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Chapter 1

Introduction and History of Scholarship

The greatest literary problem in the New Testament is:
What is the matter with the Gospel of Mark? Something happened to the end of it in the first or second century...1

A. Introduction

New Testament manuscripts support four possibilities for the original ending of the Gospel of Mark: ἐκ τοῦ ἱστορίου του γασπίν in 16:8,2 the “Shorter Ending” of Codex Bobbiensis (it),3 the “Longer Ending” (Mark 16:9—20)4 and the


2 The Gospel of Mark ends suddenly as follows: “But [the young man] said to them, ‘Do not be alarmed; you are looking for Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has been raised; he is not here. Look, there is the place they laid him. But go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going ahead of you to Galilee; there you will see him, just as he told you.’ So they went out and fled from the tomb, for terror and amazement had seized them; and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid” (Mark 16:8–9). Some scholars emphasize the sudden stop occurring with ἐκ τοῦ ἱστορίου του γασπίν, and so they prefer to translate the end of Mark 16:8 as “for they were afraid of...” (e.g., A. J. Edwards, “The Text of the Resurrection in Mark, pp. 161—162).

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

4 In addition to numerous patristic citations (e.g., Irenæus, Tatian) and the Longer Ending’s inclusion in the Byantine lectionary readings, 99% of the surviving manuscripts agree with the Textus Receptus and preserve the reading of the LE. For this figure see Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism (Revised and Enlarged edition; trans. E. F. Rhodes; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987) 287; K. Aland, “Das Schluß des Markus-Evangeliums,” in L’Evangile selon Marc (ed. M. Sabbe; BETL 34; Leuven University Press, 1974; Nouvelle édition augmentée, 1988) 466. The quantity of witnesses, of course, is not a sure indication of quality. This study does not offer yet another summary of all the external evidence since Kurt Aland, among others, has already thoroughly investigated this problem. See K. Aland, “Bemerkungen zum Schluß des Markusevangeliums,” in Novum Testamentum et Semitica:
interpolated “Longer Ending” of Codex fragmentarius (W, 032).5 In addition, a number of MSS like Y include both the Shorter and Longer Endings after Mark 16:8.

The “Longer Ending” of the Gospel of Mark (often abbreviated here as the “LE”) designates a passage that was not written by the author of Mark, but was added to this Gospel in the first half of the second century. In what follows I assume that the earliest recoverable ending of Mark is 16:8 and leave open the question whether Mark did, or intended to, continue beyond 16:8, since this is a problem not directly related to an examination of the LE.6 Accordingly, this study will concentrate only on the interpolated Longer Ending (Mark 16:9—20):

9 [The context of this passage is given in note 9 on page 2, which is not included in this transcription.]


5 After the Longer Ending was written, and apparently before the time of Jerome in the early fifth century (Jerome, Contra Pelagianos 2.15), the author of the interpolation (known as the Free-Lection placed into the mouths of Jesus and the disciples the following exchange, which occurs between Mark 16:14 and 16:15: “And they replied, saying, ‘This is a sign of power of God to be apprehended; therefore reveal your righteousness now.’ They were speaking to Christ, and Christ said to them in reply, ‘The limit of the years of the authority of Satan has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near, even for the sinners on whose behalf I was delivered up to death, that they might turn to the truth and sin no more, in order that they might inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven’” (BT by Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark [London: Macmillan, 1957] 574—615). For a discussion of this passage, see J. Jeremias in NTS, 1.248—249 and Bruce M. Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981) 82—93, as well as other items listed in the Bibliography.


7 Although some (e.g., E. Littenmanner, “Der [wiedergefunden] Marcus schatze,” ZTK 66 (1969) 255—287) have tried to reconstruct Mark’s original ending from traditions contained within the LE, I regard this approach as misguided. Regardless of the state in which Mark originally left his Gospel, it will be argued here that the text of the LE known of Mark 1:1—16:8 and tried to improve upon what he read as Mark’s ending. On Littenmann’s arguments, see the discussion later in this chapter. On the topic of Mark’s original conclusion, see the Bibliography, which lists works concerning the original ending to the Gospel of Mark.

καὶ ἔκακον ἐπ’ αὐτῇ τὴν ἡμερήσιαν. 12 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἔστη ἐξ αὐτῶν παραπομπὴ [ἐκ] τῆς μορφῆς πορευόμενος εἰς ἀπόκρυφος ἐπὶ τόπον λαότος ἐπὶ τόπον λαότος ἐκπαίδευσεν. 13 Τὸν τούτον ἀνακηρύσσει τῆς ἐκκλήσιος ἑνόσω ἐπὶ ἡμέραν ἐκπάθει σάμῳ εὐκοπητικάς. 14 Ἐπειδή ἂν αὐτοὶ τοῖς ἑνόσω ἐπισκέπτες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκέπτοντο καὶ ἐκπάθουν γένους τῆς τῆς τῆς. 15 ὑποτέκαστον δὲ καὶ ἐκπάθει ταύτης ἐκπάθει. 16 ὁ πατήρ ἐκπάθει καὶ ἐξονώνθηνεν. 17 σημεῖα δὲ τῶν πατεύσων ταύτης ἐκπάθει ἐν τῇ ὑπόμνησιν ἦλθαν άναπτύσσει καὶ ἐκπάθει ταύτης. 18 διὰ δέος ἐμπρόσθεν τὰ πάντα ἀπὸ τῆς ἑκπάθει τῆς ἡμέρας. 19 τοῦτο ἀνακηρύσσει ἡ ἐκκλήσια ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑαυτών. 20 ἐκπάθει· ἐκπάθει εἰρήνης κοινοῦ τούτου τούτου, τούτου παρακλητοῦντος καὶ τὸν διὸν οἰκείας διὰ τῶν ἑκπαίδευσιν ιερωμένων.

5 Text critical note on οὕτως [οὐ]: the presence of οὐ in some MSS probably reflects a later assimilation to ὡς (16:9) and μετὰ ταῦτα (16:12) to the LE, or perhaps to other occurrences of οὕτως οὐ in the NT (Matt 21:27, 22:27, 25:11, 26:65; Heb 12:5).

6 Text critical note on ἐν τοῖς ταῖς [τοῖς]: These three words are a later expansion of Mark 16:16a. If they were original, there would be no reason (whether dogmatic or careless) for a later scribe to take them out. While assimilation to Acts 28:9—6 could perhaps explain the addition, it is more likely that the idea of pushing up anes was so strong that it required some Christians that they found it necessary to change the text by this embellishment. On this point see the discussion of Mark 16:16a in chapter 6.

7 Text critical note on μὲν οὖν: in some MSS (C, L, W, S) οὖν may have been carelessly omitted because both of these short words end with a “n.” In addition, the inclusion of οὖν in the mss... of construction of vv. 19—20 could have been regarded as awkward and thus deleted.

8 Text critical note on τῆς [του]: the possibility of the accidental omission of the name Τηρούς is not strong, and there was certainly no reason for a later copyist to delete Τηρούς if it were originally present in the text, especially since the two instances of τῆς (cf. τοῦ κυρίου, v. 22b) are the only names Jesus receives in all twelve verses of the LE. It is more likely that the ἔστη τηρούς was added to clarify the unusual occurrence of the name τῆς τοῦτοι alone and perhaps to bring the name into conformity with verses like Luke 24:33, Acts 1:21 and 1 Cor 12:23 (cf. Acts 4:33, 7:59, 8:16, 11:20, 15:11, 16:31, 19, 19:15, 19:21, 20:21, 20:24, 20:25, 21:13 and 1 Cor 12:23).

10 Text critical note on καὶ ἐκπάθει as “that woman” to draw attention to the author’s intention of stating that at least one of the fearful women of Mark 16:8 did follow the command of 16:7 (cf. καὶ κατακλίθην, v.13a). On the absolute use this demonstrative pronoun in the LE, see the discussion of Mark 16:10 in chapter 2.
Last of all he appeared to the eleven while they were reclining at table, and he reproached their disbelief and hardness of heart, because they had not believed those who saw him after he had been raised. 15 And he said to them, 16 Go into all the world and preach the gospel to all creation. 16 The one who believes and is baptized will be saved, but the one who does not believe will be condemned. 17 And these signs will accompany those who believe: in my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new languages; 18 they will pick up snakes; and if they drink any deadly thing, it certainly will not hurt them; they will lay hands on the sick, who will recover. 19 After he spoke to them, the Lord was taken up into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God. 20 They then went out and preached everywhere, and the Lord continually worked with them and granted confirmation to the word through the accompanying signs.

At least on the surface, the passage seems to contain both traditional and novel forms of expression. Concerning the former, following a brief mention of the resurrection (ανάστασις, v. 9a), Jesus’ initial appearance to Mary Magdalene, which resembles Luke 8:22 and John 20:11–18, is met with disbelief (vv. 9b–11). A subsequent appearance to two disciples (v. 12; cf. Luke 24:13–35) also finds a doubting audience (v. 13). Having finally come to “the eleven” as a group (v. 14a; cf. Matt 28:16–17, Luke 24:33), Jesus upbraids their lack of faith in the passage of his earlier appearances (v. 14b). The risen Lord then commissions them to “preach the gospel to all creation” (vv. 15–18; cf. Matt 28:18–20). Two distinctive elements of the passage include the association of baptism with salvation (v. 16) and the promise of miraculous signs — including the picking up of snakes and the ability to survive the drinking of poison — that will follow “those who believe” (vv. 17–18). Following his ascension to heaven (v. 19; cf. Luke 24:51, Acts 1:2, 1:11, 2:22), Jesus himself “works with the commissioned evangelists, granting confirmation through the signs that will authenticate their preaching” (v. 20; cf. v. 170–18).

As is outlined in greater detail toward the end of this chapter, this study investigates both the unique contributions that Mark 16:9–20 has to offer for the understanding of second-century gospel traditions, and the significance of miraculous “signs” in this writing as compared with Christian literature of the first three centuries and with other ancient witnesses.

From Birk to Burgon (1801–1877)

This survey of the history of the investigation of the LE is offered with some caution, for no less than six such reviews of scholarship have been undertaken since 1972.15 These offerings by Joseph Hug, Veronika Krauss, Paul Mirecki, Steven L. Cox and others all focus upon certain aspects of the LE and, for the most part, review different contributions to the study of Mark 16:9–20. The following does not seek to repeat unnecessarily what these and other scholars have noted in their respective reviews of the scholarly literature, but rather to build upon past insights, to explore certain hypotheses not discussed elsewhere and to offer a more complete picture of scholarly views, in particular over the past two centuries. For the most part, this literature review will proceed chronologically, discussing in turn studies from A. Birk to J. W. Burgon (1801–1871); from F. C. Conybeare to C. R. Williams (1891–1915); from G. Hartmann to E. Halzle (1926–1939); and from E. Lamennais to S. L. Cox (1929–1993).

The vast majority who have written on Mark’s Longer Ending have been primarily concerned with the question of authenticity, that is, whether “Mark” the evangelist wrote this passage.16 As a result, two methods of inquiry dominate the secondary literature: examinations of external and internal evidence. External evidence concerns the discipline of textual criticism, that is, the evaluation of which MSS, patristic citations and lectionary texts do and do not reflect knowledge of the LE. Previous examinations of the internal evidence have usually relied upon statistical analyses of vocabulary, although a few have also considered aspects of style, syntax and philology in the LE as compared with those of the Second Gospel.17


From Birch to Burgon (1801—1871)

Just prior to the turn of the nineteenth century, however, the observation of the omission of Mark 16:9—20 after 16:8 in Codex Vaticanus (B) gave rise to doubts concerning the Markan authorship of the LE. Certain readings of Vaticanus were published between 1788 and 1801 by the Danish scholar Andreas Birch, who apparently was the first person since Erasmus in the sixteenth century to be aware of the absence of the LE in this codex.21 Notes in other codices questioning the passage’s authenticity also led Birch to doubt that the LE was originally a part of the Second Gospel. Referring to such codices and to the Eusebian Canons, which do not include material from Mark 16:9—20, he thus writes:

Hoc scollion egregie confirmatur suffragio plurimorum optimae notae Codicium, qui numerosus capitulorum, quibus Eusebius in harmoniam usus, ultra versus octavam non habent, et reliqua Marci que sequuntur a commune nono, tantum percipiunt ab ipso Evangelio separtum, senvium cunctis.22

Samuel Tregelles later noted that Birch’s work did not become widely available because “[a] fire in the royal printing-house at Copenhagen... prevented the completion of” an edition of the NT which was intended to take into account many readings of Vaticanus, including the absence of the LE in this codex.

Albeit not in time for his first edition of the Greek NT (1774—75), such information apparently did reach Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745—1812) in time for his second (1803), revised edition of the NT Gospels. Griesbach, who is most famous for defending the priority of Matthew, argues in his Commentatio that the original ending of Mark, which must have incorporated elements of Matt 28:9—20, has been lost:

If the last twelve verses of Mark were genuine, or if Mark had ended his Gospel at verse 8, it would be difficult to offer a feasible explanation for the omission. But we know that these verses are missing in the important Codex Vaticanus (en codice percutiuntus vaticanus) and were formerly lacking in many other ancient manuscripts. . . . It is therefore

21 See Andreas Birch, Varietatesationem ad Textum IV Evangeliorum (Hannai: G. C. Pöstl, 1801). 225; cf. related works by Birch listed in the Bibliography. Frederic Kennon notes concerning Erasmus, “A few readings from [Vaticanus] were supplied to Erasmus by his correspondent Selvadura, but too late for use in his editions of the New Testament. In 1669 a collation was made by Bartolocci, librarian of the Vatican; but this was not published, and it [i.e., the collation] was never used until Scholz in 1819 found a copy of it in the Royal Library at Paris.” See F. G. Kennon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (Second Edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1901, 1912; reprinted, 1993) 78. On J. M. A. Scholz see the discussion below.


reasonable to conjecture that the real ending of the Gospel—one that undoubtedly mentioned the journey into Galilee—was accidentally lost.\footnote{24}

Thus, one reason for doubting the Markan authorship of the LE is that the surviving edition of Mark— which, according to Griesbach, follows Matt 28:1—8 closely in Mark 16:1—8—does not record a Galilean appearance of Jesus (cf. Matt 28:16—20; Mark 14:28, 16:7). Without an explanation like the one cited above, such an “omission” at the end of Mark could cast doubt into question Griesbach’s thesis that Mark is primarily an epitome of Matthew into which elements of Luke were incorporated.\footnote{25} With regard to Mark 16:9—20, Griesbach elsewhere explains in his Commentatio:

This and the remaining verses of Mark are dubious. If you regard them as genuine, you will easily see from our table that they are partly from Mark and partly from Luke, and are, at it were, reduced to a summary (which seems, looking back, to be inconsistent with Mark’s usage) and interspersed with a few things which do not occur in either.\footnote{26}

This second argument against the passage’s authenticity rests upon the difference between the way in which Matthew and Luke were used by the author of Mark, on the one hand, and by the author of the LE, on the other.

As a result of these new discoveries and realizations, in his second edition of the NT Gospels, Griesbach places a final bracket after Mark 16:8 — ἐορθοῦντο γάρ — in order to separate the surviving end of Mark from verses 9—20, which are also set off with brackets — ἐνδιάτεις.\footnote{27}

Concerning the LE’s authenticity, Griesbach thus seems to have built upon Andreas Birch’s painstaking work with variant readings of many MSS, including Vatinnieus, and added a well-thought-out argument concerning the literary relationships between the Synoptic Gospels.

As will be noted below, Griesbach’s bold — and, from the standpoint of textual criticism, revolutionary — thesis concerning the non-Markan authorship of the LE found support among many other scholars who, unlike Griesbach, did not seek either to defend the priority of Matthew or to explain Mark’s use of the First Gospel. Nonetheless, his approach to the LE had a profound impact on scholarship in at least two ways. First, after the author of Mark 16:9—20 is shown to be different from the author of the Second Gospel, all too many scholars have simply abandoned the study of the passage. Second, many others after Griesbach have attempted to answer the question of the passage’s authenticity while, at the same time, seeking to reconstruct the original ending of Mark. That is to say, demonstrating the non-Markan authorship of the LE was regarded only as a stepping stone to other questions concerning the original content of the Second Gospel. With notably few exceptions, such disinclination in the interpretation of Mark 16:9—20 has persisted until the present, and it was not until nearly a century later that F. C. Conybeare and others made a concerted attempt to understand the origin and original purpose of this oft-overlooked passage.

Independently of Birch and some twenty years after Griesbach, the observation by the German scholar Johann Martin Augustinus Scholz (1794—1852) in 1819 that a seventeenth-century collation of Vatinnieus, like the codex itself, does not include the LE after Mark 16:8 continued to fuel questions concerning the LE’s authenticity.\footnote{28} Although the text of Scholz’s NT, unlike that of Griesbach’s revised NT, largely resembles that of the Textus Receptus, Scholz notes in the critical apparatus to Mark 16:9—20 both that marginal notes contained in various MSS express doubt about the material after

tòν ἐκαλουθητών στρεμένον.\footnote{27}
Mark 16:8, and that a number of codices like Vercanius do not include the passage.29 Scholz’s observations, however, did not persuade a majority of scholars in his day. For example, S. T. Bloomfield notes the objections “by several Critics” to the LE’s authenticity and responds “that Scholz, after all his extensive researches, has never been able to find this portion [Mark 16:9-20] omitted in more than one MS. (and, that one, in which great liberties have been taken) and a single Version.”30 Before the eventual publication of Vercanius and the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus (8), such rejoiners were, perhaps, understandable at the time Bloomfield wrote.31

After the Vatican granted permission for the publication of Codex Vercanius, Cardinal Angelo Mai’s belated and famously flawed edition did not appear until 1857 and 1859. After an additional wait, Constantin von Tischendorf (1815—1874) was allowed to examine the codex briefly in 1866 and in 1867. Finally, in 1890 a photographic facsimile became widely available.32 As has already been noted, only a few scholars like A. Birch, J. J. Griesbach and J. M. A. Scholz — and, as is noted below, K. Lachmann and J. Tregelles — had some knowledge of Vercanius before Tischendorf’s edition was published.

Also after Griesbach’s controversial second edition of the Greek NT, Karl Lachmann (1793—1851), who referred to Griesbach as “mein Führer,” also questioned the LE’s authenticity.33 In 1830, the year before Lachmann published an edition of the NT Gospels, he explained in an article his principles for evaluating different manuscripts and other witnesses to the text of the NT. He held that, by comparing the text of Codex Alexandrinus (A) with that of the recently (re-)discovered Vercanius, the reliable reading could usually be ascertained.34 Toward the end of this discussion, he notes that Mark’s ending very well may have been left “unfinished (unvollendet),” and suggests that the ending of Mark may have been improperly lengthened at some later point.35 He supports the contention, “[v]on dem edem Wortes” of the LE “ganz ohne Zweifel,” not only by contrasting the passage with the emphases of the Second Gospel, but also by the corroborating testimony of Vercanius’ omission of the passage and the doubt expressed by Eusebius’ ad Martianum.36 Because already in the second century Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. iii.10.5) cites the LE as a part of Mark, the inauthentic expansion of Mark’s ending must have occurred before Irenaeus wrote.37 Nonetheless, in the critical apparatus of his Greek New Testament, the LE is not separated from the rest of Mark. Lachmann calls attention to the witnesses of Vercanius and of Eusebius, but his own conclusion concerning their authenticity is not stated.38

Three years before the first volume of his Greek NT appeared, Samuel P. Tregelles (1813—1875) discussed at some length the LE and Mark’s original conclusion.39 Compared with Lachmann, Tregelles calls attention to a greater number of early Christian authors, including “Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome” and other “later writers

29 See J. M. A. Scholz, Novum Testamentum Graece (Vol. 1: IV Evangelia complectens; Lipsiae: Frederici Fleißcher, 1830) esp. pp. 195—201. The second volume of Scholz’s Greek NT appeared in 1836. Many of Scholz’s points concerning differences between vocabulary in Mark and the LE are followed and elaborated upon by Karl Friedrich August Fritzsche (Evangelium Marci recensuit et cum commentariis; Lipsiae: Summiatis F. Fleischeri, 1830) 717—756, esp. pp. 719, 726—731, 746—752. Fritzsche also devotes considerable attention to the interpretation of ἃλλος ἐξελέγχοντος τοῦ λόγου (Mark 16:17b) in relation to analogous statements in early Christian and other ancient writings (pp. 731—743; cf. on snake; [Mark 16:18a]; pp. 743—745) and poison ([Mark 16:18b]; pp. 745—746). In addition, Fritzsche discusses many external witnesses in connection with the question of the LE’s authenticity (pp. 752—758).
31 In a later edition of his Greek NT, however, Bloomfield continues to defend the above cited position in greater detail (The Greek Testament with English Notes [Ninth Edition; London: Longman, 1855] 1545—259).
32 On these last two points, see F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT, pp. 78—79; cf. D. C. Parker, “Codex Vercanius” in the article, “Codex,” ABDS 1, 11074—11075. Kenyon also (pp. 254—256) criticizes Scholz’s approach to textual criticism, noting that “[i]f this text” for the NT “is not very different from that of Griesbach, although his critical principles were the reverse of Griesbach’s” (p. 285).
33 Karl Lachmann, “Rechenschaft über seine Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments,” Theological Studies and Kritiken 3 (1830) 217—218. Lachmann was active at roughly the same time as J. M. A. Scholz was.
34 For the most part, Lachmann ignores the witness of the Textus Receptus and concentrates instead on the very small number of ancient witnesses (“Rechenschaft über seine Ausgabe des Neuen Testaments,” pp. 817—845, esp. pp. 826—859, cf. F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT, pp. 286—298).
38 Lachmann writes, “divaōdywv et exame aukhne ad finem liber ACDG ήρων ττo B et Euseb canonum” (Novum Testamentum Graece et Lezina [Vol. 1; Berlin: Georgii Reimeri, 1842; 1st ed. 1831] 1341, emphasis original).
39 S. P. Tregelles, Account of the Printed Text of the Greek NT (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854) 246—261; cf. on Tregelles, F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT, pp. 291—293.
History of Scholarship on Mark 16:9–20

Tregelles also highlights the omission of the LE in certain important, early witnesses like Vaticanus, Bobbienis (90) and numerous Armenian MSS, as well as differences in style between Mark 16:9–20 and the Second Gospel. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Tregelles held that Mark himself likely did intentionally and his work with ὕστερον γάρ, and thus Tregelles regarded the LE as a later addition. Tregelles’ critical edition of Matthew and Mark appeared in 1857. Unlike Laichmann, Tregelles emphasizes the break between Mark 16:8 and Mark 16:9 by reproducing the twofold superscription occurring in many MSS in which KATA MAPTON occurs after both Mark 16:8 and 16:20. In addition, his copious notes on the passage summarize many of his earlier published arguments against the authenticity of the LE.

Like others before him, Henry Alford also doubted the LE’s authenticity. Alford, who thought that the three Synoptic evangelists wrote independently of one another, surmised, like Griesbach, that the original conclusion to Mark had been lost. Alford also describes the LE as an “authentic . . . fragment” that was added during the apostolic period. In designating the LE as “authentic,” Alford does not support the passage’s Markan authorship. Rather, he maintains, as M. J. Lagrange and many others later did, that Mark 16:9–20 should be received as authoritative scripture even if the author of Mark did not write it.

Moreover, in referring to the LE as a “fragment,” Alford infers that the LE was placed “rather than written, “as a completion of the Gospel soon after the apostolic period.” Noting certain inconsistencies between the LE and the conclusions of Matthew, Luke and John, Alford argues that “[t]he inconsistency itself is a valuable testimony to the antiquity of the fragment, as having been composed from independent testimony, and not from the other Gospels.” Unfortunately, Alford’s position concerning the LE as an ancient fragment that was independent of the NT Gospels is stated rather than argued. It also seems to assume that no later author who had knowledge of Matthew, Luke and John would ever dare to differ with these writings in composing a more satisfactory ending to Mark. This thesis was later emboldened by H. B. Swete, whose views are discussed below and critiqued in greater detail in chapter 4.


48 H. Alford, Greek New Testament, 1,408, emphasizes original. Contrast, however, p. 39 of the same volume (cited in an above note), where Alford states that the addition took place “in,” rather than shortly after, the “apostolic times.”
records only the Shorter Ending after Mark 16:8 (it); certain MSS that read "κατα τον ακολουθητην," indicating the "end" of the Gospel, after Mark 16:8; the external testimony of certain early Christian writers against the LE's authenticity; and the absence of mention of the LE in early Christian writings like the Ebionite canons. Only after this evidence does the LE appear in his Greek NT. As is the case in the rest of Tischendorf's NT, variant readings for these twelve verses are listed in the copious text-critical notes in the apparatus. Likewise, August Klostermann, who refers to Tischendorf's 1869 Greek NT, also opposed the LE's authenticity, arguing, as S. P. Tregelles did, that the Second Gospel originally ended with Mark 16:8. As a result, Klostermann dismisses the LE as non-Markan (pp. 298—300) and then discusses the external witnesses for the LE in the early church and the promise of miracles in vv. 15—18 (pp. 301—305). He also recognizes the unity of the passage, as well as an epitomizing use of Luke 24 and John 20 in Mark 16:12—13 and 16:14 respectively (pp. 295—297).

