé; d'où l'on peut inférer que cette édition n'était pas de Jérôme, ou qu'il a lui-même été négligent dans ce qu'il a transmis. Car ce que j'indique ici lui est fréquent dans cette œuvre.</p>	<p>This work is lost to us, unless Bede perhaps considers that <b>LB 216</b> the commentaries on Mark, which bear the name of Jerome, are those of Ambrose, which I neither deny nor affirm. This is because they seem coming from a man who is neither a child nor an uneducated man, and who certainly shares with Ambrose the tendency to be immersed in allegories and affects. But the book-sellers seem to have added a clumsy and uneducated preface <b>190</b> to attract the buyer by the draw of a popular name. I will add that Jerome refers to this passage in terms other than those found in the Latin edition of Mark, though he wrote against the Pelagians at a very advanced age. It may be inferred that this edition was not Jerome's or that he was careless about what he had transmitted. From what I can tell, this happens frequently in his work.</p>

### Appendix Notes

- <sup>1</sup> P. F. Hovingh, ed., *Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami: Ordinis sexti, tomus quintus; Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*, part 1 (Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, 2000), 434 and 436. In open access: <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/34713>.
- <sup>2</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 1. The 1705 edition starts the passage in 15:47 (LB 213; Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 432).
- <sup>3</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: "Augustinus, *Cons. euang.* III, 25, 75, CSEL 43, p. 377sq."
- <sup>4</sup> We added quotation marks to *deinde* and *postea*, according to the meaning of the sentence.
- <sup>5</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: "Augustinus, *Cons. euang.* III, 25, 76, CSEL 43, p. 379 sq."
- <sup>6</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 434: "ἐξείνους, sed ἀνθρώποις D: ἐξείνους ἀνθρώποις E."
- <sup>7</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: on *relatiue* and *discretiue*: "by 'relatiue' Er. understands 'pointing back to a person mentioned before,' by 'discretiue,' 'distinguishing from others.'"
- <sup>8</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: "duodecim E: vndecim D."

- 9 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 434: “villam E: villa D.”
- 10 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “Qui viderant ... opere. The additions from 1535 could be connected to criticism by N. Beda; cf. *Supputat. error. in cens. N. Bedae, LB IX*, 717 BC.” We thank Jan Krans who signaled to us that *LB IX*, 717 BC can now be updated as ASD IX-5, 632 ll. 765–766.
- 11 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “Bernardus E: Bernhardus D.” Hovingh proposes references for Gregorius and Bernardus, prudently (“perhaps”; see section 2 of this article for further discussion): “Gregorius, *Hom. in Ev.* II, 21, 3, about Mc 16, 1–7; Migne *PL* 76, 1171 B; Bernardus, *In ascensione Domini sermo*, I, I, Migne *PL* 183, 299 D – 300 C.”
- 12 Lines 150–60: Hovingh’s edition gives the text of E, but A–D have a slightly different text: “Hieronymus ... Admonet E: Hieronymus in epistolis indicat hoc caput, quod in Marco legitimus, a plerisque non recipi, et in omnibus pene Graecorum libris in fine poni, velut adiectitium, propterea quod hic diuersa narret a reliquis Euangelistis. Admonet A–D” (Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435).
- 13 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “Hieronymus ... Mariae *Epist.* 120, 3, 2 sq., CSEL 55, p. 481.”
- 14 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “deinde *prima sabbati* visum E: deinde mane primo sabbati visum A–D.”
- 15 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “et E: vt A–D.”
- 16 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “Mariae ... Idem E: Mariae, etc. At idem A–C, Mariae. At idem D.”
- 17 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “*distinctionem* ‘punctuation mark’; cf. *supra* p. 57, n.1. 54.”
- 18 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “Theophylactus *Enarr. in Mc.* 16, 9–13, Migne *PG* 123, 677 C.” Christopher Stade, trans., *The Explanation of the Gospel according to St. Mark, by Blessed Theophylact of Ohrid* (House Springs: Chrysostom Press 2008) 142: “Now when Jesus was risen”—put a comma here, and then read—early the first day of the week he appeared to Mary Magdalene.”
- 19 *Interpres* means here *Jerome*; the Vulgate has *surgens* in Mark 16:9.
- 20 Hovingh signals that *ἀναστράς* means “cum surrexisset” (Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435); it is worth keeping in mind that the Vulgate has *surgens*.
- 21 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 437: “Hieronymus ... iustitiam tuam *Dialog. adv. Pelag.* II, 15, CCSL 80, p. 73.”
- 22 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “Pelagium B–E: Pelagianum A.”
- 23 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “Graecorum ... Postea E: Graecorum, hanc coronidem adiectam fuisse; postea A–D.”
- 24 We have chosen to translate *coronis* by “end, conclusion,” as argued in Section 2 of the article.
- 25 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “duriciem cordis eorum E: duriciam eorum A, duriciem eorum B–D.”
- 26 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “multis qui viderant B–E: multi qui viderunt A.” But Jerome’s quotation and the Vulgate are: “quia his qui eum uiderant resurgentem non crediderunt” (*Adv. Pel.* 2.15, Moreschini, S. *Hieronymi*, 73); “in that they did not believe those who had seen him after he had risen” (Hritz, *Saint Jerome*, 317). GA 032 and NA<sup>28</sup> have here: τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγγρημένον οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν.
- 27 Hovingh does not explain why Erasmus transmits *substantia*, whereas the CCSL edition that he quotes in note has *sub Satana*. The correct reading is *sub Satana*, as fully confirmed by the Freer-Logion as quoted in Mark 16:14 in GA 032, but Erasmus, like Vallarsi in 1735, had access to manuscripts with *substantia* in this passage. See the critical apparatus of Jerome, *Pelag.* 2.15, Moreschini, S. *Hieronymi*, 73, with the *stemma codicum*, XXXII.
- 28 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “vt hoc extremum ... in omnibus E: vt extremum illud caput habetur hodie omnibus A–D.”
- 29 We have chosen to translate *caput* as “chapter” as argued in the body of the article.
- 30 Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “Graecorum E: Graecis A–D.”
- 31 As one can read in Hovingh’s note on p. 437, the reference to the exact passage of Theophylact is not obvious here, since Migne *PG* 123:677 notes that it is only present in a codex in Venice: “If ‘hoc caput’ is the antecedent of ‘quod’, it refers to *Enarr. in Mc.* 16, Migne *PG* 123, 676–81. If it refers to the whole preceding part of the sentence, Er. aims at a passage that occurs in codex 26 of Theophylact’s *Enarr.* in the library of San Marco in Venice (v. Migne *PG* 123, 677, n. 90, cf. 135 sq.)” However, see Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 15 n. 99: “Er. used a 15th-century codex which was kept in the Dominican abbey in Basel in his time and is now preserved in the Universitätsbibliothek in