Moving beyond previous analyses, Klostermann calls attention to the importance of the LE's literary dependence for explaining the origin of the passage. Whereas others like H. Alford had described the LE as a fragment because Mark 16:9 does not follow exactly the narrative of 16:8, Klostermann calls attention to the reworking of other traditions by the author of the LE. Such use of the NT Gospels explains why the author of the LE chose — just as, it may be added, the authors of Matthew and Luke did — to deviate from the narrative at the end of the Second Gospel:

Aus dieser Umzeichnung scheint mir zu folgen, daß man kein Recht hat... [Mc. 16, 9—20 für das Fragment einer anderen Schrift zu halten, weil es keinem Zusammenhang mit dem Verhältnis der Sache bedarf, habe, wo[ö]r[ö]r aber mit der Verschreibung des Subjekts in der V. 9 einen anderweitigen Zusammenhang unwahrscheinlich vorauszusetzen...]

Because the author of the LE viewed Mark 16:1—8 as "als zur Geschichte des Begrabens gehören," he began verse 9 with mention of the resurrection (diapheia ἀνέτεθη). Following the model of Matthew, Luke and John, the LE's

---

50 Tischendorf happened upon parts of this codex in 1844 and, during his third visit to the monastery of St. Catherine's, was allowed to see the entire codex in 1859. On this and related points see B. M. Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Paleography, pp. 76—79; ibid., The Text of the New Testament (Third, Enlarged Edition: New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 42—46; F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT, pp. 60—64; cf. pp. 288—291; James H. Charlesworth, "Codex Sinaiticus" in the article, "Codex," ABD, 1:674.

51 The first of these was C. von Tischendorf, Nova editio critica Bibliorum Sacrarum (1860). He published a copy of Sinaiticus in 1862 (Bibliothek Codicum Sinaiacorum). F. G. Kenyon lists references to subsequent works in his Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT, p. 60 n. 2; cf. pp. 62—63; C. von Tischendorf, "When Were Our Gospels Written? An Argument, with a Narrative of the Discovery of the Sinaitic Manuscript." [ET: The Religious Tract Society in London; New York: American Tract Society, 1866].

52 Tischendorf's seventh edition of the Greek New Testament was issued in 1859, a few months before his discovery of Codex Sinaiticus, and while the Codex Vaticanus was still practically unknown to scholars. This edition was consequently based mainly upon authorities of the a-type, agreeing substantially with the Textus Receptus; but his eighth edition, published ten years later, was prepared under the influence of these two great four-century codices, and it has been computed that it differs from its predecessor in more than 3,500 places (Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the NT, p. 70; cf. p. 71). For a facsimile of the end of Mark in Sinaiticus, see Kenyon, Handbook, Plate III (between pp. 60 and 61).

53 E.g., C. von Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece: Ex Sinaitico Codice Omnim Antiquissimo (Lipsiae: F. A. Brockhaus, 1865) 131; idem, Novum Testamentum Triplorum: Graece Latinse Germanice (Lipsiae: Hermann Merckelbach, 1865) 195—199.


56 A. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium nach seinen Quellenwürfeln für die evangelische Geschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1867) 298—309. Toward the beginning of his discussion, Klostermann (p. 298) refers to Tischendorf's edition of the Greek NT. In this volume, Klostermann's treatment of the LE "Untersuchung über den Schluss des Markusevangeliums," pp. 298—300 is separated from his discussion of other parts of the Gospel of Mark (e.g., "Rückblick auf die zweite Hälfte des sechsten Abschnittes [Mark. 14, 1—16, 8] und ihr Verhältnis zur ersten [Mark. 10, 12—13, 37],[pp. 309—312].

57 A. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium, p. 307. An apparent misprint, in the above citation he refers to the LE as "Mk. 17, 9—20."
author portrays the resurrection as the next significant event of the post-crucifixion sequence before the appearances. Thus, the LE’s deviation from the narrative of Mark 16:8 does not dismiss the claim that its author wrote a continuation of the Second Gospel.

Not surprisingly, B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, who regarded agreements between Vaticanus and Sinaiticus as an allegedly “neutral” basis for the text of the NT, also excluded the LE as an original part of Mark. Their arguments for this position appear in the Appendix to their New Testament in the Original Greek. Concerning the original ending of Mark, Westcott and Hort consider the explanation “incredible that the evangelist deliberately concluded either a paragraph with ἐγέρθη αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπήγαγεν, or the Gospel with a petty detail of a secondary event, leaving his narrative hanging in the air” (p. 46). They also dismiss the claim that the apparent incoherence of Mark 16:8 requires the inference that a passage like Mark 16:9—20 originally followed ἐγέρθη αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπήγαγεν. In order to discount this possible case for the LE’s authenticity, Westcott and Hort offer two arguments against the likelihood that anyone— that is, either the author of Mark or a later individual like, for example, the author of the LE—would intentionally compose Mark 16:9—20 to follow Mark 16:8. First, they claim that the LE is only secondarily related to the evangelist’s portrayal of the fearful, silent women in Mark 16:1—8. Moreover, they claim that the “contents” of Mark 16:9—20 “are not such as could have been invented by any scribe or editor of the Gospel in his desire to supply the observed defect by a substantial and dignified ending.” (p. 47). Supposing that the LE would not have been written to complete Mark, they thus deduce that the passage was “adopted by a scribe or editor from some other source” (p. 48, emphasis added).

58 A. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium, p. 308.
59 This second volume explains the decisions made concerning the text for the NT: B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (2 Vols.; Cambridge, Macmillan: 1881—1882; Second Edition, 1886) Appendix, 2.25—51. The majority of their discussion focuses on external evidence for and against the authenticity of the shorter and longer endings (pp. 20—46). For example, with regard to the omission of the LE in Codex Vaticanus, Westcott and Hort note that “the scribe, after ending the Gospel with v. 8 in the second column of a page, has, contrary to his custom left the third or remaining column blank; evidently because one or other of the two subsequent endings was known to him personally, while he forebore mention of them in the exemplar which he was copying” (p. 29). They conclude that both the LE and the SE were early interpolations of Mark (p. 46). Cf. B. F. Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels with Historical and Explanatory Notes (London: Macmillan, 1851) 330—351.
60 B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, NT in the Original Greek, Appendix 2.47; cf. pp. 48—51 on the rough transition from Mark 16:3 to 16:9, as well as the argument that ὅτι γίνεται is required as the stated subject of ὠπλάζων ἐν τῷ ν. 9. These objections are addressed below in this chapter in connection with H. B. Swete, as well as in the discussion of the origin of the LE in chapter 4.
61 Noteworthy nonetheless is their explicit affirmation of this point: “A scribe or editor, finding the Gospel manifestly incomplete, and proceeding to conclude it in language of his own, would never have begun with the words which stand in v. 9. If he noticed the unpunctuated v. 8 as a sentence and as the end of a paragraph, he must have at least added some such words as the first sentence of the Shorter Conclusion” (Westcott and Hort, NT in the Original Greek, Appendix, 2.30, emphasis added). This last point begs the question of the way in which a scribe would have necessarily perceived Mark 16:8.
62 In chapter 4.1 argue that the LE best understood as the composition of one author who intended to continue the narrative of Mark 16:8. Despite the fact that the author of the LE—like, one should remember, the authors of Matthew and Luke did—alters substantially the form of Mark 16:1—6, his point seems to be that, although the three women in Mark did not report the news of the resurrection, at least Mary Magdalene (Mark 16:9) and two of the disciples (16:12) did.

At almost every point, their arguments concerning the origin of the LE, which had a significant impact on subsequent scholarship, are flawed. Their first argument that Mark 16:9—20 does not directly complement Mark 16:1—8 rests on a questionable a priori assumption concerning what any author or later editor would necessarily choose to write. Although their argument against the authenticity of the LE is persuasive, namely, that Mark himself probably would not have followed Mark 16:8 with Mark 16:9—the same inference does not necessarily hold for a later scribe, who could well have been perplexed at the concluding words ἐγέρθη αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπήγαγεν. Their second argument is also dubious because it assumes a false dichotomy between the use of source material and the writing of a novel composition. Westcott and Hort seem to maintain that, because exact and extensive written parallels to the LE do not exist, and because the matters discussed in 16:9—20 are too sacred to have been spun out of whole cloth, no single author could be responsible for them. As a result, the two scholars have confused the questions of authenticity and authorial intent in maintaining that nobody would have composed the LE in order to improve the ending of Mark. Thus, although their discussion of the LE’s authenticity is persuasive, the same cannot be maintained concerning the origin and authorial intention behind this passage.

In response to the criticism of the Textus Receptus fueled by these new discoveries, John William Burgon offered in 1871 what has come to be regarded as the classic argument for the authenticity of Mark 16:9—20. As
has been already noted, the arguments typically raised against the Markan
authorship of the LE hinge upon the external witnesses of patristic authors
and of manuscripts that omit the passage, as well as of the LE’s non-Markan
internal features. Noting that “the hostile verdict of Biblical Critics” was then
“quite of recent date,” Burgon argues, on the contrary, that both the external
(pp. 19–135; 191–242) and internal (pp. 136–190) evidence over-
whelmingly support the authenticity of the LE. Accordingly, Burgon’s
unwavering faith in the reliability of Byzantine MSS prevails in his subsequent
publications on the subject of textual criticism.

Burgon’s support for the Textus Receptus and resulting desire to defend
the LE as the original conclusion to Mark have been thoroughly criticized.
Nonetheless, Burgon’s conviction about the LE’s authenticity was followed
by Abbé J. P. Martin, George Salmon, Ivan Paris, Gerhard Hartmann and
many others up to the present. In particular, Jean Pierre Paulin Martin
devoted the entire-second volume of his published lectures on NT textual
criticism to the defense of the LE as an original part of Mark. Theodor Zahn,

66 The above quotation is taken from the title of Burgon’s second chapter, “The hostile verdict of Biblical Critics shown to be quite of recent date” (Last Twelve Verses, pp. 5–16).
67 Burgon, like many others after him, thought that Grégoire was the first to question the authenticity of the LE and was apparently not aware of the work of A. Birch. On the LE’s authenticity, see below on the arguments of William Farmer and the discussion of chapter 2.
68 J. W. Burgon, Last Twelve Verses, pp. 248–254. In discussing the external evidence, Burgon draws extensively from later patristic sources. Afterward he concludes that his arguments are “enough to have demonstrated . . . that not a particle of doubt, that not an atom of suspicion attaches to ‘THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. MARK’” (p. 254, emphasis original).
71 In addition to J. W. Burgon, those who have argued for, or tacitly assumed, the authenticity of the LE include: J. P. Martin, Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament (Vol. 2; Paris: Maisonneuve frères et C. Leclerc, 1884); George Salmon, A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament: Being An Exposition of Lectures Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin (London: From Birch to Burgon (1801–1871)
moreover, regarded Martin’s arguments as sufficiently weighty to warrant a
detailed response some eight years later.69

2. From Conybeare to Williams (1891—1915)
The first modern period of study from Griesbach to Burgeon was primarily
concerned with demonstrating that Mark 16:9—20 was not written by the
author of the Second Gospel. After the question of authenticity was resolved,
very little attention was devoted to the passage itself or to its author. By
contrast, the period of scholarship subsequent to Burgeon’s futile attempt to
restore the LE as an original part of Mark yielded a number of intriguing
theses concerning the origin and authorship of these verses. Perhaps most
notably, in 1891 F. C. Conybeare discovered in the monastery of
Edschmidian (Erzmitadn, Armenia), an Armenian codex of the Gospels
dating to 989 CE.70 After Mark 16:8 there is a space of two lines, after
which the following gloss, written in red ink, appears: “Aríston Eristou” (“of
the presbyter Ariston”). The text of Mark 16:9—20 is given after this gloss.71
Conybeare identifies “Ariston” with the Greek name Aris tain because of the
likelihood that the Armenian language could have dropped the “i” in transla-
tering, perhaps carelessly, this name (hence “Aristoovv or proesibvoutou”).
The name Aris tain could perhaps designate Jesus’ disciple of whom Papias,
cited by Eusebius, wrote (so Co nbeare and T. Zahn; cf. Eusebius, Histor.
calendar 3.39.5) or a second-century Jewish-Christian author from Pelia (so W.
Sanday and A. R. Sella; ca. 140—150 CE).72 Judging the latter individual as

69 See, respectively, J. P. M. Martin, Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau
testament (Vol. 2; Paris: Maisonneuve frères et C. Leclerc, 1884); T. Zahn, Geschichte des
Neutestamentlichen Kanons (2d ed.; Berlin: Reichenbachsche Verlag, 1880—1881; and
1885—1886); and T. Zahn, Geschichtliche Untersuchungen über die Verfasser der
points, Zahn follows the arguments of Westcott and Hort and responds to many of J. W.
Burgeon’s objections to Westcott and Hort.

70 F. C. Conybeare, “Ariston, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark,” The
Expositor Fourth Series 6 (1891) 241—254. A facsimile of this part of the Edschmidian MS
appears in H. H. Swete, The Gospel According to St Mark (Third Edition; London:
Macmillan, 1913; reprinted, 1927) between pp. cix and cv. As Theodor Zahn notes,
Conybeare inaccurately lists the date of the codex as 986 CE (T. Zahn, “Ariston: der
Verfasser der letzten 12 Verse des Markus,” Theologisches Literaturblatt 14 (December,
1890) 592—593).

71 F. C. Conybeare, “Ariston, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark,” pp.
242—243. Conybeare emphasizes that the same scribe copied Mark 16.8, “Ariston Eristou,”
and the LE. The identification of Aris tain in this MS resembles other scribal notations,
e.g., when the authors of the other Gospels (e.g., Mark) are identified.

72 On this debate see F. C. Conybeare, Theodor Zahn and Alfred Reissch, “The
Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark,” The Expositor Fourth Series 10 (1894) 219—232.
Conybeare translated the arguments of Zahn (pp. 220—220) and (pp. 226—232), which were
originally published as T. Zahn, “Ariston: der Verfasser des letzten 12 Verse des Markus,”
Theologisches Literaturblatt 14 (December, 1890) 591—594; A. Reissch, "Ariston Eristou’s
having lived “too late,” Conybeare argues that the disciple Aris tain either
must have “composed these twelve verses” himself or, as Zahn later
maintained, delivered them orally to Papias, who wrote them down.73 Thus,
according to Conybeare, even if Mark himself did not write the LE, the
passage at least stems from “a ἀπὸ τοῦ μῆνιον.”74
Although the ascription in this Armenian codex is intriguing, it is very
difficult to maintain, as Conybeare and a number of other prominent scholars
did,75 that the tenth-century Armenian translator did, in fact, copy “Aríston
Eristou” from a considerably earlier Greek or Syriac MS.76 That is, there is no
earlier Greek, Syriac or Armenian witness to support his inference that the
tenth-century Armenian codex is based upon a tradition dating to the fifth
century or earlier.77 For the purpose of ascertaining the author of the LE, it is

Parallelsien in den Evangelien (TU 10.1—5; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1892—1897) [Heft 2:
Parallelstellen zu Mathaiou und Mariane, 1894]) 2,449—456. In the following year,
Conybeare responded to Zahn and Reissch in F. C. Conybeare, “On the Last Twelve Verses of
St. Mark’s Gospel,” The Expositor Fifth Series 2 (1895) 40—42.

F. C. Conybeare, “Ariston, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark,” pp.
242—247.

74 F. C. Conybeare, “Ariston, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark,” p. 254.

75 In an untitled article responding to Conybeare, A. von Harnack, “Einleitung zu
Ariston: die lateinische und die syrische Tradition,” pp. 561—564 states that he agrees with many of Conybeare’s theses concerning Aris tain as the author of the
LE. Moreover, even a textual critic of such note as Eberhard Nestle maintains, without argument, as “evidently correct” the likelihood that Aris tain was the author of the LE. See E.
Nestle, Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament (trans. the 2d
ed. by W. E. Edie; London: Williams and Norgate, 1901 [orig. Ger. ed.: Einleitung
Mk 16, 9—20,” BZ 15 (1913—1914) 149—150. For his part, J. Edgar Breus connects Aris tain
not only with the LE but also with Pauline Christianity (“A Note on Mk 16:20—20,” CBE 9

76 Clarence Williams, among others, makes this point. See C. R. Williams, “The
Appendixes to the Gospel according to Mark: A Study in Textual Transmission,”
Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 18 (February, 1915) 381—
383; cf. Adolf Harnack, untitled review of Paul Rohrbach (Der Schluß des
Markusevangeliums, 1894) in Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie 37 (1894) 626—
627; Joseph Scholz, “Wir sind die Nächste Aris tonegeten” hinter Mk 16, 8 in der
armenischen Handschrift von Eshchimah (A. D. 887), BZ 15 (1915) 24—25; Benjamin W.
Bacon, “Again the Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark,” The Expositor Sixth Series 12
(1905) 401—412; idem, “Note on Mark 16:18,” JBL 30 (1911) 105—107; B. H. Streeter,
364—374; J. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 15—17; V. Krauss, „Verkleidete
das Evangelium,” p. 25.

In addition, Williams notes “that the name Aris tain is not in the genitive” (p. 383). For his
part, B. W. Bacon maintains that “Aríston Eristou” is simply an unrelia ble marginal note
(“Note on Mark 16:18”), pp. 105—106.
thus a moot point whether "Ariston Eritzou" was intended to refer to Jesus’ disciple mentioned by Papias or to the somewhat later second-century Jewish-Christian author from Pella, for the codex likely reflects only the conjecture of a tenth-century Armenian scribe.\footnote{87}

Nonetheless, Conybeare’s thesis concerning the authorship of the LE almost immediately sparked a number of other hypotheses, most notably from Theodor Zahn and Paul Rohrbach. For his part, Zahn was attracted by Conybeare’s thesis that Ariston was in some way connected with the authorship of the LE. Primarily on the weight of the external evidence, Zahn agreed with others that the LE was not written by the author of the Second Gospel.\footnote{88}

Although Zahn realized some of the problems with Conybeare’s analysis, he nonetheless took the discussion in a different, but equally problematic, direction.\footnote{89} Zahn argues that the diversity of emphases within the LE is best explained in terms of the various sources drawn from the NT Gospels (vv. 9–13), Aristion’s teaching (vv. 14–18) and the apostolic teaching about the ascension (vv. 19–20). Rather similarly he states that vv. 9–13 stem from John 20:1–18, Luke 8:2 and 24:13–35, while vv. 19–20 summarize “[The language . . . of the Apostolic Creed] rather than “the Gospels.” Moreover, he regards vv. 14–18 as “strikingly different” from the rest of the LE: these verses offer “a real narrative,” which, unlike vv. 9–13, does not reflect “dependence upon a canonical Gospel” and differs with the style of vv. 19–20.\footnote{90} Zahn mentions the Armenian codex found at Edschmidt in support of the likelihood that Mark 16:14–18 ultimately stems from Aristion of Pella in that, after Papias wrote down the narratives of Aristion, the person who compiled Mark 16:9–20 from gospel and creedal materials incorporated also part of Aristion’s writing into vv. 14–18.\footnote{92}

Although Zahn’s observations on the LE’s manifold character represent a step forward in the literary analysis of this passage, his theses concerning Aristion’s otherwise unknown work are not persuasive. Both B. W. Bacon and C. R. Williams criticize Zahn for suggesting, on the one hand, that the ascension goes back to an unknown fourth- or fifth-century author, and also maintaining that this author was correct in making this ascension to the second-century Aristion of Pella, on the other.\footnote{93}

Also intrigued by this tenth-century Armenian codex, Paul Rohrbach embellished Conybeare’s and Zahn’s theses concerning the origin and authorship of the LE.\footnote{94} Rohrbach’s study is concerned with two different problems — an analysis of the LE and an explanation of the process by which Mark’s original ending was lost — which he views as intrinsically related. Beginning with the former, he assumes that the LE’s non-Markan authorship has been demonstrated by Tischendorf and Zahn (p. 7). He also expresses agreement with Conybeare that the Aristion mentioned by Papias was the author of the LE (pp. 9–11; cf. pp. 15–17). Like Zahn, Rohrbach highlights the similarities between Mark 16:9–13 and Luke 24 and John 20, and regards Mark 16:14–18 as stemming from Aristion.\footnote{95} Unlike Zahn, however, Rohrbach infers that “der Rest [16:19–20] wieder von dem Redakteur des Markusschlusses hergestellt” (pp. 11–12). Thus, for the first time, Rohrbach rightly acknowledges the possibility that the compiler of the passage, rather than simply recycling older traditions, may himself have composed some parts of it. As H. Alford did, Rohrbach also refers to the LE as a “fragment” rather than as a composition written to augment the Second Gospel.\footnote{96} Also differently from Zahn, Rohrbach states, as Alford et al had also maintained, that there is no reason that the preaching of Aristion could

\footnote{87} Williams also notes that, even if the ascension could be shown to be of ancient origin, there exists no case of verifying its ancestry, for none of Aristion’s alleged writings survives, and it is not even known whether Aristion, in fact, ever wrote anything ("The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark," p. 385).


\footnote{91} T. Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, 2.471–475; cf. idem, "The Authorship of the Last Verses of Mark," pp. 222–226. This position is not altogether different from Paul Mirecki ("Mark 16:9–20: Composition, Tradition and Redaction," pp. 26–100), who,


\footnote{93} P. Rohrbach, Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, der Vor-Evangelien-Kanon und die Kleinasiatische Presbyter (Berlin: Georg Nauko [Frisch Kibb], 1894).

\footnote{94} P. Rohrbach, Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, p. 11; cf. pp. 12–14.

not lie behind all of Mark 16:9—20. Further distinguishing himself from Zahn, Rohrbach regards the LE as independent (unabhängig) of the Gospels of Luke and John.

Having discussed the above points, Rohrbach asks, "Warum und wann ist die Ergänzung des Markus durch das Aristionstück geschehen?" (p. 22). In order to address this issue concerning the LE, he raises the additional question when the original ending to the Second Gospel became lost or corrupted (p. 22). A clear metabasis eis allo genos, the discussion that follows calls attention to the difference between Mark, who predicted one or more appearances of Jesus in Galilee (Mark 14:28, 16:7), and Luke, who later presented the risen Jesus among his followers in and around Jerusalem. Rohrbach surmises that not all of Mark's lost ending can be reconstructed on the basis of Matthew 28 or Luke 24 (pp. 23—26). He then refers favorably to a suggestion of his teacher, Adolf von Harnack, that the Gospel of Mark, like the Gospel of Peter, originally ended with an appearance of Jesus to the apostle Peter.

Rohrbach's own contribution—which Harnack himself, as well as others, later criticized—was that the original ending of Mark, including appearances to Peter and the eleventh, was deleted because it contradicted the presentation of

---


88 P. Rohrbach, Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, pp. 18—19. Rather, the brevity of Mark 16:9—20 points to an earlier tradition used by the NT evangelists and the author of the LE. This tradition was later adopted by J. Weg and is criticized in chapter 4 of this study.

89 I.e., μετὰ δὲ τὸν Εὐαγγέλιον της Χριστιανίματος ἡ ἀνακάλυψις της Χριστιανίματος λέγεται, a fuller/specific shift in the argument (cf. Chapter 1).

90 P. Rohrbach, Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, pp. 22—23. The discussion is problematic in that it is based upon a conjecture concerning what the author of the Second Gospel might have written after Mark 16:8.

91 According to this view, Mark 16:7a ("Bist gu, to his disciples and Peter that he is going ahead of you to Galilee") is understood to imply that Jesus, when he appears in Galilee, will restate the apostles Peter, who denied Jesus before the crucifixion (cf. Mark 14:66—72, Joha 21:15—19, 1 Cor 15:5). See P. Rohrbach, Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums, pp. 26—27; A. von Harnack, Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus (Second edition; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893) 33; cf. pp. 32—37. For Rohrbach, despite the inference that the original endings of Mark and of the Gospel of Peter are lost, "die Hauptsache des einstigen Matthaeuschusses, die Wiedereinsetzung des Petrus, stand ja an Ende des Johannesevangeliums zu lesen" (p. 41).

Jesus' appearances in the Gospel of John. In the place of Mark's original conclusion, someone in Asia Minor, "vielleicht um 110—120" and after the completion of the Four-Gospel canon, added the LE, which summarizes Aristion's preaching and does not stand in tension with the account of the appearances in the Fourth Gospel. Ultimately, Rohrbach's creative synthesis of earlier discussions by Conybeare, Zahn and Harnack collapses from a lack of evidence concerning the likelihood that Mark's original ending can be reconstructed on the basis of comparisons with the Gospel of Peter. Nevertheless, Rohrbach is to be credited with exploring the important question why Mark 16:9—20 came to be associated with the Second Gospel. Moreover, the suggestion that the collection of the four NT Gospels was a necessary precondition for the composition of Mark 16:9—20 has merit and will be explored in greater detail in chapters 2 and 3.

Henry Barclay Swete's commentary on the Gospel of Mark, which first appeared seven years after Conybeare's discovery of the tenth-century
Armenian codex (discussed above), devotes attention to the alternative endings of the Second Gospel and to the analysis of the LE. 97 Swete, who was later followed by B. H. Streeter and M. J. Lagrange, argues that, because Mark 16:9 focuses on only one of the three women who visit Jesus’ tomb in Mark 16:1–8, the LE must have been taken from another document and secondarily appended to Mark 16:8. 98 In chapter 4 I will express disagreement with Swete on this point because his argument, like those of H. Alford, Westcott and Hort and a number of other scholars, presupposes that someone who composed a continuation of Mark 16:8 would have necessarily followed without adaptation the narrative left off by the evangelist himself. 99 Complementing his support of the “fragmentary theory,” Swete writes with regard to the origin of the LE that “Conybeare with much probability suggests” that the disciple of Jesus and presbyter Arist also wrote the LE, which someone else later added to Mark. 100 In contrast with the endings of Matthew, Luke and John, the LE is taken to reflect a purpose that was “didactic and not simply or in the first sense historical.” 101 Swete also suggests that the mention of Jesus’ ascension (v. 19) “echoes a creed-like hymn.” 102

Dismissing, like others, the possibility of the LE’s authenticity, Alfred Plummer agrees with the fragment theory held by Westcott and Hort, Swete and others: “The twelve verses not only do not belong to Mark, they quite clearly belong to some other document. While Mark has no proper ending, these verses have no proper beginning.” 103 By contrast, Plummer maintains that the Shorter Ending “was evidently written as an ending, to finish the unfinished Gospel.” 104 Similarly, C. H. Turner argues that Mark 16:9 “commences . . . the resurrection narrative from the beginning with no regard to what has proceeded.” 105 Turner also offers an additional argument against the LE’s authenticity based on the priority of the Second Gospel, namely “that neither Matthew nor Luke found [Mark 16:9–20] in their copies of Mark.” 106

Writing some seventeen years after the appearance of H. B. Swete’s commentary on Mark, Clarence Russell Williams updated the discussion of MSS pertaining to the end of Mark since the time Swete wrote. 107 After offering a brief overview of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholarship on the question of the LE’s authenticity (pp. 355–355), Williams devotes the majority of his book-length article to important Greek MSS and other significant witnesses like the Old Latin, Armenian and Ethiopic translations of the NT. 108 Williams also responds to many of J. W. Burgon’s misguided arguments concerning the importance of the various external witnesses which do or do not include the LE after Mark 16:8.

Having examined over twenty such witnesses, at the end of this work Williams seeks to explain the origin of the disparities between those ending at Mark 16:8, continuing with the LE, ending with the Shorter Ending (SE), or the Gospel according to St Mark (Third Edition; London: Macmillan, 1898; reprinted, 1927) respectively, pp. xii–xiii and 399–408.


100 H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St Mark, pp. xii–xiii. Swete mentions only the hypotheses of Conybeare and not those of other who criticized Conybeare or offered alternate themes concerning the identity of Aristus.


102 H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St Mark, p. 27.


104 Alfred Plummer, The Gospel according to St Mark, p. xlvii, emphasis original; cf. pp. xliii–xlviii. Plummer continues the statement cited above as follows: “The passage in question is not a ‘weeping over a gap’ in the Gospel of Mark, feeling that ἔκκολοδώτος γῆς was intolerably abrupt as a last word, and that readers ought to be told that the women obeyed the Angel’s command, added these few lines.”

105 C. H. Turner, The Gospel according to St Mark: Introduction and Commentary (London: SPCK, 1936) 54, emphasis added. Like A. Plummer and others, Turner considers “doubtable” the propositions that the LE “fills the Shorter Ending” . . . “was written simply to fill up an obvious gap” left after Mark 16:8 (p. 94).

106 C. H. Turner, The Gospel according to St Mark, p. 83. Thus, if Mark 16:9–20 was not yet a part of the edition(s) of Mark used by the authors of Matthew and Luke, it is less likely that the passage was original to the autograph of Mark.

107 Clarence R. Williams, “The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark: A Study in Textual Transmission,” Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 18 (February, 1915) 347–467. As noted above, Williams also offers numerous criticisms of the various hypotheses stemming from Conybeare’s analysis of the Armenian codex from Edeshoin or the Gospel according to St Mark, p. 83. Thus, if Mark 16:9–20 was not yet a part of the edition(s) of Mark used by the authors of Matthew and Luke, it is less likely that the passage was original to the autograph of Mark.

108 C. R. Williams, “The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark,” pp. 356–432. Particularly valuable is Williams’ inclusion of facsimiles of many of the codices and translations that are discussed, as well as of bibliographies corresponding to most of these witnesses.
including both the LE and the SE.\footnote{C. R. Williams, "Reconstruction of the History of the Conclusions of the Second Gospel," in A. J. Edmonds, "The Second Gospel According to Mark," pp. 438–447.} He argues that the original ending of Mark was lost at some time before the authors of Matthew and Luke used Mark as a source.\footnote{C. R. Williams, "The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark," pp. 428–429. In Williams' view, it is thus not possible to reconstruct from either Matthew 28 or Luke 24 the original continuation of the narrative beyond Mark 16:8.} With regard to the origin of Mark 16:9–20, Williams seems to follow Swete when stating that "[t]he Longer Conclusion seems to have belonged originally to an apocryphal writing, possibly a gospel, perhaps a kerygma like the Kerygma Petri."\footnote{C. R. Williams, "The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark," pp. 424–425. In Williams' view, it is not possible to reconstruct from either Matthew 28 or Luke 24 the original continuation of the narrative beyond Mark 16:8.}

Apparently intended for a more general audience, a six-page pamphlet by Albert Edmonds offers English translations of the ends of Mark in Codex Vaticanus, the Old Latin, the Sinaiticus Syriac and the Old Armenian, which do not include the LE.\footnote{C. R. Williams, "The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark," pp. 424–425. In Williams' view, it is not possible to reconstruct from either Matthew 28 or Luke 24 the original continuation of the narrative beyond Mark 16:8.} Edmonds' article published in the following year discusses the endings of these MSS and suggests that the author of Luke, responding to the later problem of Docetism, may have written the LE in order to emphasize in the Gospel of Mark the reality of Jesus' appearances.\footnote{C. R. Williams, "The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark," pp. 424–425. In Williams' view, it is not possible to reconstruct from either Matthew 28 or Luke 24 the original continuation of the narrative beyond Mark 16:8.}

To summarize, the period of the study of the LE beginning with Conybeare is promising in that the LE is recognized as a passage meriting its own investigation without primary reference to questions of authenticity or the lost ending to the Second Gospel. At the end of this interval, however, the course of the discussion turns full circle. C. R. Williams refuted many of the unprofitable inquiries concerning Arisio as the author of all or part of Mark 16:9–20, but in so doing he re-focused primary attention upon the external witnesses to the Markan endings and discussed the LE only briefly as an afterthought.

3. From Hartmann to Hezal (1936–1959)

In the following decades of the twentieth century, the two most significant works on the LE were both dissertations written in Germany. Although it contains a number of insights, Gerhard Hartmann's study of the LE represents a somewhat anachronistic attempt to understand the passage, like the rest of Mark, as stemming from the teaching of the apostle Peter. Eugen Hezal's work refutes many of Hartmann's theories but is limited in scope to comparing Mark 16:9–20 with other NT passages.

As a lengthy appendix to his 1936 study of the structure of the Gospel of Mark, Gerhard Hartmann offers one of the last serious efforts to defend the LE as an integral, original part of Mark.\footnote{Gerhard Hartmann, Der Aufbau des Markus-Evangeliums mit einem Anhang: Untersuchungen zur Echtheit des Markusschlosses (NTAbs 17.2–3; ed. M. Meicrhein; Münster: Aschendorff'sche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1936) 175–276. A dissertation written under Prof. M. Meinrhein (p. iv), this work reflects the thought of Hartmann as a mature scholar, for the author indicates that this study grew out of an article published in 1913. The dissertation was completed not later than July, 1934, for it received the designation "breviarium" in that month (p. ll; Hartmann maintains that arguing for (or against) the authenticity of Mark is related to "one's position concerning the Echtheit des Markusschlosses" (p. iii). This point is underscored in the introduction to this appendix (p. 175), where he states that "this study [of the LE] leans directly on the preceding study of the unity of the Gospel of Mark (pp. 12–173). The main body of Hartmann's work reflects the traditional view that the apostle Peter was closely connected with the Second Gospel (cf. Papias in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 3.39.14–15) and is divided into four parts: the traditional teaching-proclamation of Peter, in which the traditions of the apostle Peter in Mark, Acts, 1 Peter and 2 Peter are discussed (pp. 4–35); the position of the name of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark (pp. 36–38); "investigation of the unity from the text of Mark itself" (pp. 39–113); and "conclusions and assumptions," which reflect on the relationship of Mark to the teaching of the apostle Peter. In this final part he lists Mark 16:9–20 as the last of seven sub-sections comprising Mark 15:16–16:20 (p. 154). Translations of Hartmann's work are my own.}\footnote{These first eight chapters are: 1) "New light on the connection of [the LE] with [the Gospel] from the recognition of the unity of Mark," (Der Aufbau des Markus-Evangeliums, pp. 176–183); 2) "Examination of the objection ([stemming] from the alleged [philological] and [text-critical] incoherence of the LE" (pp. 183–187); cf. p. 179; 3) "The objection against the authenticity of the LE from word-statistics," (pp. 188–193); 4) "The Pauline element as an objection to the authenticity of the LE," (pp. 195–200); 5) "Further grammatical.} Nearly as long as the main body of the work, Hartmann's appendix on the LE, entitled "investigations of the authenticity of the end of Mark with special consideration of language," is divided into nine chapters. Eight of these chapters respond to arguments, especially those of T. Zahn, against the LE's authenticity.\footnote{C. R. Williams, "The Appendices to the Gospel according to Mark," p. 437; cf. p. 436. Moreover, Williams offers the probable place of origin as Asia Minor because of similarities to the Fourth Gospel and because licentious, who cites the LE, came from Asia Minor (p. 437).} As he does
with the rest of the Second Gospel, Hartmann then interprets Mark 16:9—20 in terms of the first-century ministry of the apostle Peter "in the fall of 63 or winter of 63—64" CE.116

At the time he wrote his commentary on Mark, Vincent Taylor regarded it as "unnecessary to examine in detail the almost universally held conclusion that xvi. 9-20 is not an original part of Mk."117 Taylor devotes five pages of his commentary to a discussion of the LE with an eye to philological matters.118 Because of the passage's particular teaching about miracles, he thinks that vv. 17—18 point to "the atmosphere of A.D. 100-40."119

Defended some two decades after and standing methodologically in counterpoint to Hartmann's study, Eugen Helze's Tübingen dissertation was, unfortunately, never published.120 As the title indicates, the first half of this work focuses on Mark 16:9—20 (pp. 2—109), and the second part studies the interpolation between Mark 15:14 and 16:15 known as the Freer Logion (pp. 111—203).121 After summarizing certain arguments against the Markan authorship of the LE, Helze reasons that the LE was written "shortly after (kurz nach) 100" CE.122 Having reviewed recent scholarly opinions on the passage,

debts and [issues of] content and [style] against the authenticity of the LE," (pp. 204—209); 6) "The principal witness of T. Zahn against the authenticity of the LE," (pp. 209—223); 7) "Linguistic-stylistic proofs for the authenticity of the LE," (pp. 225—255); 8) "Text-historical and text-critical grounds for the detailed treatment of the textual history of the LE according to T. Zahn." (pp. 233—245).

G. Hartmann, "Time and original circumstances of the LE," in Idem, Der Aufbau des Markusevangeliums, pp. 255—263.

Vince Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan, 1952; reprinted, 1957) 610. Instead, Taylor simply refers to the discussions of Westcott and Hort, Swete and others as having sufficiently demonstrated this point. William Farmer (Last Twelve Verses, p. 109) later criticized Taylor for making such a generalization without argument. Curiously, however, Farmer does not respond directly to the studies upon which Taylor's statement is based.


V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 613. Taylor does not state whether this date would apply to this individual piece of tradition (vv. 17—18) or to the passage as a whole.

Eugen Helze, "Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums (Mk 16, 9-20) und das Freer Logion (Mk 16, 14 W), ihre Tendenz und ihre gegenseitigen Verhältnisse: Eine vorzeichenlose Untersuchung," (Diss., Tübingen, 1959); a summary of this work appears in TLZ 85 (1960) 480—742. Supervised by Hildebrandt Hommel, this "inaugural-dissertation" was approved in February, 1959.

In offering such a "word-exterjonal study," Helze seeks to examine "each individual word" in both passages (p. 1). One drawback to this line of inquiry is that Helze's study, like Hartmann's, does not take into account differences in how various authors might use the same word. Here and elsewhere, translations of Helze's dissertation are my own.

Eugen Helze, "Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums (Mk 16, 9-20)," pp. 4—5. Although he is correct to date the LE to a point after the composition of Mark, his primary justifications for this date stem from a literary analysis of the LE's internal features, in particular the chirological and messianological elements (pp. 101—103), and from the LE's dependence on the Gospel of Luke (pp. 103—106). Thus, there is no reason why this passage could not have originated somewhat earlier, or much later than, the date that Helze maintains.

Eugen Helze, "Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums (Mk 16, 9-20)," pp. 90—92. A similar argument concerning the unity of the LE was later made by Frena Warazza, "Structure literaria et momentum theologiam pericopae Mt 16,9-20," ZD 45 (1957) 19—22.

For example, Helze finds "Zeugnisse einer apologetischen Verkündigung" in the LE's three appearances (vv. 9—14; p. 9, cf. pp. 9—22). Helze's analysis is weakened by virtue of the fact that he never explains the way in which reports of Jesus' appearances should necessarily be connected with apologetic aspects of the apostolic preaching. In view of the many appearances of Jesus reported in the NT and other early Christian writings — including numerous Nag Hammadi writings not yet known at the time Helze wrote — such a narrow line of interpretation is unwarranted. In addition, it is questionable that the depiction of the disciples "reeling at table" (v. 14a) points to the "culd life of this community" (p. 27). Also unpersuasive is his argument that the emphasis on unbeliefs (vv. 11, 13, 14a, 15) points to the discipline of this church community "nach Ausbleiben der Paradies" (p. 31; cf. pp. 41—43).
in the LE, Helze discusses briefly, and somewhat superficially, each of the signs promised in vv. 17b—18 (pp. 65—74). He states — without arguing the point — that the LE (especially vv. 17—20) points to the missionary activity of an early second-century Christian community (pp. 75—77). Helze also characterizes the promise of signs in v. 17a as "eine Veränderung gegenüber der sonstigen nnl. Botschaft." Thus, while Helze is to be commended for raising such social-historical questions, his solutions are not always persuasive.

Concerning the origin of the LE, Helze argues that the LE, before it was added as an ending to Mark, "may have been a teaching tool (Lernstück) for the baptized [people] of the missionary community" (p. 90; cf. pp. 87—90). In support of this claim Helze highlights its "apologetischen Charakter" in comparison with passages like 1 Co 15:3—7, Phil 2:6—11 and Rom 10:9, which also have a didactic function (pp. 88—89). His argument, however, sets up a false dichotomy between apologetic and missionary motives, on the one hand, and the possibility that this author could also have desired to complete the end of Mark, on the other. Given that the NT evangelists themselves wrote certain passages with more than one purpose, Helze offers no reason why the author who composed with such didactic and apologetic intentions and the individual who joined the LE to the end of Mark could not have been the same person.


Although vehement dissenters continue to treat the LE as Markan and thus as a product of the first century, the vast majority of critical scholars were united in their estimation of the Longer Ending until about thirty years ago. No part of the LE reflects the ending Mark the evangelist intended for his Gospel. In addition, the passage itself consists of a later author’s compilation of texts that were probably borrowed from one or more of the NT Gospels. Like their nineteenth century counterparts, most recent scholars, having reached this conclusion concerning the non-Markan authorship of Mark 16:9—20, have been content to abandon its investigation. Since Mark did not write the LE, it is either a "false" (and embarrassing) interpolation or not worthy of serious attention by NT scholars.

A move towards the serious re-evaluation of this consensus began perhaps with the 1965 Society of Biblical Literature presidential address of Kenneth Clark, who stated that the question of the genuineness of these verses was "still open and perhaps ‘insoluble at present’." Although Clark himself did not explicitly argue in favor of this position, his comments were an inspiration to William R. Farmer, who responded with a monograph "in response to" Clark’s address. Farmer’s analysis is divided neatly into two parts, which investigate the external (pp. 3—75) and internal (pp. 79—103) evidence pertaining to the LE. Until his concluding remarks (pp. 107—109), Farmer strives to keep these two investigations separate, lest the findings of one line of inquiry unfairly prejudice those of the other. In Part One he argues that the external evidence does not yield a definitive conclusion concerning the authenticity of the LE.

Correctly observing that the LE was in circulation at least as early as the second century, Farmer also surmises that the passage’s origin "cannot be traced back to any particular ecclesiastical centre or geographical locale, nor to any singular text type or textual group" (p. 74). The glaring exception to the LE’s early attestation is Egyptian Alexandria, where neither Clement nor Origen reflects any knowledge of the passage (pp. 26—31, 40—47). Farmer later builds upon the thesis of omission in Egypt to suggest the possibility that the removal of the LE from Mark was intentional on the part of certain Alexandrian scribes, who considered that picking up snakes and drinking poison were too dangerous to be part of the biblical tradition.

127 The address was published as Kenneth W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," JBL 85 (1966) 1—16. Clark made this statement in the context of noting that the Catholic edition of the RSV translation of the Bible (RSV CE) restores the LE, from a footnote in the RSV, to the text of Mark (pp. 9—10).

128 The Last Twelve Verses of Mark (ENTEM 26; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974) in. Farmer completed this book in 1965, but it was not published until five years later. It is probably no accident that Farmer gave his book a title similar to John W. Burgon’s 1871 tome (The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark Vindicated against Recent Critical Objectors and Established, discussed above). Farmer thus intended his book to read as a prompt examination of Clark’s remarks and a refinement of Burgon’s arguments.

129 W. Farmer explains (Last Twelve Verses, pp. 79—80) that he follows this procedure in order to avoid the excesses of presuppositionally-driven approaches like that of Robert Morganhale, who assumed the LE’s inauthenticity, and then sought to demonstrate the validity of word-statistical research by using Mark 16:9—20 as an example (Robert Morganhale, Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes [Zürich: Gotthelf, 1958] 58—60, 186).

130 One commendable element in Part One is Farmer’s recognition of the complexity of the questions surrounding many of the witnesses for and against the inclusion of the verses. That is, it is not sufficient simply to list the MSS and church “fathers” who present evidence "for" or "against" the LE as an authentic part of Mark. When possible, a more significant question is why each witness takes a stance and what implications this may have for evaluating the significance of each testimony.

131 W. Farmer, Last Twelve Verses, pp. 107—108. Note the similarity to the thesis of P. Reubkeand C. R. Williams, which are discussed above. Also earlier than Farmer,
likelihood of such a possibility, however, was rightly challenged by Gordon Fee, who writes, "The whole argument that 'omission' spread out from Alexandria can be turned on its head to show that inclusion spread out from Roman influence (Irenaeus, Tatian, Old Latin, etc.)."132

As mentioned above, Farmer reaches no definitive conclusion concerning the LE's authenticity in Part One. As a result, he offers that the "question can only be settled by a study of the internal evidence" in Part Two (p. 72), where he argues that an investigation of the LE's vocabulary tips the balance slightly in favor of authenticity. There are also many problems with Farmer's analysis of vocabulary, most notably his myopic focus on comparing Mark 16:9—20 almost exclusively with Mark 1:1—16:8 and not also with other early Christian writings. Although Farmer correctly and meticulously calls attention to many Markan elements in the LE in an effort to support the Markan authorship of the passage, he fails to appreciate its many Mattian, Lukan and Johannine elements as well. It is thus ironic that Farmer — a Neo-Griesbachian who, as J. J. Griesbach did, affirms the priority of Matthew — seeks to reverse the scholarly consensus concerning the LE's authenticity, a question that was championed by none other than Griesbach himself.133

In addition to Farmer, between 1969 and 1986 a number of other scholars offered, with varying degrees of success, new directions for research. Writing

Marshall von der Valk mentioned the possibility of the LE's intentional omission because of the potentially offensive nature of Jesus' rebuke of the disciples in vv. 14a and the presentation of miracles in vv. 17—18 (M. van der Valk, Observations on Mk 16, 9-20 in Relation to Mark's Gospel, pp. 2—6). Most of van der Valk's discussion, however, intends to refute this possibility and to show that the LE may be understood in harmony with the Second Gospel [pp. 11—39].


134 One often overlooked benefit of Farmer's study of the LE's vocabulary is that a detailed comparison of the LE's terminology relative to the wording of the NT Gospels suggests that the author of Mark 16:9—20 included numerous traditional formulas when composing this passage. Such an inquiry, which involves not only interaction with but also a modification of Farmer's method, is the subject of the following chapter.

at the same time as Farmer, Eta Limmen notice in 16:9—20 a natural break between verses 14 and 15. She divides the passage into 16:9—14 and 16:15—20 and observes that Justin Martyr cites only the latter part.134 Limmen concludes that these two parts of the LE were originally independent and that the original ending of Mark consisted of Mark 16:1—8 followed by elements of both Matt 28:16—17 and Mark 16:15—20.135 Although her analysis drew a swift refutation from Kurt Aland,136 other hypotheses concerning the original ending of Mark continued to be proposed, for example, by Walter Schmitthals and Gary Trump.137

Also departing from conventional examinations of the LE, Joseph Hug — who is to be distinguished from the famous NT scholar of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Johann Leonard Hug (1763—1846) — has made some of the most important advances of recent decades in the understanding of Mark 16:9—20.138 His book represents the first significant study of the LE as a distinct passage without primary reference to traditional questions of authenticity and relationship to Mark.139 In the first chapter

135 As J. Hug (La fin de l'évangile de Marc, p. 14) notes, Christian G. Wilke (Der Urevangelsia (Dresden, Leipzig; G. Fleischner, 1838) 649—651) preceded E. Limmen over a century in arguing for the originality of Mark 16:15—20, and in regarding only Mark 16:9—14 as inauthentic.
139 Hug's work is divided into seven chapters: 1) Brief history of the exegetes of the Long Ending of Mark (pp. 11—32); 2) The composition and structure of the LE (pp. 33—38); 3) Analysis of the ending (pp. 39—162); 4) The LE and its sources (pp. 163—190); 5) The end of the Second Gospel (pp. 177—180); 6) Textual criticism of the end of the Second Gospel (pp. 187—216); 7) Conclusion (pp. 217—254). Here and elsewhere, translations of Hug are my own. Throughout his book Hug uses the abbreviation "Éôte"
Hug’s thorough and insightful history of scholarship on the LE remains a useful resource to this day.140 Hug argues in the second chapter that the author of the LE organized this passage into four sections (vv. 9—11, 12—13, 15—18 and 19—20). In his configuration, each section is marked with a temporal particle (πρῶτον, v. 9; μετὰ, v. 12; οὕτως, v. 14; μετὰ, v. 19) and mentions in turn the initiatory of Jesus, the response of the messengers to Jesus and the reaction of those who hear the message.141

For reasons more significant than its length, the most important contribution in his discussion occurs in chapter three (pp. 39—102), in which Hug compares the terms used by the author of the LE with those of other second-century Christian writings. Although essentially a vocabulary study, it advances previous scholarship by attempting to analyze the words of the LE in relation to numerous extracanonical Christian writings rather than simply those of the NT. Hug’s discussion contains many individual points of insight, some of which are noted in the course of the study to be offered here. Such a novel approach, however, has certain drawbacks, for some of Hug’s word studies resemble the format of articles in G. Kittel’s TDNT and are of questionable relevance for interpreting the LE.142 Moreover, Hug builds upon the assumption — which, at least in some cases, is untenable — that certain terms are more characteristic of Christian authors of the second, rather than the first, century, and uses this comparison of characteristic vocabulary words to support his dating the LE to “the second third of the second century.”143

Hug’s argument in chapter 4 that the LE’s author did not write with knowledge of the other three NT Gospels and Acts persuaded the majority of his reviewers on this point.144 He explains the similarities of Mark 16:9—20 to those NT writings in that the less detailed narratives of the LE reflect a completely independent witness to the same Vorlagen that the other evangelists used. In chapter 3 I critique Hug’s argument and maintain, on the contrary, that his case for the LE’s independence vis-à-vis the NT Gospels rests upon faulty methodological assumptions concerning gospel traditions in the second century. In particular, Hug posits that an unreasonably rigid standard of demonstrating one author’s copying nearly verbatim and at length from another writing is necessary for recognizing the dependence of the LE on any NT text. Such a narrow approach to possible literary dependence allows no room for the author of Mark 16:9—20 to adapt or even condense traditional, written materials for his own purposes.

A more fundamental problem with these two chapters is one of organization: in chapter 4 Hug challenges the view that Mark 16:9—20 was dependent upon Matthew, Luke, John or Acts. The earlier vocabulary study of chapter 3, however, assumes the conclusion of chapter 4 and, as a result, makes light of the numerous points at which the wording of the LE parallels NT passages more closely than those by other second-century Christian authors. Moreover, when such dependence can be demonstrated, tracing the chronological development of the ways in which Christian authors tended to use certain vocabulary becomes a more complicated task than Hug admits. Furthermore, if the LE depends on the other NT Gospels — a point on which Hug and I differ — it is also necessary to consider how the LE’s author adapted these earlier writings, in addition to comparing his work with that of his contemporaries.

Toward the end of his fourth chapter, Hug discusses the literary genre of the LE in terms of “instruction missionaire”145 and, following E. Helde, argues for the compositional unity of the passage (pp. 175—176). In chapter 5 Hug surveys a number of possible explanations for the original ending of

---

140 J. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 11—20. In the remainder of chapter one, Hug notes a number of lacunae in the previous studies (pp. 20—24) and summarizes certain arguments against the LE’s authenticity (pp. 25—27). More importantly, he suggests that although missing some significant items in German and English and containing a number of inaccurate citations, was, at the time he wrote, the most complete to date.

141 J. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 33—34, apparently following M.-J. Lagrange, Evangile selon Saint Marc, pp. 419—426. In chapter 4 I agree with E. Helde (discussed above) and P. Mirecki (discussed below) that the first three of these divisions are valid.