Basel (MS. A III 15),” that is, GA 817. In GA 817, the f. 97v does not contain the passage referenced by Hovingh in the Venice codex 26; see the discussion in Section 2 of the article.

<sup>32</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “nimum audaci E: studioso A–D.”

<sup>33</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 436: “Essenis E: Ebionitis A–D.” On p. 437, Hovingh has a quite extended note to discuss the presence of *Essenes* and concludes: “I consider it improbable that they read a Gospel.” But one could rightly question why he has chosen *Essenis* rather than *Ebionitis* here, apart from the perspective of his global preference for E. Indeed, Erasmus mentions previously the Gospel of the Ebionites in his *Annotaciones* on Matt 12:2–18, l. 486 (Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 212), whereas *Essenis* designates a group mentioned in the New Testament in his *Annotaciones* on Matt 22:18–30, l. 562 (Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 212). Consequently, we have chosen to give in the translations “[Ebionites]”/ “[Ebionites]” in brackets.

<sup>34</sup> See Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 67–69 n. 47, for the references related to lines 178–80: Jerome, *Pelag.* 3.2 (Moreschini, S. *Hieronymi*, 99): “In Euangelio iuxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, siue, ut plerique autumant, iuxta Mattheum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca, narrat historia.” Jerome, *Comm. In Matt.* 2.12 and 13 (CCSL 77) 90: “In euangelio quo vtuntur Nazareni et Hebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone translulimus et quod vocatur a plerisque Mathei authenticum.”

<sup>35</sup> Lines 180–94: Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 435: “testimonia ... opere. E: testimonia. DES (D. A) ERASMI ROTERODAMI ANNOTATIONVM IN EVANGELIVM MARCI FINIS. A–D.”

<sup>36</sup> Hovingh does not provide an explanation for the expression “dogma Manicheorum” (l. 182). Erasmus refers four times in the *Annotaciones* to the *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* by Augustine (see Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 34 for the introduction and 78, 404, 591, and 592 for the passages, also with a possible reference to Jerome on Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 219). We thank Jan Krans who noted also four occurrences in ASD VI-6 and ten in ASD VI-7. Here, Erasmus is using *dogma Manicheorum* rhetorically, without a specific reference to a previous author.

<sup>37</sup> Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 437: “Beda... decerpisse: I could not find such a remark in Beda Venerabilis, not even with the help of CLCLT or PLD.”

<sup>38</sup> See Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 353 n. 49: “Commentarii ... circunfruntur Ps. Hier. (Cummianus, Cumeanus or Cummine, Abbot of Durrow, seventh century), *Comm.* In Mc., Migne PL 30, 609–68, or Hier. *Tract. in Mc.*, CCSL 78, pp. 448–500; the latter was published by Er. as work by Chrys. CCSL 78, p. 219, no. 632, Frede, 417 and 538.” More recently, see Michael Cahill, ed., *Expositio Evangelii secundum Marcum*, CChrSL 82 (Turnhout: Brepols 1997); Cahill, trans., *The First Commentary*. References given by Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 108 n. 58. But the *Comm.* In Mc. does not refer to the Freer-Logion nor discuss the differences in Mark’s endings (see Cahill, *The First Commentary*, 127–31).

<sup>39</sup> These *librarii* are printers and booksellers during the time of Erasmus.

<sup>40</sup> See lines 170–172 (Hovingh, *Opera Omnia*, 437). Indeed, Jerome did not include the Freer-Logion in his Latin edition of Mark (*Vulgata*).