142 A case in point concerns digressions into the LXX usage of certain words (La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 44, 51, 81—82), the relevance of which are questionable.

143 J. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, p. 213; cf. other reasons stated on pp. 213—214. On different grounds, I argue toward the beginning of chapter 4 that the LE should be dated to ca. 120—150 CE. Hug also argues that, although the geographical location of the LE’s author is not certain, Syria is possible, and it is safe to exclude Egypt (pp. 214—215).


145 J. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 174—175.
Mark (pp. 177—180) and examines the ways in which the addition of the LE completes or transforms Mark. Chapter 6 deals primarily with issues of textual criticism of the various readings to the Second Gospel, including the LE (pp. 187—216). His seventh chapter, entitled "Conclusion," is more of a final chapter than a summary of what the study has accomplished. Here Hug treats issues of NT theology, the historical value of the LE and the passage’s relationship to the Second Gospel. Hug also discusses the LE’s originality and value as "a document of the Christian mission in the Hellenistic milieu in the second third of the second century" and explores each of the passage’s components in this light. With regard to the characteristic elements of the LE, Hug analyzes the passage’s particular christological and ecclesiastical emphasis (pp. 218—220). These pages are some of the most insightful in Hug’s study. For example, whereas the NT evangelists use the appearances to emphasize the identity of Jesus as the crucified, the fulfillment of scripture or Christ’s corporal reality, the LE’s author highlights Christ’s role in the mission without reference to these other interests. Hug notes that in Mark 16:9—20 "[l]a proclamation universelle de l’évangile est l’illustration directe de l’exaltation." Building on his argument that the LE is independent of the NT Gospels and Acts (chapter 4), Hug also raises the question of the passage’s historical value as a witness to early gospel traditions and maintains that no part of Mark 16:9—20 offers a superior tradition to parallel texts in the NT. A final section in chapter 7 discusses the LE as a reinterpretation of Mark’s Easter message. Hug notes that "[l]e seul fait de l’addition modifie le sens de Mo." For, rather than concluding with the eighteenth women of Mark 16:8, the LE focuses instead on the appearances and the mission (pp. 222—223). All in all, there is much to appreciate in this study, even if, as will be argued in chapter 5, Hug’s rejection of a literary relationship between the LE and the NT Gospels is untenable.

In her dissertation submitted to the Catholic theological faculty at the University of Vienna, Veronika Krauss offers a thorough commentary on Mark 16:9—20 as a prelude for a discussion of the passage’s relevance for contemporary biblical theology. In the introduction she contrasts older with more recent approaches to exegesis within Catholic circles, and also discusses J. Hug’s dissertation (pp. 1—13a). The three main parts of her dissertation examine the LE from the standpoint of its authenticity (pp. 14—26), and afterward focuses on exegetical (pp. 27—228) and biblical-theological (pp. 229—265) issues. The second part, devoted to exegesis, discusses the original text of the passage (pp. 28—38); the author’s organization of the passage (pp. 39—40); grammar and semantics (pp. 41—127); the author’s style (pp. 128—157); the passage’s literary genre (pp. 158—197); the "Sitz im Leben" (pp. 198—203); redaction criticism (pp. 204—221); source criticism (pp. 222—228); and the date of composition (p. 228). Much of the study synthesizes the dissertations of E. Helzle and J. Hug. Nevertheless, Krauss offers a number of significant observations, the majority of which occur in Part Two, that advance the work of previous discussions.

---

14 J. Hug, *La finaile de l’évangile de Marc*, pp. 180—185. In the latter endeavor Hug compares two themes: preaching the gospel and disbelief. With regard to the first theme, Hug contrasts Jesus’ journey toward the cross in Mark with the emphasis on mission led by the exalted Lord in the LE. 
14 J. Hug, *La finaile de l’évangile de Marc*, p. 218. The LE also contains no mention of eschatology or the paracrinia (p. 220). 
14 J. Hug, *La finaile de l’évangile de Marc*, p. 218. That is to say, the exalted Jesus is active in assisting the proclamation of the Gospel with signs (p. 219). It is also interesting that the "optimisme et enthousiasme" of the LE "ne sont pas sans causer de graves problèmes aux communautés apostoliques" (p. 219). 
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Like Hug, Krauss maintains that the author of the LE wrote with the intention of building upon the narrative of Mark 16:1—8 (pp. 59, 221, 242—248). Initially, she divides the passage into three parts, namely vv. 9—11, 12—13 and 14—20, which are introduced by the temporal indicators πρῶτον, v. 9; μετά, v. 12; ὠπέτερον, v. 14. Elsewhere, however, she seems to follow Hug in assigning a separate section to vv. 19—20 (introduced by μετά, v. 19a). By far the largest subsection of Part Two offers a verse-by-verse commentary covering issues of grammar and semantics (Einzelerklärung). On the basis of the passage’s uniformity in style, Krauss affirms its literary unity as the work of a single author (pp. 141—145, 153—157).

A welcome aspect of this discussion is its attempt to define the literary genre of the passage. Concerning the passage as a whole, she rightly regards ascertaining “eine exakte Gattungsbestimmung für Mk 16:9—20... als unmöglich.” Krauss calls attention to “[d]er summarische Charakter des Textes,” but discounts terms like “Summarium,” “Epitome,” “Résumé,” or “Kompilation” as sufficient for describing the genre of the entire passage (pp. 185—186). She offers “Abschluss eines Evangeliums” as the most appropriate designation for the LE, conceding that “[d]ies ist keine Gattungsbestimmung im strengen Sinn” (p. 185). With regard to Mark 16:14—20, she uses the term “üblicher Auslassungsbericht” to describe these verses’ commissioning statement and depiction of the mission (p. 197; cf. pp. 186—197).

Krauss discusses the occasion for the LE’s composition (“Sitz im Leben”) in terms of its author’s view of the Christian mission and the role of miracles in faith formation. Although there is much to be commended in the exploration of this issue, her discussion largely overlooks the fact that, as she herself argues elsewhere, the passage was written with the primary purpose of completing the Second Gospel. In turning to redaction criticism, Krauss considers what earlier traditions may have shaped parts of the LE. In particular, she argues for the pronounced influence of Luke—Acts on the author of the passage (p. 221). On the issue of source criticism and literary dependence, Krauss differs with G. Hartmann and F. Hug, arguing instead for the direct influence of the NT Gospels, which resulted in a “Kompilation” of various traditions in the LE (pp. 222—227). She thus dates the passage after the time of Acts and the Fourth Gospel but before Irenaeus, possibly “in das erste Drittel des zweiten Jahrhunderts.”

The third and final part of Krauss’ dissertation applies the result of the exegetical analysis to a “Biblisch-geologische Auslegung von Mk 16,9—20.” In

---

157 V. Krauss, “Verkündet das Evangelium,” pp. 41—127. A curious cross between the genres of a biblical commentary and an exegetical paper, the discussion at this point treats issues similar to those explored in Joseph Hug’s third and fourth chapters without focusing upon the issue of literary dependence. If Hug’s dissertation opens the door for exploring the merits of extra-canonical Christian writings for the interpretation of Mark 16:9—20, Krauss, although occasionally recognizing certain parallels, takes a decided step back within the biblical canon.
159 Krauss compares the LE with the final chapters of the NT Gospels (pp. 139—171); the beginning of Acts (pp. 171—178); the summary statements in Acts and in 1 Cor 15:1—11 (pp. 174—178); certain extra-canonical Christian writings (pp. 178—185) and reports of missionary and related activities in the LXX, NT and other early Christian writings (pp. 186—196).
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the concluding section Krauss offers that, with its overriding focus on Christ and call to repentance, "Mk 16:9-20 stands in Einklang mit der Grundbotschaft des NT..." (p. 268).

Paul Mirecki's dissertation, supervised by Helmut Koester, offers an insightful literary analysis of the LE using form-critical methodology. Mirecki begins his study with a valid observation and a promising idea, namely that other treatments of the LE (for example, those by J. Burgon and W. Farmer) have been too consumed with questions of vocabulary, philology and textual criticism. As a result, Mirecki sets out in a new direction concentrating exclusively on a form-, redaction- and literary-critical treatment of the passage. His rather brief inquiry is divided into three chapters, which are followed by as many appendixes, a concluding summary and one table.

Chapter 1 (pp. 1—25) reviews only seven pieces of secondary literature and introduces the problems his dissertation will address. The second chapter, "Form Criticism of Mark 16:9-20" (pp. 26—106), begins with a discussion of the LE's literary features. Mirecki rightly agrees with, but does not cite, E. Helzle and J. Hug, who observed that "three chronological indicators" (ναοῦ, v. 9; ἐκάνει, v. 12; ἑδράντυς, v. 14) introduce the three appearances of Jesus. In further support of the LE's parallel structure, Mirecki highlights the three responses of others who either hear about or witness the three appearances:


The three appendices discuss, respectively: on form- and redaction-critical grounds, the division of v. 30 into two parts (vv. 20a and 20b); "The Problem of the Anomolous in the Resurrection and the Last Supper," and the relationship of v. 9b to Luke 8:20. The table offers a diagram of the LE to clarify the order in which Mirecki sorts the passage in chapter 3. Afterward follows a bibliography of some eight pages.

167 P. Mirecki, "Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Reduction," pp. 1—25. His review of previous scholarship is limited to the arguments for authenticity by J. Burgon and W. Farmer; J. Hug's published dissertation; discussions in commentaries by V. Taylor and R. Peake; and articles by E. Linnemann and W. Schmiedtshaus (pp. 1—22).

168 P. Mirecki, "Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Reduction," p. 25. Although he does not critique J. Hug's arguments on this point, Mirecki demonstrates more persuasively that the LE, rather than comprising four parts, is "tripartite in structure (pp. 26—33)."

By and large, these observations concerning the LE's organization are sound and support his observations that various structural and terminological phenomena within 16:9-20 have a marked tendency to occur in close syntactical relationship and mostly in triple parallelism, and that "the triple parallel structure is observable only within 16:9-15, 20a" (p. 32).

Regrettably, however, Mirecki builds upon these points concerning the structure of the passage to support two arguments which do not follow. First, he maintains that such a well-organized narrative ipso facto points to an author who would not have incorporated materials from written sources like the NT Gospels. The argument poses a false dichotomy between the use of parallel formulas, on the one hand, and of written documents, on the other.

Second, and more importantly for the remainder of his study, he regards the absence of such a parallel structure in 16:15—19 and 20b as evidence that these verses constitute a secondary addition to the passage's original, tripartite narrative (pp. 33—34). Thus, according to Mirecki, the original author wrote only vv. 9a, 10—15 and 20a. At some later point, another individual supplemented this "core narrative" with vv. 16—19 and 20b, and in so doing, distorted the structure of the original "tripartite post-resurrection appearance scenes. The interpolated section comprises prophetic (v. 16) and argological traditions (vv. 17—18), a notice of the ascension and enthronement (v. 19) and the departure on the mission (v. 20b)," 170 Mirecki's second argument stemming from the passage's parallel features is also a non sequitur in that it assumes that an author who employed parallelism at certain points in a composition would have necessarily done so throughout the entire passage. 172

169 P. Mirecki, "Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Reduction," pp. 28—29. An apparent typographical error, ἐκάνει (of the masculine form, ἐκάνει) appears in v. 9a instead of the feminine ἐκάνει (p. 28). Another alleged tripartite parallel concerning "the protagonistic response of the eleven" in vv. 15a, 15b and 20a is not compelling (pp. 31—32).

170 P. Mirecki, "Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Reduction," pp. 32—33. Mirecki (p. 14) agrees with J. Hug and others on this point but offers no argument of his own to support it.

171 Mirecki's argument that Mark 16:9b (τοίς ἐκάνεις ἑτέρα δοξάσθησιν: cf. Luke 8:53) should also be regarded as a later addition does not appear until Appendix Three ("Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Reduction," pp. 145—146). Mirecki does not indicate whether he thinks that v. 9b was added by the same individual who wrote vv. 16—19, 20b, 20c.

172 In chapter 4 I respond to this and other arguments against the compositional unity of the LE.
Assuming the validity of these last two points, the remainder of Mirecki's second chapter (pp. 35-106) studies the individual formulations incorporated into vv. 16-19. Afterward chapter 3 ("Redaction Criticism of Mark 16:9-20," pp. 107-142) focuses primarily on the earlier core narrative of vv. 9-15 and 20. Regardless of whether one accepts Mirecki's history-of-traditions analysis of the LE, however, there is much to appreciate in his discussion of the micro-forms contained in vv. 15-19. Toward the beginning of this third chapter, Mirecki focuses upon the terms used for the appearances and for belief.173 In the second part of this chapter, he offers a "narratology analysis of the core narrative" (pp. 121-133) and applies literary-critical methods to distinguish between "a real author, an implied author and a narrator" in the non-interpolated passage (p. 122). For example, it is interesting that in v. 20a, which narrates the departure on the mission without relating the response to the apostolic preaching, "the reader is unexpectedly made an actor in the story."174

The dissertation's second appendix, "The Problem of the Anonymity of the Risen Jesus and the Eleven" (pp. 143-145), sheds some light on the reason for Mirecki's interest in reconstructing the core narrative behind Mark 16:9-20. According to Mirecki, this reconstructed passage, rather than Mark 16:1-8, originally followed after Mark 15:47.175 His final words at the end of his dissertation offer a vision for developing such an argument in a future study:

173 P. Mirecki, "Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Redaction," pp. 107-121. Like the earlier word studies of J. Burgon, W. Farmer, J. Hug and V. Krauss, this section comprises a series of ZIDV-like word studies of key vocabulary terms in the LE. The three wide groups he discusses are: ephoros, logos, oikonomia, and xivrouma, with a focus on the latter. Occasional insights, such as the following on the points at which unbelief is mentioned, have merit: "In each instance (vv. 11, 13 and 14), and similar to other early Christian usage, it is clear that the object of disbelief is a message" (p. 118).

174 P. Mirecki, "Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Redaction," p. 122. By contrast, the hardly intelligible argument that "the integrity of the core narrative is further demonstrated by the coincidence of evaluative and perspectological points of view with spatial oppositions within the text" borders on academic circumlocution (p. 128). Later in chapter 3, moreover, Mirecki's return to the discussion of the "secondary nature of the redaction of Mark 16:16-19, 20b" adds little, if anything, to the thesis presented in chapter 2 (pp. 133-142; cf. pp. 33-34).

175 Mirecki argues that the core narrative was not an independent pericope but was originally "written to follow the close of the passion narrative in Mark [15:47]" (Mark 16:9-20: Composition, Tradition and Redaction," p. 144). As a result, he leaves the impression that this core narrative presents an ending to Mark which should be regarded as more original than Mark 16:1-8.

It is hoped that this recognition of the nature of the text as a well-written literary composition will function as a starting point for a total reevaluation of the text in terms of its own textual history, its narrative story, its relation to similar texts, and especially its puzzling relation to the Gospel of Mark (pp. 130-151).

Indeed, if with LE's "puzzling relation to the Gospel of Mark" Mirecki refers to the thesis that his core narrative, which originally occurred after Mark 15:47, was secondarily supplanted by Mark 16:1-8, the end of his study raises more questions than it answers.

Finally, Steven Lynn Cox's ambitious inquiry into a variety of areas related to the LE was published in 1993.176 Most of Cox's work offers a critique of secondary sources on a variety of issues related to the various Markan endings. For example, in chapter 2 Cox addresses the history of scholarship on the LE from the second century through the Medieval and Reformation periods (pp. 13-51). Chapter 3, moreover, reviews the arguments of those, including J. Burgon and W. Farmer, who continue to affirm the Markan authorship of the LE (pp. 53-95). Cox also discusses the possibility that euqo eurp (Mark 16:8) was not Mark's intended conclusion,177 as well as a variety of explanations why Mark 16:8 should be regarded as the original end of Mark.178

A conclusion (chapter 6) summarizes the insights stemming from this extensive and disparate literary review (pp. 207-211) and offers a few proposals for future research (pp. 211-215). Appendix A (pp. 217-222) lists which church fathers cite or allude to the LE but, unfortunately, does not...
offer exact references for these early Christian writings. At the time he wrote, he was not aware of P. Mirecki’s 1986 dissertation, and Cox only refers in passing to J. Hug’s important 1978 book in a footnote. Accordingly, Cox’s contribution to the understanding of the LE and of other aspects of the Markan endings comprises primarily a summary and critique of a number of the important studies published in English.

C. The Aims of this Investigation

The history of scholarship offered above allows for the generalization that Mark 16:9—20 has all too often been neglected in the past two centuries. Among those in recent decades who have studied this passage, there is no consensus about the possible literary relationship of the LE to Mark and the other NT Gospels. There also remain numerous aspects of this passage that have never been explored. These twelve verses thus give rise to a plethora of questions meriting exploration, and this study will seek to further the discussion of those which, in my view, are most crucial for explaining the origin of the passage and the distinctive views of this author toward the Christian mission.

For one thing, the passage begins with three post-resurrection appearances of Jesus which resemble passages in the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John (Mark 16:9—14). The questions whether this author was influenced by and, moreover, had access to a copy of one or more of the NT Gospels are addressed in chapters 2 and 3. Second, the observation that the author of the LE wrote in light of the four NT Gospels supports the argument that Mark 16:9—20 is not a fragment of another, now lost, work, but was

---

179 G. L. Cox, History and Critics of Scholarship, p. 22 n. 151; cf. on this point J. K. Elliott’s review of Cox in NovT 27 (1985) 205. Cox summarizes simply that Hug denied the LE’s authenticity although affirmed its canonicity, a point which largely misses the heart of Hug’s work. It is also inaccurate for Cox to state that “Hug (p. 213) concluded that the longer ending was appended in the late first century to the early second century,” for Hug himself places the date “in the second third of the second century” (La finale de l’évangile de Marc, p. 213). P. J. Cahill’s review of Hug (CRQ 42 [1980] 270—271), which Cox may well be paraphrasing at this point, incorrectly summarizes (p. 271) that Hug’s vocabulary comparison supports the dating of the passage to “the end of the first century or the middle of the second century.” Also curious is the fact that Cox never interacts with, or even refers to, Hug’s own history of scholarship, which includes numerous items not even mentioned in Cox’s discussion. In a conversation during the fall of 1998, however, Cox informed me of his intent to offer a more complete review of scholarship, including an expanded discussion of Hug and others.

180 In these chapters I will argue (contra W. Farmer and J. Hug respectively) that the author of the LE, although undoubtedly different from “Mark,” was nonetheless dependent upon actual copies of each of the NT Gospels.

---

181 In Chapter 4 it will be argued that the Longer Ending is the composition of a single author. Moreover, one can ascertain rather precisely the date of the LE’s composition. The terminus post quem for the point at which the four NT Gospels had been collected and compared with one another (probably not before ca. 120—150 CE). The LE may well have been written before Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3.10.5) cited Mark 16:19 as a part of Mark’s Gospel around 180 CE. Since it can also be demonstrated that Justin Martyr (Apol. 1.35-35), writing ca. 155—161 CE, reflects knowledge of Mark 16:9—20, the LE should be dated to ca. 120—150 CE.

182 The author of the LE had a great appreciation for the role of miracles in the Christian mission. Moving beyond the final post-resurrection appearance to “the eleven” (v. 14), Jesus commands the disciples to preach (v. 15) and promises that five signs will follow “those who believe” (vv. 17—18). Once Jesus sends the recently christened eleven (v. 14) on their mission (v. 15) and mentions the list of five signs (vv. 17—18), the disciples’ problems are instantly solved (ἐρωτούν ὦ ἐξ οὗ ἐστε ἐκ πατέρας ἐχρίστηκας, 20a), and the signs demonstrate the connection between those who preach and the exalted Lord, who continues to work with them (v. 20b).

183 The history of scholarship offered in this chapter focuses on works directly related to the LE. Elsewhere in this investigation important secondary studies pertaining to the specific topics—e.g., gospel traditions in the second century (Chapter 3); miracles as depicted in the early Christian mission (Chapter 5)—are addressed in Chapters 2—7. It is argued in Chapter 4 that the Longer Ending is the composition of a single author. Furthermore, one can ascertain rather precisely the date of the LE’s composition. The terminus post quem for the point at which the four NT Gospels had been collected and compared with one another (probably not before ca. 120—150 CE). The LE may well have been written before Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 3.10.5) cited Mark 16:19 as a part of Mark’s Gospel around 180 CE. Since it can also be demonstrated that Justin Martyr (Apol. 1.35-35), writing ca. 155—161 CE, reflects knowledge of Mark 16:9—20, the LE should be dated to ca. 120—150 CE. The author of the LE had a great appreciation for the role of miracles in the Christian mission. Moving beyond the final post-resurrection appearance to “the eleven” (v. 14), Jesus commands the disciples to preach (v. 15) and promises that five signs will follow “those who believe” (vv. 17—18). Once Jesus sends the recently christened eleven (v. 14) on their mission (v. 15) and mentions the list of five signs (vv. 17—18), the disciples’ problems are instantly solved (ἐρωτούν ὦ ἐξ οὗ ἐστε ἐκ πατέρας ἐχρίστηκας, 20a), and the signs demonstrate the connection between those who preach and the exalted Lord, who continues to work with them (v. 20b).
Chapter 2

Literary Dependence: The Imitation of Traditional Material

by the Author of Mark 16:9—20

We have thought it right to state and discuss the evidence affecting the end of St. Mark's Gospel at a length disproportionate to the usual scale of these notes. Much of the evidence is of so intricate a nature that a bare recital of its items, ranged according to our judgement on one side or another, would have done injustice both to the merits of the case and to the eminent critics who have treated of this at first sight difficult question.1

A. Introduction

As the title indicates, this chapter does not merely revisit the familiar debate of the Longer Ending’s Markan or non-Markan authorship. The following analysis has two parts. That comprising chapter 2 discusses philological matters and compares the LE’s literary features primarily with those of Mark, the other NT Gospels and Acts. Chapter 3 considers the question how to determine dependence on written or oral tradition with an eye to J. Hug’s treatment of the LE, and to the methodology of Helmut Koester in his discussion of other early Christian writings. In a detailed and influential analysis, Joseph Hug maintains that the LE’s author was independent of the NT evangelists’ writings; rather, this author used the same written traditions (Vorlagen) as Matthew, Luke and John.2 It will be argued here that these hypothetical texts are both unlikely to have survived into the middle of the second century and are in any case unnecessary to account for the numerous verbal similarities between the LE and other NT passages.3 A more satisfying explanation lies in the hypothesis that the LE’s author deliberately imitated

4 An alternate hypothesis would be to describe the parallels in terms of dependence on oral traditions based upon the evangelists’ writings. “Oral traditions” could include the influence of the written Gospels when they are read in the Christian community. Nonetheless, the correspondences between the LE and the NT Gospels are so striking that dependence upon written documents is the most likely explanation.

5 At various points in his discussion of the LE’s style, Eugen Hezel (“Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums [Mt 16, 9–20]”, e.g., pp. 14, 16–17, 46) criticizes Ernst Hartmann (Der Aufbau des Markusevangeliums), who, as noted in chapter 1, argues for the LE’s authenticity and highlights the passage’s similarities to the Gospel of Mark. One weakness of Hezel’s discussion is that he has little response for Hartmann’s observations concerning Markan elements in the LE. The analysis offered here looks, when possible, for all significant features of Mark 16:9–20, both Markan and non-Markan. This approach is similar to that of V. Krause, who also discusses a number of possible influences on the LE (“Verrecht des Evangeliums”, pp. 205–215; cf. pp. 216–221).

6 The presence of Markan elements in the LE, of course, does not pro facto constitute an indication of Markan authorship. An accomplished student of Greek who had access to a copy of Mark’s presentation of “the gospel of Jesus Christ” (Mark 1:1) — or who at least knew the wording of Mark well because of having heard it read on numerous occasions — could reproduce certain aspects of this evangelist’s writing in a later composition. A writer well acquainted with Matthew, Luke and John could also incorporate aspects of these writings. As a result, certain similarities with Mark do not support Markan authorship any more than the LE’s verbal agreements with the other NT Gospels suggest that any one of these evangelists penned the LE.
phrases are novel compositions reflecting the work of the LE's author. What is missing in other discussions is adequate attention given to the fact that quite a number of the LE's "non-Markan" elements resemble passages in Matthew, Luke, John, and Acts.7

Accordingly, this analysis will broaden the traditional scope of comparison beyond Mark 1:1—16:20 (Markan vs. non-Markan elements) to include the other NT Gospels and Acts.8 Although the striking parallels to the four NT Gospels do not speak directly to the question of authorship, they are extremely valuable for another reason. It could well be of concern to someone who appended an addition to the Second Gospel as long as Mark 16:9—20 that the new passage resembles certain elements of the work it was intended to continue. Such a perceived need would explain a number of "Markan" features within the LE.9 The author of the Longer Ending, moreover, shows numerous signs of having written in light of all four of the NT Gospels. The hypothesis that the LE's author was an imitator of earlier traditions will thus be tested here. That is to say, the vast majority of 16:9—20 does not bear marks of this author's own novel composition or style, but rather those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

This chapter could, hypothetically, focus on as many first- and second-century writings as the LE's author chose to imitate. It is the choices of the LE's author that have determined the focus of this chapter on the writings that came to be known as the NT Gospels and Acts. Thus, the approach of this and the following chapter, in which the LE is compared primarily with Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Acts, does not reflect an arbitrary preference for writings which eventually became canonical but aims to reflect the decisions of this author. To demonstrate the validity of this approach, both similarities to the NT Gospels and Acts and differences from certain extra-

canonical Gospels and other Christian writings must be considered. The first part of this comparison is the main focus of chapters 2 and 3. The following excursus on extra canonical Christian writings concerns the second part.

Excursus: The Likelihood of the LE's Literary Dependence upon One or More Extra canonical Christian Writings

The analysis following this excursus compares the LE with analogous words and phrases in the four NT Gospels and Acts. Those familiar with the various positions taken by scholars concerning the use of oral tradition and written texts in writings as diverse as the so-called Apostolic Fathers, the second-century apologists, Marcion, Celsius, the various writings associated with the New Testament Apocrypha and the Nag Hammadi library will undoubtedly agree that the approach to be taken here requires some justification.

Even a cursory reading of Mark's Longer Ending reveals a number of phrases which resemble NT texts and call for an explanation. In theory, these similarities could be the result of:

1) quoting oral tradition which was independent of the NT Gospels; 2) citing written documents - either written documents (Forlagen) earlier than the NT Gospels or later summaries, harmonies or adaptations of one or more Gospel Mss; 3) recapping from memory the NT Gospels; or 4) referring to actual copies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

The merit of the first three options for explaining the LE in relation to various forms of traditional material is to be discussed here.

The first scenario, of course, must always be viewed as a possibility for any early Christian writing. Scholars always face certain insurmountable difficulties, however, in proceeding much further beyond the observation that a certain author seems to have consulted oral tradition. This is because, without the benefit of tape recorders and video cameras in antiquity, oral tradition always remains a largely unknown entity to later generations, except as it happens to have been recorded in writing. As a result, if the author of the LE used only oral tradition which was not preserved in at least one other writing, there exists no means of analyzing either the contents of these sources or how he used them, and thus little or nothing more to discuss on this issue.

Of greater concern is the second possibility, namely whether the LE's author was influenced by written documents other than the NT Gospels. In order for this possibility to constitute anything more than an a priori suggestion, there must be evidence that such written materials actually existed when this author composed the LE. It would thus not inspire confidence to maintain that, although the LE resembles the NT Gospels, its author cited

---

7 Compare, e.g., Mark 16:10 and John 20:11—18; Mark 16:12 and Luke 24:13—35; Mark 16:15 and Matt 28:9; Mark 16:19 and Acts 1:2, 1:11, 1:22; and see the discussions below in this chapter.
8 Mention of the NT Gospels is not intended to imply an authoritative collection of 27 books. It will, however, be argued in chapter 3 that the LE points to the existence of a four- Gospel canon at the time the passage was written. That is to say, in order to understand the author of Mark 16:9—20, a new standard is needed for analyzing the parts of the LE, namely the distinction between traditional and redactional elements in the passage. For purposes of this analysis, traditional elements are defined as those which closely resemble, and may ultimately stem from, the writings of the other NT Gospels. This study will conclude that traditional materials make up the majority of the LE.
9 This was not a universal criterion for making additions to Mark, however. Neither the author of the Shorter Ending to Mark (Codex Bobiensis [P6]) nor the person who interpolated the Fore-Logion into the LE (Codex Freerianus [W, 083]) shows any such interest in crafting an ostensibly Markan addition.
other documents which also are strikingly similar to the same texts.\textsuperscript{10} Such arguments often rest on the assumption that one or more hypothetical texts actually existed, although the character of such texts remains unknown.

Thus, for the second possibility to be an alternative which can be proven, one must be able to compare two or more texts whose content is both consistent with one another and different from the NT Gospels. Only when this criterion is satisfied can one begin to discuss the nature of another written source which has not survived except in the partial citations of other authors.\textsuperscript{11} With regard to the LE, one finds a text that bears a striking resemblance to the NT Gospels but does not reflect extensive, verbatim citations from them. As a result, all that is required to support the possibility of the second option is the existence of another text which differs from the NT Gospels in ways that correspond to one or more expressions in Mark 16:9—20.

In considering how to satisfy this criterion, however, caution is also in order. If the LE resembles the formulations of one or more texts over and against those preserved in the NT Gospels, the second option is not yet proven. This is because similarities between the LE and another text can point to at least four possibilities, namely that:

2a) both the LE and another text point to gospel material which is older than the NT Gospels; 2b) the LE's author and another writer both cited the same summary, harmony, or adaptation of one or more Gospel MSS; 2c) the author of the LE made use of the other text, perhaps as an authoritative source for the post-resurrection activity of Jesus; 2d) the other writer was dependent on the LE.

In the cases where 2c) or 2d) is the most likely option, the explanation concerning the use of a common source is unnecessary since one author relies upon the other.\textsuperscript{12} With regard to the possibility that the LE's author and another writer cited a third text independently of one another, these borrowings could point to the existence of a document which could be (2a) earlier than the NT Gospels, or possibly (2b) a later adaptation of them.

In what follows it will be argued that no extracanonical writing resembles the LE in ways that are distinctive from the NT Gospels. This would exclude the possibility that other written traditions influenced the LE's author. The argument is, admittedly, largely a negative one, but it is an important observation to make, especially in light of the fact that a number of other second-century authors preferred oral testimony to written traditions. Thus, in the case of the LE, this possibility should not be excluded without an examination of the evidence. This inquiry builds on the observations of Joseph Hug, who offers an extensive study of the LE's vocabulary as compared with a number of other diverse Christian traditions, including the NT. Hug's observations bear upon the task of ascertaining what, if any, extracanonical traditions the LE's author may have consulted when writing Mark 16:9—20.\textsuperscript{13} The eleven parts of his study will be discussed sequentially:

1) the vocabulary of the resurrection; 2) the date of the resurrection and chronological indications; 3) the vocabulary of the appearance of the Resurrected; 4) he manifested himself in another form' (16:12); 5) the situation of the disciples; 6) the sending on a mission; 7) the alternative (16:16); 8) the signs; 9) the ascension and session at the right hand; 10) the departure on a mission; and 11) the cooperation and assistance of the Savior.

This comparison of vocabulary has value also for this excursus because it highlights the numerous points at which the LE resembles NT passages in contrast with other early Christian writings.

\textsuperscript{10} For such an argument, see, e.g., Julian V. Hills, whose otherwise instructive dissertation on the Epitome Apostolorum largely ignores source-critical questions (Tradition and Composition in the Epitome Apostolorum [Harvard Dissertations in Religion 18; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990] esp. p. 65).

\textsuperscript{11} In the study of the Synoptic Gospels, e.g., most NT scholars point the existence of the "Q" source from the similar wordings of Matthew and Luke not contained in Mark, and afterward seek to ascertain the original content and character of "Q." If, however, Matthew or Luke had not survived, this task would be, if not impossible, significantly more difficult. For example, if Luke had been lost, one would have a much harder time distinguishing between special Markan material ("M") from what was originally a part of "Q."

\textsuperscript{12} Certain parts of this excursus will touch upon the question whether the author of the Gospel of Peter knew the LE. For reasons outlined below, it will be argued that there are no examples of 2c), and that Justin Martyr and perhaps the author of the Gospel of Peter knew the LE and would thus fit into the category of 2d).

\textsuperscript{13} J. Hug, La fin d'événant de Marc, pp. 39—162; see chapter 1 on this part of Hug's study. This section of Hug's book, entitled "Analyse de la Fianale," compares the LE's vocabulary with numerous NT and extracanonical writings of the first and second centuries. In addition to drawing on Hug's study, I have, to the best of my knowledge, read all extant early Christian writings before I began, and many which are later than ca. 160 CE, with the goal of ascertaining which texts bear upon the question at hand. See chapter 4 on the date of the LE. Irenaeus, writing around 180 CE, cites the LE as a part of Mark and thus offers a certain terminus ante quem for the LE's composition. Although theoretically possible, it is highly unlikely that a writer later than Irenaeus could preserve independent traditions that were also used by the LE's author. In chapter 4 it is also argued that Justin Martyr reflects knowledge of the LE. Accordingly, the following involves a critical analysis of Hug's observations to which I have added comments on a number of additional first- and second-century Christian writings.
With regard to (1) the vocabulary of the words: ἀναστάς (v. 9), ζητί (v. 11) and ἐγερμένων (v. 14). Because of the frequency with which ἀναστάς and ἐγερμένων occur in a variety of first- and second-century writings, it is difficult to date the LE on the basis of their occurrences. Perhaps the closest analogy to the active participle ἀναστάς appears in Ignatius' Letter to the Smyrnaeans, according to which Christ ταύτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαιθαν . . . καὶ ἄλλης ἐπάθαν, ὡς καὶ ἄλλης ἐνάστησεν αὐτοῖς (Smyrn. 2.1). Although the term used for the resurrection is the same, this alone cannot support either a common source for, or a literary relationship between, these two authors. The same may also be said for Justin Martyr, who also uses active participial forms of ἀναστάς in reference to the resurrection. Moreover, the most analogous uses of the verb ἐφέυνοι appear in Luke-Acts (Luke 24:5, 24:23, Acts 1:3, 2:28, 25:19) and Revelation (Rev 2:8; cf. 13:14, 20:4—5) rather than in extracanonical writings. In other Christian writings I have found no first- or second-century parallel for the perfect passive participle ἐγερμένων. As a result, the only plausible source for ζητί is Luke-Acts and possibly Revelation.

Hug's discussion of (2) the date of the resurrection and chronological indications also does not point conclusively to parallels outside the NT.

His investigation of the timing denoted by καὶ ἐφέυνοι σαββάτου in Mack 16:9 has two parts. First, he finds only one passage in Justin's writings to support the assertion that the singular σαββάτου indicates a later time of composition. His second point about the importance of the day, Sunday, when the women came to the tomb is more nuanced but also speculative.

With regard to (3) the appearances of the risen Jesus, the LE uses rather distinctive vocabulary: ἐφέυνοι, ν. 9; ἐφανέρωται, ν. 12 and 14; ἔκδηλον, ν. 14. The verb ἐφέυνοι has no NT parallel in passages mentioning the resurrection of Jesus and occurs in the writings of only one second-century Christian author, namely Justin Martyr and Melito of Sardis. One passage by Justin discusses the eighth day, "in which our Lord appeared from the dead (ἐν τῇ ἐφάνεσθαι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ)". This comparison with Justin, however, is somewhat complex in that Justin could well have borrowed these words from the LE. For his part, Melito speaks of Christ, "who appeared both to the dead in Hadades and to mortals in the world (ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἐν δόνω ἐφάνεθαι καὶ τοῖς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐφάνεθαι)." Here again there is nothing to indicate a direct influence on the author of the LE.

As Hug also observes, only John 21:14 and Barnabas 15:9 contain occurrences of ἐφανέρωσεν analogous to that in the LE. While the authors of the LE and of John 21 use the aorist indicative ἐφανέρωσεν, the aorist participial ἐφανέρωσεσ is found in Barnabas. In addition, there is no anal-
gous use of the verb 

Also follows that the LE’s use of these three verbs with reference to the appearances of the risen Jesus did not arise from any known extracanonical Christian source.

Moreover, Jesus’ second appearance (4) “in another form (ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ) μορφῇ, v. 12) also does not point to the use of extracanonical sources.26 Hug rejects the explanation that Mark 16:12 reflects some influence of the Emmaus narrative of Luke 24. He argues instead that the appearance of Jesus in another glorious “form” bears comparison to Ovid’s Metamorphoses and discusses also the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (49:2—51:1), which, in his view, provide closer analogies to the glorious “form” Jesus assumed after death.27 In the latter writing Baruch wonders whether those who will be raised from the dead will have the same “shape” or “form” (49:2—3). The Lord responds that at present before the day of judgment, “the earth” holds the dead “not changing anything in their form” (50:2). After the judgment, however, both the guilty and “righteous will be changed” (51:1). Although Hug’s comparisons provide a possible literary analogy to Mark 16:12,28 the LE’s dependence on Luke and the influence of passages like the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 49—51 are not necessarily mutually exclusive possibilities.

Hug’s analysis of (5) “the situation of the disciples” covers their description as τοὺς μετ’ αὐτῷ γενομένους (Mark 16:10),29 their weeping and mourning (16:10); the eleven at the table (16:14a),30 their disbelief (16:11, 13, 14b); and the rebuke of Jesus (16:1b). The most important of these for this discussion is the description of the disciples as πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν in Mark 16:10. While authors of the NT never refer to the disciples in this way, a number of other early Christian writers do.31 Hug finds such a description to be a common motif in texts as diverse as the Gospel of Peter, the Epistula Apostolorum, the Apocryphon of James,32 and the Gospel according to the Hebrews33 and argues that the LE’s author made use of this motif but did not borrow directly from any particular extracanonical source.34 Of these four writings, only the Gospel of Peter and the Epistula Apostolorum merit discussion in the paragraphs to follow.

In the Gospel of Peter the apostle relates autobiographically that he and others “hid” themselves from the Jewish leaders after the death of Jesus.35 He explains, “Because of all these things we were fasting and sat mourning other Christian literature suggests the LE’s independence (La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 49—71). It will be argued below that Hug misses an important parallel to this part of the LE in Mark 14:18. I agree, however, that the LE does not reflect borrowing from any extracanonical source at this point.

26 F. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 61—67.
28 The question arises, however: is Jesus’ “form” different from that of Mark 16:9 (the first appearance to Mary Magdalene) or of Mark 1:1—6a? In chapter 41 he offers an alternative interpretation of Mark 16:12 and focuses upon the way in which the author of the LE combined different traditions, sometimes with the result of the vagueness evident in Mark 16:12. On the meaning of ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ, see also H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 402. The ET cited above for the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch is by A. F. E. Johnston in OTP, 1:631—638.
29 I agree with Hug, who notes that the description τοὺς μετ’ αὐτῷ γενομένους “est assez singulière dans les récits de la résurrection” and merits comparison with NT expressions like Mark 3:14.
30 Problems, however, is Hug’s inference that the similarity between Mark 3:14 (καὶ εἶδον αὐτῶν τοὺς δίκαιους διδάσκοντας) and Mark 16:10 may be explained in terms of common pre-Synoptic tradition (La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 67—68). See below the discussion of Mark 16:10, where it is suggested that τοὺς μετ’ αὐτῷ γενομένους reflects a reworking of Mark 3:14 by the author of the LE.
31 Concerning the description of the disciples reclining at table (διακοσμεῖται, v. 14), Hug infers that the absence of an apologetic motif analogous to passages in Luke—Acts and
and weeping (πνεοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες) night and day until the sabbath” (7:27). Such a description of the disciples after the crucifixion matches both the context and wording of the LkE. In addition, those same disciples continue to weep and mourn after the resurrection was announced to the women who visited Jesus’ tomb:

Now it was the last day of unleavened bread and many went away and repaired to their homes, since the feast was at an end. But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and mourned (πνεοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες), and each one, very grieved for what had come to pass, went to his own home. (14:38—59)

In light of the similar contexts and wording between the Gospel of Peter and the LkE, it is possible that one of these authors knew of the other’s work.

On the one hand, one could posit that the LkE’s author read the reference to the silence of the women in the Gospel of Peter 15:37, noticed the similarity to Mark 16:8, and borrowed from Gospel of Peter 14:59 the description of the disciples who “wept and mourned” (Mark 16:10) before Jesus’ appearance to them in Mark 16:14. The LkE’s author would then have related in Mark 16:9—14 three separate appearance stories, which are all different from the one that seems to begin in Gospel of Peter 14:60: “But I, Simon Peter, and my brother Andrew took our nets and went out to sea. And there was Levi, the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord . . .”

On the other hand, the question whether the author of the Gospel of Peter knew and drew from the NT Gospels is still hotly debated. J. Decker, who is followed by H. Koester, argues that the Gospel of Peter reflects independent citations of oral tradition and gives this Gospel an early date (100—130 CE). Schweinleicher, however, disputes this claim: “The verbal agreements between the Gospel of Peter and the NT Gospels are too numerous to allow us to uphold so sharp a rejection of their knowledge and use.”

A resolution to this debate cannot be offered in this context. The position taken here is that, if one of these authors knew the other’s work, the similarities can be more readily explained in terms of the historical priority of the LkE, which was known as a part of Mark by the author of the Gospel of Peter. If the author of the Gospel of Peter knew the NT Gospels and the LkE, the progression of the texts to which he referred can be ascertained: 1) Mark 16:8 (Gos.Pet. 13 [57]); 2) Mark 16:14 (Gos.Pet. 14 [58—59]); 3) John 21 (Gos.Pet. 14 [60]).

The other writing to be considered in this connection is the Epistula Apostolorum, which survives only in Ethiopic and in Coptic fragments. The three women who visited the tomb of Jesus and “took ointment to pour upon his body” were portrayed as “weeping and mourning over what had happened” (c. 9). With the order of the participle reversed, the same description appears shortly thereafter: “...as they were weeping and mourning immediately before the appearance of Jesus in the Epistula Apostolorum 9—10 parallel to a certain extent the description of the disciples in Mark 16:10. There is not sufficient evidence, however, to indicate that the LkE’s author borrowed this from this text or then applied this description to the sorrowful disciples in the LkE, who listened to Mary Magdalene (Mark 16:9) and waited until Mark 16:14 for Jesus to appear to them.

Accordingly, there are similar references to weeping and mourning in the Gospel of Peter, the Epistula Apostolorum, the Apocryphon of James and the LkE, but it is highly unlikely that all four texts point to a common source. The two writings that are most similar to one another are the Gospel of Peter and the LkE. Hug offers the most plausible explanation for the LkE’s similarity with these writings, namely that the author of the LkE used a motif common to certain second-century writings without borrowing directly from any particular extracanonical source.

With regard to Jesus’ appearance to the eleven disciples (τοῖς ἑνδέκα), Mark 16:14), the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles relates a similar appearance. This Nag Hammadi writing, which dates to either the second or third century, relates the following: “Then he had (in this way) truly revealed to us that it was he, we prostrated ourselves on the ground and worshipped him — we were eleven disciples.” The context of this

39 Epistula Apostolorum 10. Of related interest is the fact that the Epistula Apostolorum, which initially mentions the “three women” (c. 9), afterward offers only Mary Magdalene as speaker in e. 10: “And Mary came to us and told us. And we said to her, ‘What have we to do with you, O woman? He that is dead is buried, can he live then?’ And we did not believe her, that our Savior had risen from the dead.” In the Ethiopic version she is given the name “Mary,” but in the Coptic she is “Martha.” It is likely that the Coptic “Martha” is secondary. After the disciples disbelieve and Jesus commands another to go and say “this again to them,” the Coptic reads, “Mary came and told us again” (emphasis added). The statement that Mary “again” assures that she came the first time. Contrast with the Ethiopic, which states that Sarah came the second time after Mary came the first. Mary’s coming a second time clearly stands in tension with the Lord’s command that “another of” the women go. Someone may thus have changed Mary to Martha, without realizing the problem caused below with the statement that “Mary came and told us again.”

40 J. Hug, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 65—69.

41 See NTApo, p. 412; ETI 2:422.
appearance of the risen Jesus to the eleven has obvious similarities to Matthew 28, Luke 24 and Mark 16:14 but does not resemble the wording of any one of these NT passages.

Hug also notes that the problem of disbelief is of concern in Matthew 28, Luke 24 and John 20, as well as in Ignatius' letter to the Smyrnaeans, the Epistula Apostolorum and Pseudo-Justin.42 In comparison with these other references, he grants that Thomas' doubt in John 20 "est i' illustration par excellence" for the LE but does not explore adequately the question whether the Fourth Gospel was also a source used by the author of the LE.43

Finally, concerning Jesus' rebuke (καὶ ἠκούσαν τὴν ἀπείκονισιν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν, v. 14b), Hug suggests that it is "very probable" that similar terms in the Shepherd of Hermas influenced the LE.44 The verbal agreements, however, are far from compelling and actually strengthen the case for the LE's independence of Hermas.45

The analysis of (6) vocabulary associated with the mission treats Mark 16:15 and 20a and discusses words for preaching (τυποῦσατο, ἐκθέον); the gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον); the word (ὁ λόγος); verbs designating a departure on a mission (πορεύοντες, ἐξελθόντες); and the area to be covered by the mission (ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπαντάνεται, παρά τῇ κτίσει, παντοκράτωρ).46 Hug notes that 'preaching the gospel' is a common formulation in Mark and that no extracanonical writing reflects the Markan expression τυποῦσατο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον as closely as Mark 16:15 does.47 The same is also true for the reference to "the word" in Mark 16:20a.48

Concerning the participles πορεύοντες and ἐξελθόντες, no extracanonical passage offers a more probable source for the LE than Matt 28:19 and Mark 6:12 do.49 To establish this point it is necessary to consider similar passages in the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, the Epistula Apostolorum and the Letter of Peter to Philip.

First, the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, a Nag Hammadi writing mentioned above in connection with an appearance to the eleven disciples, contains a commissioning. Jesus gives his followers a "medicine chest"50 and commands that they return to "the city" (Jerusalem?), "teach all those who have come to believe in my name that I (too) have endured hardships of the faith," and give "the poor of that city... what they need."51 Concerning "the pouche with the medicines," Jesus also commands that they "heal all the sick of this city who believe in my name."52 Such an instruction to teach and heal only believers differs with the commissionings of the NT Gospels and Acts, as well as that of the LE.

Second, in the Epistula Apostolorum Jesus charges the disciples, "Go and preach to the twelve tribes of Israel and to the gentiles and Israel to the land of Israel towards the East and West, North and South." Although the command to "go and preach" resembles Mark 16:15, it is unlikely that the LE's author borrowed from the Epistula Apostolorum these three words, which occur also in Mark and Matthew.

Third, a characteristic feature of the Letter of Peter to Philip is the prevalence of missionary instructions. When the disciples want to know how they "shall fight with the archons," Jesus gives a commission to "come together and teach salvation to the world." The reference to preaching in the final sentence of Letter to Peter to Philip is also unlike the LE: "Then the apostles separated to 'the four winds' that they might preach. And they went points when "the Blessed One" gives instructions to "preach the Gospel of the kingdom" (E.T. NTApO, 1:392–393).

42 See, e.g., Matt 28:19. See also J. Hug, who writes, "... ce vocable de l'Évangile particulièrement en clôche BCE [La finale de l'évangile de Marc, p. 113]; Hug's reference to Sim. 9:13c, 15.
43 Hug, La finale de l'évangile de Marc, p. 79.
44 For the καί μον ἀκούσαν τὴν καρδιάν αὐτῶν, οὓς συνέκτιεν διὰ τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν τοῦ ἄνθρωπος (Sim. 3:7:9), and δικαιούντως, ἡγείται τις ἀνθρώπῳ τῶν γενειακῶν τῶν καὶ λύων μητέρας ἀγγέλων ἢ ἢ πατέρας ἢ ἢ ἄρχοντας ἢ ἢ ἄνδρας ἢ ἢ γυναῖκας ἢ ἢ πάντα τοιαῦτα (Sim. 9:13:4); Hug's reference to Sim. 9:13c.
45 Hug, La finale de l'évangile de Marc, p. 79.
46 J. Hug, La finale de l'évangile de Marc, p. 81–84.
47 J. Hug, La finale de l'évangile de Marc, pp. 83–88. See Mark 1:14, 13:10 and 14:9 and the discussion below. Hug also finds a common root ("parent") in the language of the LE and Barn. 5:8–9 and 8:3 (p. 85). Such a connection, however, is questionable, for Barn. 5:8–9 discusses the righteousness of the apostles whom Jesus chose during his lifetime, and 8:3 offers a christological interpretation of the OT sacrifice of a bull. Note also that the Gospel of Mary bears a closer affinity to the Gospel of Matthew than to the LE at two
in the power of Jesus in peace."

54 The conclusion with a departure is similar to Mark 16:20, but such language only faintly resembles, if any NT passage, Matt 28:16–20 rather than the LE.55

Finally, Hug is correct to group the LE's mission charge with other texts envisioning a "perspective géographique, sans distinction."56 No first- or second-century Christian writing matches exactly either εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐπάνω αὐτής τή κτίσει. Accordingly, no extra canonical writing offers a plausible source for the wording of Mark 16:15.57 The closest wording to πάντῃ τῇ κτίσει appears in Colossians 1:23, which, as is argued below, probably reflects an independent formation.

With regard to Mark 16:7, Hug demonstrates that the concepts of this verse merit comparison with a number of second-century writings.58 The similarities with the Kerygma Petri,59 the Kerygma Petrou,60 and the

54 Letter of Peter to Philip, "Conclusion" (EF: NTAp, 1.352).
55 This section of Letter of Peter to Philip is referred to as the "Remande question of the apostles and answer of Jesus." The translation cited is from NTAp, 1.350. Cfr. the "Christophany" (ET: 1.351), which is also more like the end of Matthew than Mark 16:15:

"Then Jesus appeared to them, saying to them: Peces be with you [all] and with everyone who believes in my name. And when you go, may joy, grace and peace be yours. Do not faint-hearted! See, I am with you for ever." 59 It is surprising, however, that J. Hug omits Mark 13:10 (λέγων ὑμῖν τῷ θεῷ καὶ 14:9 (ἐγείρετο τὸν κόσμον) from this list (La finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, p. 93).
57 It is argued below that this formulation can be understood as a combination of several Synoptic passages. Contrast the LE's wording with I Clement 5:7 (ἐγείρετο τὸν κόσμον); 7:4 (καὶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον); 59:2 (ἐγείρετο τὸν κόσμον); Herm. Sim. 9:25:3 (ἐγείρετο τὸν κόσμον); Justin, Apol. 159:8 (ἐγείρετο τὸν κόσμον); and other passages cited in J. Hug, Le finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, p. 93.

In the Kerygma Petri the alternative is stated without mention of baptism. The risen Lord says of the "twelve" disciples, "... And I sent them... into the world to proclaim to men in all the world the joyful message that they may know that there is only one God, and that the time has come for the kingdom of God to be revealed. .. And to the end that those who hear and believe may be saved (σώζων οἱ δικαιομένων καὶ πιστεύοντες σωτηρίου); and that those who do not believe may testify that they have heard it (οἱ δὲ πιστεύοντες δικαιομένως πεπιστευκόμενοι) and not be able to excuse themselves saying, "We have not heard" (Kerygma Petri 3.1). Hug, Le finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, p. 239; the Greek text was edited by von Dobschütz and is cited by J. Hug, Le finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, p. 99.

60 Along with John 3:18, this passage is also discussed in chapter 4.

The Kerygma Petrou connects baptism with salvation but does not mention the alternative voiced in the LE and the Kerygma Petri: "And do not believe that you will ever have hope if you remain unbaptized, even if you are more pious than all the pious have been hitherto" (25.2; ET: NTAp, 2.337). Cfr. "Come then now, be you a righteous man or an unrighteous man. For if you are righteous, you need only to be baptized for salvation, but an unrighteous man ought not only to submit to baptism for the forgiveness of the sins he has committed in ignorance, but should also do good according to the measure of his past godlessness, as baptism requires" (27.1; ET: NTAp, 2.338).

61 Asc. Isa. 3.18: "... and that they will teach to all the nations and every tongue the resurrection of the Beloved, and that those who believe on his cross will be saved, and on his ascension to the seventh heaven, whence he came" (ET: NTAp, 2.605).
63 J. Hug, Le finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, pp. 103–104. See, e.g., Mark 6:5 and 9:39; John 20:30. Hug wisely does not limit himself to texts using the word σωθήνων but comments on the many miracles in early Christian writings. The question whether the LE's author articulates an original concept in vv. 17–18 will be examined in detail in chapters 3–7, which discuss in turn these verses' depiction of miracles, miracles, and miracles.
64 Cfr. Julian Hills, who, touching only briefly on the presentations of Jesus' miracles in sections 4–5 of the Epitoma Apostolorum, writes that "The reports are indistinguishable from those in other early Christian miracle lists, and observations concerning the final pair of reports suggests the possibility that a source list, written or oral, was taken over by the author of the Epitoma" (Tradition and Composition in the Epitoma Apostolorum, p. 65, emphasis added). It is unfortunate that Hills, who describes these as "indistinguishable from those in other early Christian miracle lists," does not consider the possibility of the influence of the NT Gospels on the Epitoma Apostolorum.
65 J. Hug, Le finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, pp. 128–133.
66 J. Hug's vocabulary study includes an unpersuasive attempt to assign a late date to the terms of Mark 16:9 (La finale de l'évangile de l'Édico, pp. 130–133). Hug ignores the fact that the LE's author uses the word θανάτου (Mark 16:9) which appears in Acts 1:11 and 22 and concludes that 16:9 "does not go back to the ancient layers of the tradition" (p. 132).

The grounds for such an argument, moreover, are unclear because his definition of "mediation" is not specified.
With regard to (10) the departure on a mission (Mark 16:20a), one passage of Justin Martyr deserves comment: in Apology I.45.5 he refers to the mission of the apostles after the resurrection and ascension as follows: εξελθόντες πανταχοῦ εκήρυξαν.⁶⁷ Although it is possible that Justin, writing independently of the LE, draws εξελθόντες εκήρυξαν from Mark 6:12 and πανταχοῦ from Luke 9:6, it is much more likely that Justin’s source for this information was Mark 16:20a (εξελθόντες εκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ).⁶⁸

In examining (11) the cooperation and assistance of the Savior in Mark 16:20b, Ehr divdes NT references into those which identify the presence of the glorified Jesus with signs or with the Spirit.⁶⁹ According to Ehr, the LE belongs to the first group and merits comparison with Matthew 28 and certain passages in Acts.⁷⁰ He concludes that the ideas present in 16:20b are novel and original to this author and that there is no likely source for the genitive absolute construction with which the LE ends.⁷¹ The questions of the LE’s originality and distinctiveness will be taken up in chapter 5. For now it can be noted that Mark 16:20b is not unique among early Christian writings. For example, in the Acts of Thomas the apostle refers to Jesus in a prayer, “you who are not seen with our bodily eyes...”⁷² In the Acts of Thomas it is through “words” like the raising of the girl in c. 54 that Jesus makes himself known. Such an understanding of Jesus who reveals himself in his “words” parallels the idea, but not the words, of LE, where the risen Christ confirms the Gospel through signs.

To summarize, this comparison of Mark 16:9—20 with a number of extracanonical Christian writings has found no evidence to suggest that the author of Mark’s Longer Ending wrote with the intention of either imitating or borrowing from any of these writings. The same is true in the case of any written sources that may have been used by the authors of, or subsequently based upon, any of these writings. At one point only the language of

the LE might possibly have been borrowed from one or more extracanonical Christian writings of the second century, namely the portrayal as those who had been with Jesus as πενθοῦσι καὶ καλοῦσιν (Mark 16:10). A comparison of Mark 16:10 with similar depictions in the Gospel of Peter, the Epistula Apostolorum and Apocryphon of James demonstrated that there is no sufficient evidence either to suggest the LE’s dependence on any one of these texts or to posit an additional written source behind two or more of them.

B. The Imitation of Mark and Other Writings by the Author of Mark 16:9—20

As mentioned above, the purpose of this chapter is to ascertain what can be known about the choice in wording that the author of the LE made when faced with a number of different sources of tradition. Presumably, a wide variety of traditional materials was available to this author at the time he composed the LE. The remainder of chapter 2 and much of chapter 3 will discuss the LE primarily in terms of its relation to the four Gospels of the NT. In contrast with the extracanonical writings surveyed in the preceding excursus, the NT Gospels offer much more material for comparison. This study aims to demonstrate that the LE’s author composed this passage to improve Mark’s ending in conscious imitation of the NT Gospels.⁷³

Numerous scholars have analyzed this passage to argue either for or against its Markan authorship.⁷⁴ William R. Farmer presents the strongest case thus far in the twentieth century for the authenticity of the LE.⁷⁵ Farmer also lays out concisely many pieces of data relevant to the question of the LE’s authenticity. More problematic is Farmer’s focus on the singular question his

---

⁶⁷ I agree with J. Ehr (La finale de l’évangile de Marc, pp. 153—156) that there are no extracanonical sources that may have influenced the selection of these five words.

⁶⁸ On this point see the argument for Justin’s knowledge of the LE in chapter 4. In Apol. I.45.5 Justin writes of the time after the ascension and interprets Psalm 110:1—3 as referring to “the powerful word (τὸ ἐννοοῦν αὐτῷ) of the apostles, [who] go out from Jerusalem, preached everywhere” (εἰς ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐξελθόντες, Mark 16:20b).

⁶⁹ J. Ehr, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, p. 160.

⁷⁰ J. Ehr, La finale de l’évangile de Marc, p. 161.

⁷¹ La finale de l’évangile de Marc, p. 161.


⁷³ An examination of the internal evidence is one of two inquiries pertinent to determining whether the author of the Second Gospel wrote the Longer Ending. As is also mentioned in chapter 1, the other is an examination of the external evidence: MSS, patristic citations and liturgical readings. For reasons outlined in chapter 1, this study does not discuss in detail these other avenues of inquiry.

⁷⁴ This is not to say, however, that no persuasive case exists. James K. Elliott’s article is a good example (“Text and Language,” pp. 255—262). Elliott is primarily concerned with establishing the original text of the LE, explaining textual variants and contrasting the LE with Mark 11:1—16.8. Robert Morgenstern’s statistical analysis, however, does not do justice to the data in that it assumes that the LE’s non-Markan authorship has been proved by the external evidence. The analysis of the LE and other texts is intended to prove the reliability of statistical analysis (R. Morgenstern, Statistik des Neuen Testamentlichen Wortschatzes (Zürich: Gotthelf, 1958) 58—60, 186).

⁷⁵ The Last Twelve Verses of Mark (SNTSMS 25; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
A comparison of analogies will clarify the difference between the method to be employed here and Farmer’s. Farmer seems to suppose that there is a free, democratic election, in which each of the words within a verse casts its vote ("yes," "no" or "maybe") concerning Markan authorship, and that each verse then sends its delegate to the final convention of twelve voices (that is, verses), who will ultimately decide the outcome. Borrowing a metaphor from American baseball, this study will examine these verses "at the plate" trying to get a "hit": once three "strikes" (or however many are found) occur, the umpire should pronounce that the proposal for Markan authorship is "out." Consequently, parts of the LE that the evangelist could have written are not as decisive as items that he most probably would not have.

The following examination of the language and style of Mark’s Longer Ending will proceed straight through the passage to determine whether the words and phrases of 16:9–20 resemble those of the Second Gospel. With regard to the LE’s Markan elements, it will be asked whether the similarities point to the evangelist’s hand or could be the work of a later imitator. Moreover, the non-Markan parts of the LE will also be compared with Matthew, Luke, John and Acts. At the end of most every verse, a summary of how wordings in the LE compare with those in the NT Gospels and Acts will be given.

Verse 9

*ἀναστάσις*

At first glance, the fact that the author of Mark uses the verb ἀναστάσις 16 times (of which 7 refer to the resurrection) could designate this word as a Markan feature. A closer look at Markan style reveals the opposite, however: at six points the evangelist consistently employs the accusative active participle to denote the act of rising from a sitting to a standing position, and not the resurrection.

Such a selective use of the participle is not particular to Mark, since Luke also reflects it in passages not parallel to Mark (Luke 1:39, 4:29, 4:38, Acts 5:17, 5:34, 9:18, 10:13, etc.). In fact, there is no participial use of ἀναστάσις in the NT Gospels or Acts which refers to the resurrection. In 16:9 occurs a usage that is not only non-Markan but atypical.

---

76 Numerous reviewers have agreed with W. Farner’s harsh criticisms of K. Jorgensen’s [Last Twelve Verses, pp. 79–83] but have seen little ultimate difference between the methods of these two scholars. See the comments of W. M. T. Davies (NT 1975 977), A. Wilke (CBQ 3:7 1975 230 and J. N. Birskhead (LJS 26 1976 152) in their reviews of Farmer’s book. By and large, Farmer’s objections do not strike me as particularly significant. This may explain why Farmer offers a study that is so similar to that of M. Farner.

77 There is a methodological problem with many of Farmer’s “yes” votes. I will correct this problem by offering a broader analysis of Mark’s use of a word or part of speech in comparison with that of the LE. It is not sufficient only to assert that Mark had used a certain word in 16:9–20 or that he could have done so again at a certain point in the LE. I do not intend to make light of these data but to redefine their significance: they are important initial observations but are not conclusive in themselves. When there are sufficient data, it is more useful to consider the Gospel of Mark more broadly to observe Mark’s own patterns of wording: when Mark wanted to express “he,” “a,” and “you” did he usually do this? I will then compare the data of what Mark was accustomed to writing with the little that can be ascertained about the writing style of the author of the LE. One rewarding example discussed below concerns the ways in which each author uses demonstrative pronouns (ὑος, ἐκεῖνος and τοιαύτα).
for the NT as a whole: any imitator could use the right vocabulary word, but only a more careful observer would also write a verbal form that Mark also used. In addition, while the NT usually speaks of Jesus having "been raised," Mark 16:9 uses the active participle of another verb. Thus, the word choice, verbal form, and voice are distinctive. 83

- προήγουν

A likely source for this word is the timing of Mark 16:2 (καὶ λεγόντας προήγουν τῇ μεγίστῃ τῶν σωμάτων ἐπέβαλεν τῷ μνημείῳ τῆς), which an imitator familiar with the narrative of the three women's visit to the empty tomb (Mark 16:1—8) could easily have followed.

- προέχθησαν

Unpersuasive is the argument of Gerhard Hartmann, who maintained that προέχθησαν reflects the influence of the LXX and is therefore not to be construed as a construction later than that of the NT Gospels. 84 On the contrary, this time indicator is a prime example of a later writer trying to improve, but still reflect, the timing of Mark 16:2 and its parallel passages. Whereas Mark (and with him, the other NT evangelists) used the word for "one" followed by the plural for Sabbath (τῇ μεγίστῃ τῶν σωμάτων, 16:2), the LE's author writes "first" and the singular for Sabbath. 86 The LE's formulation then, is best understood as a deliberate attempt to achieve agreement with Mark's timing while improving his wording.

- ἐφεξῆς

The word ἐφεξῆς is not a common means of denoting "a person 'appearing' after death," but a very different meaning ("a synonym of δοκεῖ") belongs to the word in Mark 14:54, the only Markan use of the verb. 87 In fact, the only NT author who uses ἐφεξῆς like Mark 16:9 is Matthew (Matt 1:20, 2:13, 2:19, etc.). Although a plausible source for this word remains elusive, there is no evidence that this use of ἐφεξῆς points to the imitation of Mark or other NT material. 88

- προήγουν

In 32 of 34 occurrences in the NT Gospels, this adverb describes the prior of two items as opposed to the first in a series of distinct events. 89 Προήγουν thus probably comes from the hand of the LE's author, who offers verses 9—10 as the first of Jesus' three appearances (cf. vv. 12a, 14a).

- ἑστήκαν

Mention of this Mary by name for the third time in ten verses of "Mark" (that is, Mark 15:47, 16:1 and 16:9) is an indication to some that the LE was not originally intended to follow Mark 16:8 because it would be unusual for the same author to make explicit her identity so repeatedly. On the contrary, the author of the LE, who certainly read the earlier occurrences in Mark, writes that Jesus appeared first only to Mary and not to the other women who had been with her. A likely reason for this clarification is that the LE's author knew of an appearance to this Mary in John 20:11—18.

- παρά + genitive and ἐπεξήγησεν

Six occurrences of so common a preposition as παρά + the genitive in Mark do not weigh heavily in the understanding of Markan style. Three of the six (Mark 2:21, 5:26, 8:11) use παρά + the third person personal pronoun, rather than παρά + a relative pronoun, as in Mark 16:9. 90 The larger philological question arises: when Mark describes an exorcism with

83 See, e.g., passive indicative occurances of the verb ἐρυθείς in Mark 16:6, Rom 6:4 and 1 Cor 15:4. Contrast E. Heilke, who minimizes the significance of the differences between the active and passive forms of ἐρυθεῖν ("Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums [Mark 16, 9-20]", pp. 10—11). 84 See chapter 4 on the implied subject of Mark 16:9a, namely ὅτι γονοῦσα. 85 Gerhard Hartmann, Der Aufbau des Markusevangeliums, pp. 229—230. Despite the numerous examples Hartmann cites from the LXX (e.g., the titles of Psalm 47: Σωτηρία τῶν ἑστήκας τῆς Κορινθίου; Παλαιᾶ τῆς Ἐφεσους; and Psalm 93: Σωτηρία τὸς Δικαίων, παραδόθησαν, ἐπεξήγησεν), some points to an analogous use of παρά in connection with the first day of the week. His analysis thus cannot support the "Einhard der LXX" in the case of Mark 16:9a (p. 216). 86 Even though Mark 16:9a stands out as unique in the NT for expressing Sunday morning this way, it is difficult to deem Mark 16:2 as an example of a "normative" idiom, since four of the other five NT examples are parallel to Mark (the is, Matt 28:1, Luke 24:1, John 20:1 and John 20:19). 87 W. Farmer, Last Twelve Verses, p. 84. Also interesting is that, where the author of Luke writes ἐφεξῆς (Luke 9:8, referring to Elijah), there is no analogous formulation in the parallel narrative in the Gospel of Mark (cf. Mark 6:1—16). 88 Note the discussion of I. Hug, who compares the words ἐφεξῆς (v. 9), ἐφεξῄν (vv. 12 and 14) and ἐπεξήγησεν (v. 14) with the language of the LXX, the NT and other Christian literature (La finale de l'évangile de Marc, pp. 55—61). Hug demonstrates the distinctiveness of the LE's vocabulary among NT and certain other early Christian authors. 89 For the general pattern see Mark 3:27 (οὑ τῶν ἐβαλόντων τοῦ τοῦτον αὐτὸν διαφώνεται) and Mark 13:10 (καὶ ἔλαβαν τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ μεταφημένου ἀγίου τοῦ ναοῦ). The two exceptions are Mark 4:28 (ἐπεξήγησεν ἀναλογίας), Mark 5:36 (ἐπεξήγησεν τοῦ συναντήσεως), and Mark 17:27 (Ἰωάννης δὲ οὐκ ἐκκαθήμενος αὐτούς, παρεβίωσεν καὶ ἐπεξήγησεν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς θάλασσας). 90 Mark 3:21: καὶ ἐπεξήγησεν ὁ παύσας ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐξελέγεται τοῦτον ἔλεγον γιὰ τὸ ἡξύφος, Mark 5:26—27: καὶ παύσατο ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἐπεξήγησεν καὶ ἀμένας ἐλέησεν ἀλλὰ μάλλον ἔδω τὸν ἐλεημονίαν ἐκείνῳ ἀνεφέρετο πρὸ τοῦ ττου, ἐξῆλθεν ἐν τῷ ὁραίῳ ὁμοιότατον τούτῳ συνεκασμενον αὐτοῦ τοῦ μακαρίου αὐτοῦ Mark 8:11. Καὶ ἐξηγήσατο ὁ Φαρισαῖος καὶ ἠρμονίως οὐκέπειν αὐτόν, ἐπηρεάστην τοῦτον μιμήμενον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, παραθέτοντα αὐτόν.
the verb ἔκβαλλω and also mentions the person exorcised, does he write ταράτων, use the preposition ἐκ, or employ some other construction? Unfortunately, there is little evidence to work with.91

It is more instructive to compare Mark 16:9b with its closest NT parallel, namely Luke 8:26: Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνής, δό θυ σαμίωνα ἐκτά ἐξελαθέτει. One difficulty with claiming that the LE’s author based his account on Luke is the fact that the LE’s wording for the name (Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή) differs somewhat from that of Luke 8:26 (ἡ Μαγδαληνή Μαρία; cf. Luke 24:10). A likely explanation stems from Jesus’ appearance to Mary in John 20. The wording Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή is consistent in Mark, Matthew, and John, but not in Luke. The likely dependence of John 20 on the LE’s author is the fact that this passage reports Jesus’ appearance to Mary Magdalene and nobody else. The consistent wording of Mark 16:1 (perhaps also Matt 28:1) and John 20 was probably a sufficient impetus to motivate the LE’s author to deviate slightly from Luke 8:26 at this point.

Even more striking are the remaining words of Mark 16:9b and Luke 8:26:

Mark 16:9b: ταράτων ἐκβάλεται κατὰ σαμίωνα

The change in the LE from the preposition ἐκτά to ταράτων is perhaps neither more nor less Markan. Above it was noted that Mark infrequently uses ἔκβαλλω for specific exorcisms but reserves this word for describing exorcisms in general. Ironically, however, it would follow that the form of Luke 8:26 (ἐξελαθέτει) could be considered more “Markan” than the LE’s ἐκβάλεται.92 A change by the LE’s author probably stems from the desire to be consistent with the verb used also in Mark 16:17c (σαμίωνα ἔκβαλοντων; cf. Mark 9:38) and to emphasize the role Jesus had played in casting out the seven demons.

91 Among the twelve Markan uses of ἔκβαλλω for exorcisms, there are summary statements (1:4, 139, 549, 615), mention of others’ work as exorcists (Mark 3:15, 9:18, 9:26, 9:38) a hypothetical example (3:22, 32), a point where Jesus sends someone away (1:43) and only one specific exorcism (7:25). Of the above references, Mark 7:26 is the closest match to the construction of the LE. The Syrophoenician woman asks Jesus τινα ταράτων ἔκβαλε κατὰ τήν μετακομίσαν αὐτής. It should be underscored, however, that none of the above verses from Mark use ἔκβαλλω as a relative pronoun like ταράτων.

92 W. Farmer is thus incorrect to write that the wording of Mark 16:9 is more Markan as compared with the parallel passage concerning Mary Magdalene in Luke 8:26 (Last Twelve Verses, p. 8). Conversely, Gerhard Hartmann calls attention to the Lukian preference for ἀθικὸν as opposed to the typical Markan usage of ἔκβαλλω (Der Aufbau des Markusevangeliums, pp. 223—236). Viewed in this light, the adaptation of Luke 8:26 could be understood an attempt to make Mark 16:9 appear more Markan.

Summary of the Analysis of Verse 9

The only potentially Markan words in this verse are the adverb ταράτων and Μαρία, τις Μαγδαληνής. The name corresponds to the form in John 20 and Mark 16:1 but not in Luke 8:2b and 24:10. The participle διάκονες does not resemble any NT use and probably reflects a later author who used a traditional term in a way not characteristic of the NT authors (cf. Justin, Dial. 11.1, 63.1, 133.1; Apol. 1.59.12, 63.16). One may regard similarly the improved wording of προφήτη σοββάντα. In addition, Μαρία, κατὰ σαμίωνα is a close restatement of Luke 8:2, in which the author of Mark 16:9b seems to allude to the appearance to Mary in John 20 and to elaborate the description of Mary in light of the tradition of Luke 8:2b. The author of the LE seems to assume here that his audience is familiar with the traditions preserved in Luke and John. Presumably, he writes with the hope that others will receive his addition to Mark because it resembles accounts they have already heard. The LE’s opening verse thus reflects no significant signs of Markan authorship or of an author who composed de novo.

Verse 10

Before analyzing the individual components of 16:10, it is necessary to observe the way in which this verse relates to the structure of the passage as a whole. The repeating pattern of v. 10a (ἐκείνη παραστάσατο ἐπιγένεται), v. 13a (κατὰ δὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπέδεικτο) and v. 20a (ἐκείνοις δὲ ἐπέδεικτον ἐπεργάζοντα) reflects the organization of the LE’s author. It will be argued here that the first of these constructions in verse 10 stems from some knowledge of John 20 and Matthew 28. As is maintained below, Mark 16:13 and 20 also reflect knowledge of earlier traditions (respectively, Luke 24 and Mark 6). Herein lies the skill of this author, who both allows himself to be informed by a number of diverse traditions and creates a unified, parallel composition.93

• ἐκείνη

Denoting Mary as “that woman” probably reflects some knowledge of Jesus’ appearance to Mary in John 20:15—16.94 The absolute use of this demonstrative pronoun referring to a person is rare in the NT, occurring elsewhere in only one other Johannine passage (John 11:29). The contrast with Mark may further be emphasized in such an atypical NT usage.

93 See the critique in chapter 1 of P. Mirel’s “Mark 16:9—20: Composition, Tradition and Reduction,” pp. 32—33, who posits a false dichotomy between an author’s creation of a parallel structure and the incorporation of traditional materials.

94 John 20:15—16: λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς; Γάρ, τί κλητέε; τίς γείτη; ἐκείνη δὲ δουκάνει ὅτι το κηρυκός ἐγὼ σελεύει. Κυρίε, λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς, Ἰωάννη; λέγει δὲ αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης, Μαρία, ἀποκρίθη κάποτε λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς, ἀποκρίθη (6 λέγεται διδάσκοι).
seems characteristic of the LE’s author, who employs absolute uses of ἐκεῖνος three times (cf. vv. 13b, 20a) and of κακεῖνος twice (vv. 11a, 13a) in this short passage.

* πορευέσθαι

This participle is the first of three such occurrences in the LE (cf. vv. 12, 15) of a form that Mark does not use.53 While Matthew and Luke use the aorist participle twelve and nine times respectively, Mark never uses this form. This isomer of various early Christian writers does not mind occasionally venturing beyond Mark’s writing pattern; the threefold use in the LE points to such a different writer. Its purpose here is to offer Mary’s obedient response (ἐκεῖνος πορευέσθαι ἄπιθης ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ἁπλά ἐπίσταται) as at least a partial realization of the command to the women in Mark 16:7 (ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε ἐπίστευε). Since, according to Mark 16:8, the women did not do this, the LE’s author may himself have composed Mary’s response or consulted another tradition. The latter option is more likely because of the LE’s similarity with the distinctive account of these same women in Matthew 28.

In Matt 28:7 the angel of the Lord commands, καὶ τοῖς πορευόμενοι ἐπίστευε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν. The common use of the verb πορευόμενοι in Matthew and the LE is likely not to have been coincidental, since the very next word in Mark 16:10 (πορευήσεται ἄπιθης ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν) also corresponds to the response in Matt 28:8 of the women, who ἔβαλαν ἄπιθης ἐπὶ τὸν μαθητήν αὐτῶν.56

It is thus likely that the LE’s author was familiar with the tradition of Matthew 28 and found some of this material useful in improving the direction of the narrative which ended suddenly at Mark 16:8. This author had no choice but to begin at this point where the women of Mark failed to comply with the command (saying nothing), and introduced instead the response of the more obedient women of Matthew. Although one cannot say why this author opted to begin with the appearance to Mary, it is evident that he also took considerable interest in how the narrative of Mark 16:1—8 continued in Matthew.

* ἀπήγγελεν

This verb probably reflects some knowledge of Matt 28:10, John 20:18, or both. As alluded to above, in Matthew the same tense and voice as in Mark 16:10 (the aorist active, ἀπήγγελεν) occur. In John, as in the LE, it is

53 See J. K. Elliott, who writes, “The verb πορεύομαι found in Matt., Luke, John and Acts is not a Markan word… Mark tends to reserve compounds of πορεύομαι for the present, and uses ἔλθων for the aorist.” (Text and Language,” pp. 238—239).

56 Cf. Matt 28:11, referring to the guards at the tomb: πορευόμενοι δὲ αὐτῶν Ἰωάννην τὸν ἱερεῖον ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγελεν τοῖς φρειτοῦσιν ἄνω τῷ ναῷ.

Mark usually employs the verb γίνομαι in a genitive absolute construction. For example, ὁ πρῶτος γεννημένος, Mark 1:25; ἦν γεννημένος γεννημένος, Mark 1:26; 6:33; 14:17, 1533, 1542. Note, however, Mark 6:26 and 9:23. Mark 6:26: καὶ πάντων ἐκλέγοντας δὲ βαπτίζεσθαι τῷ δρόμῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀνεκπαλίστων σοι φίλους ἔκθεον αὐτοῖς τῷ δρόμῳ καὶ ἦσαν εἰς Καρπαθίαν. καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ νεκρῶν ἐπερώτα αὐτοῖς. Τί ἐν τῇ δρόμῳ διδάγασατε;
Verse 11

Before beginning an analysis of Mark 16:11, it will be helpful to compare the content of this verse with that of the previous two verses. Mark 16:9–10 contains mostly new information: the risen Jesus appeared to Mary, who related his appearance to the disciples. By contrast, the first eight of nine total words in 16:11 (καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους διήγησεν ὄπις καὶ ἔθεικεν ὅν' τήρηται; ... τούτι;) offer a summary of verses 9–10 in that they restate Mary’s vision of the Lord and her report of the same. Moreover, these opening words anticipate the final verb ἤτησαν.88 Because the LE’s author is largely paraphrasing what he has already written, there is less to discuss with regard to the way in which he may have used traditional materials in v. 11. As a result, the discussion will focus on how the repetition of this author contrasts with the style of Mark and other authors.

*καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους

William Farmer argues that the twofold use of this pronoun in the LE (vv. 11a, 13a) is a Markan feature since Mark is distinct among the Synoptic evangelists for these forms in the parable of 12:1—9.99 One problem with this conclusion is that the emphasis on the dual use of καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους wrongly brackets this word from the threefold occurrence of ἔκεινος in the LE.100 Accordingly, there are five examples from 16:9–20 matching comparison with Mark and other writings. Moreover, the meanings of καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους in Mark 12 and the LE differ. In the Parable of the Tenants the word denotes those in a succession subsequent to an initial one, but in 16:11 those who disbelieve.

88 On ἤτησαν (v. 13b), see the argument below that ἤτησαν stems from the influence of Luke 24:11, John 20, or both.

99 The occurrences appear in Mark 12:4–5 as καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους διήγησεν ὄπις καὶ ἔθεικεν καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους διήγησεν καὶ ἔθεικεν καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους (12:4–5). The parallel structure of 16:11 and 16:13 is key to W. Farmer’s argument: καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους διήγησεν καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους διήγησεν. His point that the twofold occurrence in Mark 12:4–5 supports the likelihood that the evangelist could have used this word in 16:11 and writes, “... in the only two places in Mt. 11:1–16:20 where καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους is used, it is used in a combination of two adjoining compound sentences where it introduces the subordinate half of each sentence” (Last Twelve Verses, p. 85). His argument, however, ignores 16:20a (εὐθεῖα καὶ ἔθεικεν), which, like 16:12a, is parallel to 16:11a. One should compare all three parts of the LE to the parable of Mark 12 and not ignore the third because it does not fit. On the LE’s tripartite structure see Paul Mirecki, “Mark 16:9–20: Composition, Tradition and Redaction,” pp. 29–32 and the discussion of chapter 4.

100 See Mark 16:10a, 13b and 20a. As mentioned above, focusing only on the word καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους reflects an unnecessarily myopic comparative approach, for the word καὶ τὰ δεξιά τους is the result of a crisis between καὶ and ἔθεικεν. While the discussion of specific words is a necessary part of the analysis, it is also important to consider the few syntactical features that are repeated within the Longer Ending. It is thus relevant to compare the LE also with Mark’s use of the demonstrative pronoun ἔκεινος.
καθορισμόν. In seventeen Markan occurrences of οὗτος, twelve are absolute, and five are additive. These data may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Absolute Uses</th>
<th>Additive Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>ἐκείνος/οὗτος</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1:1—16:8</td>
<td>ἐκείνος/οὗτος</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>οὗτος</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1:1—16:8</td>
<td>οὗτος</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, if Mark is to use a demonstrative pronoun as a substantive, he is much more likely to use οὗτος (twelve times) than ἐκείνος (three times) or καθορισμόν (two times). The LE, by contrast, never uses οὗτος, but instead employs καθορισμόν (twice) and ἐκείνος (three times) absolutely.107

- καθορισμόν

Mark uses a participial form of ὁδοιπόρος sixteen times. Since all of these occur in the aorist tense, the participle in 16:11 could perhaps be described as Markan.108 Before arriving at such a conclusion, however, it is necessary to consider what is recognizable Markan about the evangelist's uses of this participle. Eleven of these sixteen cases, like 16:11, occur at the beginning of a sentence and are thus relevant for comparison with the style of the LE.109 Of these eleven, seven verses in Mark follow the following syntactical order: 1) participle, 2) subject and 3) verb as, for example, in 3:21: καθὸδοιπόρος ἐστιν πρὸς τὸν άνθρωπον, καὶ καθὸδοιπόρος ὁ διάβολος.110 In all seven of these examples (as well as others), the participle refers back to an earlier description of what is heard.111 Thus, although Mark uses participles in a variety of ways, the above syntactical order denoting the hearing of something stated previously is a recognizable Markan pattern.

On both these points Mark 16:11 differs. The order is: 3) subject, 2) participle, 1) description of what is heard (ὅτι καὶ ἔδειξεν οὗτος υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ) and 4) verb. In only one of the original sixteen cases from Mark does such a structure occur, and this exception may reflect Mark's use of traditional material. According to Mark 10:47, Bartimaeus ἀνέγαγεν τὸν ίησοῦν τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦ κοιμηθέντος καὶ λέγειν. Both the syntax and mention of what is heard after the participle match 16:11. In addition, the subject, Bartimaeus, is mentioned more explicitly in the previous verse (10:46), as is the case with those "who had been with" Jesus in 16:10.112 One example out of sixteen, however, is not an adequate basis for arguing that this part of the LE reflects the imitation of Markan style.

- οὗτος

In 16:11 οὗτος introduces a dependent clause functioning as the direct object of the participle ὁδοιπόρος (discussed above). This section will consider how Mark uses this word by investigating the semantic variations for οὗτος in Mark with an eye to the contexts within which the word appears. Beginning with the former, of the ninety-seven times Mark uses οὗτος (not counting two disputed textual variants), the majority of these introduce direct or reported speech (56 occurrences).113 Other common Markan uses denote something hear Jesus' teaching: 6:14—16: Herod hears the reports about Jesus; 6:28—29: the disciples of John hear that the Baptist is dead; 10:35—41: the ten disciples hear about the request of James and John; 14:10—11: the chief priests are glad to hear of Judas' offer; 15:34—35 (like 12:30): some of the bystanders hear Jesus cry out to God. By contrast, Mark 7:25 is the only point at which what is heard is not specifically ὁδοιπόρος γενέθλιοι καθὸδοιπόρος. The reader gathers that he heard about Jesus the healer whom the author of Mark has described above in the passage, but the evangelist focuses attention instead on the woman's daughter.

In this case too, then, Mark mentions implicitly before the participles what is heard.114 Note the difference, however: the participles beginning Mark 10:47 actually assumes the subject of 16:46. Verses 11 of the LE variate the subject of v. 10 with the non-Markan καθορισμόν. Accordingly, those in the future who may wish to argue for the authorship of the LE will need to address the question why the subject matter of the LE would force "departure" to deviate from his normal style.115

Summary Markan uses of οὗτος:


known, express the causal sense (“because”) and describe what is seen (11, 10 and 8 times, respectively). This accounts for about 88%, or 85 of 97 of the occurrences. Notably less common are uses in connection with things heard (as in 16:11), thought, believed and written.114 Thus, a rather low number of the Markan occurrences use ἐτί with the verb ἔχω (2:1, 6:55 and 10:47; only three of 97 occurrences, or about 3%).

- ἐτί

Two uses of this verb in Mark 5:23 (Ἰαυς, σωθή καὶ σάρκης) and 12:27 (οὗ ἐστὶν θέας νεκροὶ ἄλλα ζώντων) do not indicate much regarding style or use of traditions. The occurrence in Mark 16:11 may reflect some knowledge of Lukan traditions which refer to Jesus as “living” after the crucifixion.115

- ἔθειν

The fact that the Lukan author twice uses ἔθειν (cf. v. 14), a verb which never occurs in Mark, also points neither to Markan authorship nor to the imitation of Markan style.

- ὅτῳ + genitive

A close look at Markan syntactical patterns in using ὅτῳ + the genitive (Mark 1:5, 1:9, 1:13, 2:3, 5:4, 5:26, 8:31, 13:13) again has its rewards. The preposition ὅτῳ with the genitive expresses the agent by whom (or which) something is done. In Mark ὅτῳ occurs after the following verbal forms: passive participles (1:13 [present], 2:3 [present], 5:26 [aorist], 13:13 [present]); passive indicative (1:5 [imperfect], 1:9 [aorist]); and passive infinitive (5:4 [aorist], 8:31 [aorist]). If any of these occurrences of this preposition were to be considered Markan, it would be after the (present) passive participle, but there are not enough examples in 1:1—16:8 to establish such a pattern. The closest match to the above is Mark 1:9 (ὅτῳ ἔκπραξεν ὅτῳ ἔτρωκεν ὥστε ἔδοξεν). Here one can only observe that ἔθειν ὅτῳ αὐτῇ could perhaps be Markan, but there seems to be no deliberate attempt to imitate Mark or any other tradition.

- γίνομαι

No less than seven occurrences of πιστεύειν and its cognates in Mark 16:9—20 indicate that the issue of faith/belief was of great importance to the author of the LE. The verb ἔπιστευσεν occurs twice (16:11 and 16:16) and the noun δύναμις once (16:14). After exploring how the LE’s author used the verb πιστεύειν (16:13, 14, 16 and 17) and cognates, it will remain to consider how this emphasis in Mark 16:9—20 compares with analogous formulations in Mark and the Fourth Gospel.116

For the author of the LE, the content of faith is inseparably linked to believing the report of those who witnessed the appearances of Jesus. In the first half of this passage (16:9—14) occur three appearances containing two cases of unbelief, which receive a final rebuke from the risen Lord. At the end of the first appearance, the disciples do not believe Mary’s message that Jesus ἦταν καὶ ἔθειν ὅτῳ αὐτῇ (16:11). As noted above concerning the parallel structure of 16:9—11 and 16:12—13, the second appearance (16:12—13) concludes similarly; those who hear the two disciples’ message ὅτῳ ... ἐπιστεύσαν. Verse 14 makes this point about not believing the testimony about the appearances and continued life of Christ emphatically clear: appearing a third time, Jesus ἔτρωκεν τῷ δύναμιν αὐτῶν καὶ σκολοπαρίζει τῷ ἔτρωκεν αὐτῷ ἐπιστεύσαν. What vv. 9—14 states explicitly the three final instances in which belief/belief is mentioned build upon implicitness; the only alternatives are salvation (16:16a) or condemnation (16:16b), and five signs will follow τοῦ πιστεύσαν (16:17—18).

---

114 As will be discussed below, the concept of disbelief is certainly Markan (cf. Mark 6:6, 9:19, 9:26), but once again Mark’s choice of terms does not line up with those of the LE. The evangelist uses the substantive ἄπιστος (6:6, 9:24) twice and the adjective ἄπιστος five (9:19), while in the LE the verb occur only (v. 11, 16a; cf. the verb πιστεύειν, v. 13, 14, 16a, 17) and the noun once (v. 14). Even though these terms in the LE could be an extension of Markan style, the depictions of disbelief in Luke 24:11 (καὶ ἔστωκαν ἄπιστος αὐτήν ἔτρωκεν τῷ δύναμιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπιστεύσαν αὐτῶν, 24:11) and John 20 offer more plausible sources for this term.
The Gospel of Mark, however, presents a much broader conception of what having faith entails. The evangelist uses the verb πίστεύω ten times and the noun πίστις five times. He also uses the noun δικαιοσύνη twice (Mark 6:6; 9:24) and the adjective δικαιοσύνη once (9:19). The majority of these occurrences can be grouped under 1) faith to be healed (six cases in five healings) and 2) faith in God for answered prayer (three times in 11:22–24). Faith to be healed can belong to bystanders (2:5), family members (5:26, 9:23–24) or the person being healed (5:34, 10:52). In a passage on answered prayer (11:22–24), Jesus exhorts “faith in God” (πίστιν Θεον) for the granting of enormous requests. Two other occurrences of the verb (11:23–24) concern the necessity of belief in connection with answered prayer. Unlike Mark 16:9–20, the Gospel of Mark does not offer an explicit definition for the content of this faith. Four other passages in Mark mentioning faith correspond to the above in that they also do not inform the reader’s understanding of the content of faith. Ironically, the only verse in the Second Gospel that refers to belief in Jesus is one of mocking: ὁ Χριστός ὁ βασιλεὺς Τοῦρα σαλὰ καταβῆται τὸν αὐτὸ τὸ σταυρὸν, ἵνα ἰδώμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν (15:32). Such a difference between Mark’s subtlety in expressing the content of belief and the explicit, repetitive emphasis of the LE points to a difference in approach between the two authors.

By contrast, in the Gospel of John a concept of faith analogous to that of the LE figures prominently. The Fourth Gospel uses the verb 96 times, ninety of which refer to faith in Christ or to faith in something about Jesus, such as the truth of something he said, his coming from the Father or his resurrection. The following illustrates the different emphases John, Mark and the author of the LE place on faith:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mark 11:1–16:8</th>
<th>Fourth Gospel 122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal, noun and</td>
<td>Mark 11:1–16:8</td>
<td>Fourth Gospel 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective forms of</td>
<td>Mark 11:1–16:8</td>
<td>Fourth Gospel 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πίστευο</td>
<td>18121</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in something about Jesus, including the resurrection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some belief not specifically with reference to Jesus</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117 Mark 2:5: Jesus saw their faith (ἡ πίστις σας) for the paralytic to be healed; 5:36: Jesus exhorts the synagogue leader to believe that the man’s daughter can be well again; 5:34: the “faith” of the woman was what has allowed her to be healed; 10:52: Barnabas’ faith has saved him (καθαρισθή εστί). In the healing of the sea possessed by the mute spirit (9:14–27), the father has faith (νν. 23–24).

118 The other times Mark mentions faith do not clarify this question significantly. According to Mark 11:35, the understanding of faith is clearly bound up in how Mark defines elsewhere the term εὐαγγέλιον. The evangelist offers the following title to his work: Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦς τοῦ Θεοῦ (1:1): Mark writes the beginning of the gospel about Jesus. Mark’s summary of Jesus’ message (1:14–15) includes Jesus’ preaching τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ and the need to repent and believe in this gospel. From 8:35 and 10:29 it is evident that one can suffer, die and be estranged from family because of the gospel, and 13:10 and 14:9 instruct that the gospel will be preached ἵνα πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ ἅπλον τὸν κόσμον respectively. Although τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is clearly an important concept for the life of the believer and mission of the community, these passages of the Second Gospel do not offer a clear picture of what is to be believed in Mark 11:35.

119 Mark 4:49: Following the storm at sea (4:35–41), Jesus asks the disciples, Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐστε ἐγκατατεθέντες: ὅτι ἐστε πίστις: What they are to believe, however, is not stated explicitly. The context allows one to infer that they should have trusted that Jesus or God had power to calm the storm before they worried. Mark 9:42: the use of this participle “those who believe” does not reveal as much about Mark’s concept of faith as it does about the importance of not offending such people. Mark 11:31: within the dialogue of 11:27–33, the use of πιστεύω concerns whether John’s baptism was ordained by God: ἐὰν εἶπον ἦν, ἢ καὶ ἔλεγεν καὶ ἦν, ἢ καὶ ἔλεγεν ἦν εἰσερχομένοις ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς (cf. 11:29). Mark 13:31: there is need not to believe in the testimony of false messiahs. 120 The author of the Fourth Gospel never uses the nouns and only once uses the adjective: μὴ γίνοις δικαιοσύνη ἄλλα πίστεις (20:27).

121 This number includes the evangelist’s use of the verb πιστεύω (10), the noun πίστις (5), the noun δικαιοσύνη (2) and the adjective δικαιοσύνη (1).

122 Totals for the Gospel of John listed by chapter according to the above five categories:
Whereas belief in Jesus is a dominating motif in the Fourth Gospel (cf. John 20:21), the author of Mark writes with other concerns.

These observations, however, are not sufficient to substantiate a direct relationship between the LE and the Fourth Gospel. The likelihood of such a connection is, nonetheless, strengthened through a comparison of the LE with other parts of John 20. As noted above, Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene (John 20:15-18) probably influenced Mark 16:9-10. In addition, Jesus' third appearance and rebuke in Mark 16:14 also corresponds to the third appearance in John 20: Jesus appears and says to Thomas, μη γενοντις δυστυχους ἀλλα πιστος ... οτι ἔσωθε τον μακάριον δι μη ἱδόντες και πιστίζοντες (John 20:27, 29). The evidence that the LE's author was influenced in some way (either directly or indirectly) by John 20 is even more compelling if the comparison offered above focuses specifically upon Mark 20 and the LE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Verbal, noun and adjectival forms of πιστεύω</th>
<th>Belief in Jesus</th>
<th>Belief in something about Jesus, including the resurrection</th>
<th>Some belief not specifically in reference to Jesus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL in John 20:27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"This figure includes John 20:27, where this author uses the adjectives πιστεύω and πιστος.

Accordingly, the understanding of faith, narrative progression and word choices of John 20 and the LE share many points of correspondence in contradiction to those of the Second Gospel.

Two conclusions follow from these observations. First, in the LE, faith is depicted differently than in the Second Gospel. The seven references to faith in these twelve verses constitute one of the few repetitive, and notably non-Markan, themes in the passage. Second, it is likely that the call for belief in others' reports of the resurrection in John 20 merits recognition among the various Christian traditions that shaped LE.123

Summary of the Analysis of Verse 11

Because the LE's author spends most of 16:11 rephrasing 16:9-10 in anticipation of ἔσωθε τον μακάριον, there has been less to discuss concerning the possible use of traditional materials in this verse. This does not detract from the thesis that the LE's author writes in conscious imitation of older traditions. On the contrary, the fact that the only concept that is new to the LE (μακάριον) corresponds to Luke 24:11 strengthens this thesis.

With regard to this author's own style, the uses of the demonstrative pronoun by Mark and the author of the LE point strongly to two different authors. One syntactical difference concerns whether the content of what is heard typically precedes (Mark) or follows (Mark 16:11) the participle ἰδοντες. In a clause introduced by ἦν, the author of Mark never employs either two verbs or the passive voice. Both of these constructions are present in 16:11 (ἐσώθη γε καὶ ἰδοντες ὑπὸ αὐτῆς). In addition, the treatment of unbelief in the LE shows evidence of drawing on traditions other than Mark. Such glaring differences from Mark are more pronounced than

123 Contrast E. Helbig, who finds the closest parallel to the LE's references to faith in the writings of Paul ("Der Schluss des Markusvangeliums [Mark 16, 9-20]", pp. 49—50; cf. p. 108).
what was observed in verses 9—10. They are, in fact, exactly what one would expect when the LE’s author paraphrases more freely the traditional material he had consulted when writing Mark 16:9—10. Finally, the theme of belief/disbelief in the LE, introduced for the first time in v. 11, finds its closest literary analogies in Luke 24:9—11 and especially John 20.

**Verse 12**

*μετὰ δὲ τάφον*

Verse 12 marks the beginning of a new subsection within the LE and relates Jesus’ second appearance to two of his followers. Within the context of 16:9—14, *μετά δὲ τάφον* introduces the second of the three appearances. It is possible, but not certain, that the LE’s author based some part of his structure (πρῶτον… *μετά δὲ τάφον*… ἄστρων, ν. 9, 12a, 14a) on some other Christian tradition.

The only other NT instances of *μετά δὲ τάφον* are the “Shorter Ending” of Mark (codex Bobbiensis [16], Luke 10:1, 18:4 and John 19:38. There is thus nothing in Mark 1:1—16:8 that corresponds to the beginning of Mark 16:12. By broadening the data pool for comparison, there is a total of 25 other NT occurrences of *μετὰ τάφον* (without the conjunction *δὲ* in the middle). Like the aforementioned passages, these twenty-five tend to be used by certain NT writings, namely Luke-Acts (seven), John (seven) and Revelation (nine). The transitional formula never occurs in Matthew, Mark or Paul. Of the other 29 NT passages, John 21:1 offers the closest parallel to the LE. The author of this verse, like Mark 16:12, uses the phrase *μετὰ τάφον* to introduce another appearance of Jesus, one by the Sea of Tiberias after those recorded in John 20: *μετὰ τάφον ἐμφάνισεν· ἀνείπων πάλιν δὴ τὴν τούτων μαθητὰς ἐπί τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιμερίου· ἐμφάνισεν δὲ οὕτως (John 21:1). This correspondence could possibly indicate some dependence between the LE and John 21.

*δούλων εἰς αὐτοῦ… οὐχ άγὼν*

Before proceeding to treat the next group of words individually, it is necessary to make a comment about the remainder of verse 12 as a whole.


125 John 21, like the LE in Mark, is most probably a later addition to the Gospel of John. It is one thing to argue that the LE’s author knew certain traditions of John 1—20 and another to maintain that he had contact with an interpolated edition of John containing chap. 21. If this observation regarding μετὰ τάφον and John 21:1 is sound, then it would follow that the LE’s author wrote in light of this later edition of John that is preserved in most exact MSS. See further the discussion of ἐναπόθεν in Mark 16:12 in connection with John 21:14.

The discussion of Mark 16:9—10 observed that the LE’s author seems to have used selectively parts of two different traditions, namely John 20 and Matthew 28. Neither case is the borrowing from the appearances to Mary Magdalene in John or to the women of Matthew uniform or complete, but together there are enough similarities to posit some form of dependence upon both narratives. In verse 12, moreover, there is a number of correspondences to an even longer passage, the Emmaus story of Luke 24:13—27.126 In addition, one may observe the similar structure of 16:9—11 and 16:12—13 as follows:

**Mark 16:9—11**

| διήνυσεν εἰς πρόσωπον ὑποτέτοιον ἐνέπνευσεν πρῶτον ἔκηθεν εἰς τινὰς ἡ τρισίδιαν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις \---
| ἀνείπων πάλιν δὴ τήν τούτων μαθητὰς ἐπί τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιμερίου· ἐμφάνισεν δὲ οὕτως
| καὶ ἔδεικνυσαν δούλων εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν

**Mark 16:12—13**

| μετὰ δὲ τάφον \---
| δούλων εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάλιν
| ἐκποίησεν ἐν ἔκποιήσει ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων πιστῶν \---
| καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἐκποίησεν ἐν ἐκποίησει ἐν ἐκποίησει ἐν ἐκποίησει ἐν ἐκποίησει

Such parallelism indicates that the LE’s author wanted to relate a second appearance that was modeled after the structure of 16:9—11 but the content of Luke 24:13—27.

It remains to consider whether there is any connection between 16:12 and the Emmaus story of Luke 24. It will be argued that the lack of extensive citation in the LE does not weaken the case for this author’s reliance upon some form of the Lukan tradition. On the contrary, any author having only 11 words with which to capture the essence of Luke 24:13—27 would be hard pressed to offer a more comprehensive epitome than the LE’s author did. These similarities are listed briefly here and will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 3. First, δούλων εἰς αὐτοῦ indicates that Jesus appeared to two disciples; this is exactly how Luke began his account (καθὼς δὲ καὶ ἐκποίησεν βοήθειαν εἰς αὐτοῦ τῷ ἔλεγχῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Luke 24:13a). Second, the LE’s author desires only to report that the appearance occurred and either does not need or does not have space for the details of, for example, Luke 24:31 (αὐτοῦ δὲ ἐκποίησεν αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτὸν εἰς αὐτὸν).


Third, περιπατοῦν...(πορευόμενοι) εἰς θύραν (16:12) corresponds to the Lukean account that the men are on a journey (περευόμενοι εἰς κώμην)...καὶ ἠγγίσαν εἰς τὴν κώμην ὑπὸ ἐξοπλισμοῦ, Luke 24:13a, 28a). The difference between journeying “into the country” and toward a certain city respectively in the LE and in Luke may reflect the editorial activity of the LE’s author, who did not have time to relate the self-disclosure of Jesus that took place once the travelers had reached their destination in Luke 24:28–35. Fourth, the LE’s author captures the secrecy motif of Luke 24:13–15 with three short — and, within the context of the LE, somewhat vague — words: ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ. Thus, although 16:12 lacks many of Luke’s details like the suffering of Jesus in fulfillment of scripture, the intent to summarize the essence of this tradition is clearly deliberate.

*δοῦν ἐς αὐτῶν*

The appearance “to two of them” is the first indication that the LE’s author knows a tradition like Luke’s Emmaus story.128 There are also other grounds for looking beyond Mark 1:11–16:8 for the source of this phrase. Of the 39 NT occurrences of the participle genitive expressed by ἐς αὐτῶν, only two occur in Mark (14:69–70). The majority stem from the other Gospel writers, especially Luke.129 If one had to guess whether Mark or Luke was more likely to have written δοῦν ἐς αὐτῶν, the far more likely choice would be Luke. The evidence thus suggests that, when the author of the LE wrote δοῦν ἐς αὐτῶν, he probably borrowed from a passage like, if not the same as, Luke 24:13.

*περιπατοῦν...πορευόμενοι*

Rather striking is the complexity of the dative construction δοῦν ἐς αὐτῶν περιπατοῦν...πορευόμενοι εἰς θύραν, which contains a dative substantive (δοῦν), two participles and two prepositional phrases. The author of Mark uses the verb περιπατεῖν eight times, four of which are participles.130 In the Markan passages, the participle is the only one of the

---

128 W. Farmer writes that this phrase indicates “some kind of literary relationship between Lk 24:13 and Mk 16:12” (Last Twelve Verses, p. 91). The famous proponent of Matthew priority also offers that the single occurrence in Luke and absence in Mark 1:11–16:8 make the question of the direction of the dependency contingent upon whether the LE predates Luke; thus, it cannot by itself decide the question of authorship. Both of these are valid points. Those convinced of the priority of Mark will accept the first point and dismiss the second. If the LE condenses Luke’s Emmaus story, then there would be indisputable evidence that the LE was written subsequent to the composition of Mark (and Luke).

129 The participle genitive εἰς αὐτῶν; Gospel of Matthew (nine occurrences); Luke-Acts (16 occurrences; nine in Luke, seven in Acts); the Fourth Gospel (eight occurrences). There are also occurrences in Rom 11:14; Tit 1:12 and Heb 7:6.

130 Participles in Mark: 6:48–49 [two occurrences], 8:24, 11:27. The present, active participle (dative, plural, masculine) of 16:12 happens to be identical in form to the present active indicative (third person plural) of Mark 7:5.

---

131 For a different assessment see W. Farmer, who highlights the fact that Mark 4:22a contains the same verbal form as Mark 16:12 (Last Twelve Verses, p. 92).

132 See BAGD, pp. 582–583.

133 John 21:14: ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ. Note that a total of three appearances is also related in Mark 16:9–14. Alternately, the occurrence of something three times is not a distinctive narrative device.

centuries CE. Farmer's second observation is more to the point in that when Jesus appears "in another form... it is not clear whether the meaning is that Jesus appeared in a form different from that in which he appeared to Mary Magdalene... or merely that it was another form from that in which they had seen him last." For Farmer, the interpreter's inability to choose between the two options indicates an ambiguity that supports the conclusion that the LE does not fit well with the way in which Mark concluded his Gospel.

According to the final chapters of "Mark" — that is, including the addition of the LE — the point at which the two disciples of Mark 16:12—13 last saw Jesus would necessarily be prior to the crucifixion. If, however, one considers only the narrative of Mark 16:1—20, the LE (vv. 9—20) presents the only three appearances of Jesus, who does not appear to the disciples as a group until verse 14. It is thus not helpful to compare Mark 16:12 with "another form from that in which these two disciples had seen him last," since v. 14 recounts Jesus' first appearance to them. It is more useful to discuss the LE's presence within the context of the LE in terms of its tension with the first appearance of Mark 16:9—11.

It remains to be answered why the author of the LE wrote such a puzzling statement. One cannot find an adequate answer within 16:9—20, for, without these three words, one would expect that Jesus appeared to these two individuals in the same form as he did to Mary Magdalene. The first two appearances (vv. 9—11, 12—13) are quite parallel in form and content, adhering to the pattern of an appearance of Jesus, the obedience reaction of messenger(s) and a response of disbelief by others. Together they form a prelude for the climactic final appearance of Jesus in 16:14. There is thus no reason why the author of the LE would have sought to emphasize such a distinction between the two appearances.

This internal inconsistency is best explained in terms of the way in which this author made use of various traditional materials. Luke developed the motif of Jesus' secret identity in the Emmaus story (Luke 24:13—27) over the course of this extended narrative. By contrast, the LE's author never states explicitly that the identity of Jesus was hidden from the two disciples. He thus seems to have composed this verse for an audience who was familiar with some form of Luke 24. Accordingly, the words έν τῷ τέλος Μωρηνίτι may merit explanation as an expedient means of referring to the plot of Luke without rehearsing it in detail. Those who had already come to accept Luke's narrative would probably be more inclined to receive the abbreviated version of this limiter. The difference between 16:9—11 and 16:12—13 is the result of the way in which the LE's author alludes to Luke without clarifying how έν τῷ τέλος Μωρηνίτι 16:12 might be perceived following the first appearance.

**Summary of the Analysis of Verse 12**

Mark 16:12 has been discussed here primarily in terms of its similarities to two NT passages, John 21 and Luke 24:13—35. Mark never uses the transitional formula μετὰ τοῦ τάφου, which introduces the second appearance, and it is possible that the author of the LE borrowed this phrase from John 21:1, a verse which also introduces a final appearance of Jesus. The verb used for Jesus' appearance, ἐν τῷ τέλος, could also reflect knowledge of this later tradition to the Fourth Gospel (John 21:14).

The Emmaus story of Luke provides an even greater amount of structure for the other eleven words of this verse. As noted above concerning Mark 16:9, 16:12 reflects rather little about the author of the LE's own style. Moreover, the syntax of 16:12 is much more sophisticated than what one usually finds in Mark and the other NT Gospels: the rather long dative construction, for example, is divided into three parts (ψων...).
περιπτασθεῖν...πορευομένους). Finally, the wording of ἐν ἑδρέας μορφῇ points to a later author who inserted tension within his own composition when incorporating traditions that were different from those used in vv. 9—11.

Verse 13
In comparison with the parallelism noted above between Mark 16:9 and 16:12, there is an even greater affinity between Mark 16:10—11 and 16:13:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 16:10—11</th>
<th>Mark 16:13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐκείνη πορευόμενος ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ μετ' αὐτῷ γενομένῳ πενθοῦσιν καὶ κλαίοντις</td>
<td>καθὼς ἐκεῖνοι ἀπελεύθεροι ἀπῆγγελαν τῷ λοιπῷ καὶ κλαίοντις καὶ στρέφοντις καὶ ἕστησεν αὐτῷ ἐστείλαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλαίοντις</td>
<td>ὁσὶ ἐκεῖνος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκείνοις στρεφοῦντας δεῖ τῇ καὶ ἔδεισεν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ</td>
<td>ἐπίστευσεν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verse 13 contains all the main elements of vv. 10—11 but omits the description of the bearers (πενθοῦσιν καὶ κλαίοντις, v. 10b) and the action of what they heard (ἀπελεύθεροι δεῖ τῇ καὶ ἔδεισεν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, v. 11a). The only detail 16:13 adds to 16:10—11 is that those to whom the two messengers speak are “the rest (τοῖς λοιποῖς)” of the disciples. Because of the way in which the LE’s author shapes 16:13 to match the essential structure of 16:10—11, the discussion to follow will explore how the desire to parallel 16:10—11 may have affected the use of traditional materials and the composition of redactional elements.

* κλαίοντις

In the discussion of verse eleven, it was argued that there is a recognizable difference in how Mark and the author of the LE use demonstrative pronouns. Mark usually uses the pronoun οὗτος, rather than κλαίοντις or ἐκείνος absolutely. The dative plural ἐκεῖνοι also occurs in this verse.

* ἀπῆγγελοντες

Mark uses the verb twenty-two times, and the aorist participle occurs in 6:36, 6:37, 7:30 and 14:12. As discussed above, however, the choice of this word may indicate more about the desire of the LE’s author to mirror the structure of the first appearance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 16:10: ἐκείνη</th>
<th>Mark 16:13: καθὼς ἐκεῖνοι</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀπῆγγελοντες</td>
<td>ἀπῆγγελαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπῆγγελεν</td>
<td>ἀπῆγγελεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

140 See the discussion below of τοῖς λοιποῖς. Cf. V. Krauss, “Verkündet das Evangelium,” pp. 75—76, 133.
eleven NT occurrences appear in this Gospel.\textsuperscript{143} A second passage also reveals a contrast in the wording of Mark with both Matthew and Luke. The Synoptic evangelists share in common the hypothetical story of the woman who married each of seven brothers (Mark 12:18—27, Matt 22:23—33, Luke 20:27—33), but only Mark does not use the word ὃστερον:

Mark 12:22b: ἐγγανύων πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀδελφαίνειν.  
Matt 22:27: ἐγανύων οὗ πάντων ἀδελφαίνειν ἡ γυνὴ.  

The evidence thus suggests that, without trying to imitate Mark or any other tradition, the LE's author himself wrote ὃστερον to connect this third appearance of Jesus with those of 16:9—13.

\textsuperscript{143} Contra W. Farmer, who concludes that verse 13 supports Markan authorship (Last Twelve Verses, p. 100).

\textsuperscript{144} An additional example is Mark 12:6 (ἐγανύων) and its parallel Matt 21:37 (ὁστερον). See J. K. Elliott, "Text and Language," p. 259.


\textsuperscript{146} All but one of the twelve other NT instances of the verb διδόναι occur in a participial form. The exception is Matt 26:20 (ὁ δὲ γενομένα διδοὺν ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἀλλ' ἑαυτῶν τῷ διδοὺν), which may be explained as a rephrasing of Mark 14:18 (καὶ διδοὺν ἑαυτῷ τῷ διδοὺν) in light of "Q." Luke 22:14 (καὶ διδοὺν ἑαυτῷ τῇ δόσιν, διδοὺν καὶ διδοῖ δόσιν τῷ αὐτῷ). For example, Mark 5:26 contains a substantive participle (καὶ διδοὺν ἑαυτῷ τῇ δόσιν, διδοὺν καὶ διδοῖ δόσιν). For other participial occurrences see Matt 9:10, 22:10—11 (two occurrences), 26:7, Mark 14:18, Luke 22:27, John 6:11, 12:23, 13:28.

\textsuperscript{147} Unlike the Second Gospel, the parallel passages of Matt 26:20 and Luke 22:14 do not use this same participial form. See the above footnote for these differences in wording.
• ἰδιοκειμένοις αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτῶν ἐγγεγραμένοι

Of course, here is the difference in style between Mark and the LE. With regard to these two participle uses in 16:14, the first is circumstantial agreeing with αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἑνέκεις. The words are derived with the verb ἐγγράφως. The second (αὐτῶν ἐγγεγραμένοι) is accusative because it is the object of the substantive participle τοὺς θεοσαμένοις. Of the 750 Markan uses of αὐτοῦ, there are only nine occurrences with a participle.146 By contrast, in the LE a participle is used with this pronoun in two of nine instances.147 The relative percentages of 1.2% (Mark) and 22.2% (LE) suggest that an author not seeking to imitate Markan style penned ἰδιοκειμένοις αὐτοῖς and αὐτῶν ἐγγεγραμένοι in Mark 16:14.

• τὸς ἑνέκεις

Subsequent to Judas’ betrayal of Jesus, narratives of Matthew (28:16) and Luke (Luke 24:9, 24:33, Acts 1:26, 2:14) refer to the disciples as “the eleven.” This chapter has already suggested that the LE’s author had some familiarity with Matthew 28 and Luke 24. The question, then, is whether one or, perhaps, more of these five passages may have influenced the LE at this point. None of the Lukan passages is directly relevant to the context of the LE, where Jesus himself makes an appearance.148 Matt 28:16, however, relates that the eleven had followed the women’s instructions to await an appearance of Jesus. In fact, Matthew no sooner mentions their arrival in Galilee than he records their sight of the risen Lord: οὐκ οὖν ἑνέκεις μαθητῶν ἐπεφέραντος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὸ δόρον οὗ ἐπάγαγον αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς προεκομισθέντα, οὐκ έδώκεσαν (Matt 28:19).

146 See Mark 1:19 (εἰς οὖν ἰδιοκειμένοις αὐτοῖς ἐγγεγραμένοις τὸ δόρον), 41 (καὶ ἐν μέρει πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν πλατήν, διότι αὐτῷ ἐπλήγη ἐν τῷ βαλασιδῆ), 540 (οὐκ ζωή τὸν πάντας καὶ καθίσταται ἐν τῆς καθόλου, 1:23 (καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ καθίσταται πάντας, εἰς τὴν διάσωσιν καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ νίκῃ), 14-15 (καὶ θαύματα καὶ καθίσταται και πάντας καὶ καθίσται), 14-15 (καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται), 14-15 (καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται), 14-15 (καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται), 14-15 (καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται), 14-15 (καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται καὶ πάντας καὶ καθίσταται).

147 The pronoun αὐτῶν occurs nine times in the LE: vv. 10 (twice), 12, 14 (three times), 15, 18 and 19.

148 The women of Luke 24:9 returned from the tomb and ἀπεγγέλθησαν τοὺς αὐτοῖς καὶ τούς τούς λόγους. In Luke 24:23 the two men of the Emmaus story return and find ἐφορουσιν τοὺς ἑνέκεις καὶ τούς τούς λόγους. Acts 1:26 and 2:14 are also not directly relevant, because the choosing of Matthias and Peter’s Pentecost ascension occur after Jesus’ appearances and ascension. Unpersuasively, W. Farmer dismisses τοὺς ἑνέκεις as insignificant to the question of authenticity since the disciples receive mention without Judas “only in the post-resurrection narratives” and in Acts (Last Twelve Verses, p. 93). One of the purposes of this chapter is to question whether it is appropriate to separate the issues of authenticity and the history of these traditions.

28:16—17; cf. τοῖς ἑνέκεις ἐφανερώθη, Mark 16:14). A third similarity between Matthew 28 and the LE is that in both passages a commissioning follows immediately after an appearance of Jesus (cf. Matt 28:18—20; Mark 16:15—18). Of course, the two passages contain notable differences: Matthew’s disciples journey to Galilee while the LE does not specify a location;149 the commissioned people (both the women and the disciples) of Matthew 28 had followed Jesus’ instructions flawlessly, but the disciples of the LE must endure a stern rebuke (16:14b) before receiving missionary instructions. Such disparities highlight the distinctive interests of each author and do not detract from the similarities — mention of “the eleven,” an appearance after the resurrection and instructions for mission — in Matthew 28 and the LE.150 These correspondences suggest that the LE’s author modeled not only the designation τοὺς ἑνέκεις but also certain events of the disciples’ experience after those depicted in Matthew 28.

• ἰδιοκειμένοις τὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ καθίσταται

These words are examined together here because their combined force is distinctive as compared with other formulations in the NT. The Second Gospel uses this verb once to describe those who “reproached” Jesus (Mark 15:32) when he was on the cross. Jesus expresses displeasure about the disciples’ lack of perception numerous times in Mark, but the reviling connotations of ἰδιοκειμένοις are beyond the indignation attributed to Jesus in Mark.151 In Mark 6:6, for example, Jesus marvels on account of disbelief (ἐφανερώθη τῇ ἀκριβίᾳ αὐτοῦ) but does not lash out against it. Likewise, the man who confesses his unbelief (Mark 9:24) receives help from Jesus who exorcises the demon from the son. One other NT tradition contains the word ἰδιοκειμένοις: Mark 10:25/Matt 19:8. The word Mark and Matthew apply to outsiders (Pharisees) the LE’s author uses for the disciples. Such an accusation of the disciples, however, is not entirely out of character with their troubles in Mark. On one occasion in the Second Gospel Jesus questions the disciples: τί διαλογίζεσθε διὸ ἄρτος σου ἐχετε; οὐκο πατερεῖς οὐκο κυριεῖς; πέπλωματε ἐχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; (Mark 8:17; cf. 6:22, John 12:40). The accusation of having a heart that is

149 The silence in the LE here may point to knowledge of traditions relating both Jerusalem and Galilee appearances and the desire of this author not to follow one explicitly while contradicting the other.

150 The demonstration that the LE’s author makes descriptive points in the process of consulting such diverse traditions does not, however, bind him to follow every detail of any particular account. On this point see the discussion in chapter 3.

151 See J. K. Elliott, who notes, “This is the only place in the New Testament where these faults are leveled at the disciples” (Text and Language,” p. 260; cf. V. Kauss, “Wirklichkeit des Evangelium,” p. 55)
hardened is not significantly more degrading than the obstinacy that σκληροκορήθη ἔχει in 16:14.

The greatest difference between Mark and the LE is that the Markan Jesus is never presented as passionately as the LE’s author apparently was about disbelief. As noted above, in 16:11 the LE’s author, who uses πιστεύω and related words seven times in twelve verses, modeled his presentation of faith/doubt after John 20. In John, however, Jesus appears much more gracious to doubters like Thomas. 152 One puzzling element of the LE is how Jesus can in the same breath revile the disciples (16:14) and then commission them to preach to all creation (16:15–18). The most plausible explanation is that the author of the LE has extended the Johannine theme and placed his own abrasiveness of ἐπιθυμία into the mouth of Jesus before relating the commissioning. Thus, while in Mark the disciples have a similar problem as those in the LE, there is a difference in the severity of Jesus’ reaction.

* ὅτι

Such a causal use of the conjunction ὅτι as “because” occurs in Mark ten times: Mark 1:34, 4:29, 5:9, 6:17, 6:34, 8:2, 9:38, 9:41, 14:27. There is every reason to believe that Mark or, for that matter, most any other early Christian author could have written this word that was used frequently in this way in Koine and other dialects of Greek.

* ἅπαξλεπτομένος

This is the second occurrence in the LE of the verb ἅπαξλεπτομένος, which Mark never uses. As mentioned in the discussion of v. 11, the twofold usage in the LE suggests that the LE’s author repeats his own distinctive vocabulary.

* ἐγέρθηκεν

The LE’s author employs a form of ἐγέρθηκε that appears elsewhere in the NT only in 2 Tim 2:8. Five Markan uses of ἐγέρθηκε (Mark 6:14, 6:16, 12:26, 14:28, 16:6) could point to an imitation of Markan style in 16:14, but the evangelist never uses a participial form of this verb. 153 It is possible that the LE’s author chose this participle to complement Mark 16:6: ἐγέρθηκεν...

152 In John 20:24–29 there is no mention of Jesus’ anger toward Thomas. Jesus simply appears again to Thomas, allows himself to be examined, and then states ὅτι ζώον ἔχει με καὶ πιστεύεις ὅτι λέεις καὶ πιστεύεις. After this bestowal John is content to conclude his Gospel with the summary statement of 20:30–31.

153 In Mark 16:11 ὅτι introduces a subordinate clause that is the direct object of the participial ἀκολουθήσας. See the discussion above of v. 16 in 16:11.

154 2 Tim 2:8: μην ὅπως ἔρχονται ἡμείς ἤγερθηκεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ, κατὰ τὸ ἐνεκείμενον αὐτοῦ. It is not certain, however, whether one of these passages may have influenced the other.

155 The authenticity of the participle occurring by itself could be an open question, but, as noted above, ἐγέρθηκεν together with οὐκότι is not recognized Markian.
account not contained in Mark 6 (Luke 9:1—6) and the sending out of the seventy in Luke 10. Mark 16:15 does not follow any one of these passages to the exclusion of the others but adapts elements from all of them. Moreover, although the author of the LE consistently borrows from various traditions, he is not consistent either with the materials he uses or in the ways he reworks them.

* καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῶι

These three words appear in the same order six times in Mark (1:17, 2:19, 4:40, 9:29, 10:14, 14:24), five of which are, like 16:15, at the beginning of a sentence. The phrase could be “Markan,” but occurrences of these common words in the other NT Gospels (Matthew, two; Luke, eleven; John, eight) show that this conclusion is not necessary. Closer to the context of the LE is Luke 24:46—49, where καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῶι introduces a final statement of Jesus before he is taken up into heaven (cf. Luke 24:50—51, Mark 16:19). Although one would not commonly look for a source for such a common introduction of direct speech, the fact that the LE’s author emulates Luke 24 on other occasions raises the possibility that the introduction to Jesus’ final words in Luke provided him with the means for making his own addition resemble another esteemed tradition.

* πορεύεσθαι... κηρύττετε

This is the third of the LE’s three participial uses of πορεύομαι (cf. v. 10, 12), a form that never occurs in Mark. Unlike 16:10—12, however, this periphrasis is governed by verb in the imperative mood (κηρύττετε) and may indicate some literary relationship with the commissioning at the end of Matthew: πορεύεσθαι τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ δηταν (Matt 28:19a). Anyone familiar with Mark would recall that the verb κηρύσσω appears in similar contexts of mission (Mark 1:14, 13:10 and 14:9). Another noteworthy parallel is Luke 24:47 (κηρύσσεται... εἰς τὸ πάντα τὰ δηταν). Although the amount of verbal correspondence is not high, it is plausible that the LE’s author changed Matthew’s μαθητεύεται to κηρύττετε in light of Mark, Luke or both writings.

* τῶν κόσμων ἀπάντα

This accusative construction is an excellent example why the LE’s author merits characterization as someone who used Mark’s vocabulary but who did not consistently emulate the evangelist’s syntax. The meaning of κόσμοις in 16:15 is close to that in both Mark 8:36 (τῶν κόσμων διάν) and 14:9 (εἰς δίδον τὸν κόσμον); all three passages use διάκονος to designate the whole world. Mark, however, uses the adjective διάκονος in 8:36 and 14:9, a word the LE’s author could easily have adopted. Moreover, as J. K. Elliott observes, “there is no firm example of the form διάκονος in Mark...” Even if Mark 14:9 expresses a similar idea, the evidence supports the conclusion that a later imitator edited Mark’s expression in light of the other, probably written, traditions.

Furthermore, a comparison of certain uses of ἁπαντα in the Synoptic Gospels uncovers a likely reason for this change. The three times Mark uses ἁπαντα in the Synoptic Gospels reveals that early manuscripts of Mark have Jesus distinguish between the people of the first and second centuries accustomed to hearing ἀπάντα τὰ δηταν from any (or all) of the Synoptics and διάκονος τῶν κόσμων from Mark would likely have accepted the similarly-worded τῶν κόσμων ἀπάντα in Mark 16:15.

* τὸ εὐαγγέλιον

William Farmer notes that such a reference to “the gospel” is a characteristic of Mark as opposed to the other NT evangelists. The verses cited immediately above suggest that, whereas Matthew and Luke emphasize...
discipleship and repentance respectively, the LE's author incorporates the Markan emphasis on preaching the gospel.

• τὸν τῆς κτίσεως

This instance of κτίσεως “is the only occurrence in the NT Gospels” denoting “the sense of the sum of what is created.”161 The only other NT text discussing preaching “to all creation” is Colossians 1:25b, which parallels five different words of Mark 16:15: ἵνα τῇ ἔξωθεν τοῖς ἐλευθερώμενοι ὑπάρχοντες, τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ κτισθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσεως ἔτι ἄνω τοῦ σοφοῦ, ὅτι ἐγενόμενον ἐγὼ Πασχαλίων τίττους. In the LE “the creation” represents those to whom the gospel is proclaimed, but in Colossians “the creation” is the realm within which the preaching takes place. There seems to be no reason why the LE’s author would change the reading of Colossians if he had read this text and wanted to emulate it. With so many uncertainties about the authors of the LE and of Colossians, not to mention the date of Colossians, it is very difficult to determine if there is a literary relationship between these two writings.

Summary of the Analysis of Verse 15

Although καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, could have been intended to emulate Jesus’ final instructions in Luke (Luke 24:46), a literary relationship between these passages remains only possible. More certain is that Matthew 28 was quite influential on this verse. The differences in wording between Mark 16:15 (καὶ εἶπεν . . . κυρίου τοῦ κτισθέντος) and Matt 28:19 reflect the desire of the LE’s author to endow Matthew’s commissioning with Markan terms for ‘preaching the gospel.’ As will be argued in chapter 3, moreover, the mention of preaching in Luke 24:47 could also have influenced this change. Κυρίου τοῦ κτισθέντος are the only words of verse 15 that reflect the language and style of Mark.162 Conversely, while Mark certainly supported the idea of a universal mission (13:10, 14:9), none of his own writing corresponds to either τὸν κόσμον ἦκαστον ἐν τῇ κτίσει. The adjectival use of ἦκαστον, for example, is foreign to anything in Mark, and the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦκαστον is likely a novel product resulting from the combination of various traditions preserved in all three Synoptic Gospels. Finally, unless the person who forged Colossians in the name of the apostle Paul also wrote the LE, the use of Markan material cannot explain the otherwise distinctive τὸν τῆς κτίσεως, whose similarities to Col 1:23 may well be coincidental.

Verse 16

This verse continues Jesus’ commissioning instructions, which begin in 16:15. The form and content of 16:16 are distinct from the previous verse and from those which follow in the commissioning (vv. 17–18). The only words familiar to the reader of the LE pertain to faith or disbelief (ὁ πίστευσας . . . ἀπέτυχεν).163 make up the heart of the antithesis and bear a certain similarity to the terminology and structure of John 3:18ab:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὁ πίστευσας εἰς τὸν ζωὴν ἐχόντας} & \text{οὐ} & \text{δὲ} & \text{ὁ} & \text{ἀπετύχας} & \text{οὐ} & \text{δὲ} & \text{ἡμῖν} & \text{ἐχώντας.} & \text{(John 3:18b)} \\
\text{ὁ πίστευσας} & \text{οὐ} & \text{δὲ} & \text{ὁ} & \text{ἀπετύχας} & \text{οὐ} & \text{δὲ} & \text{ἡμῖν} & \text{ἐχώντας.} & \text{(Mark 16:16)}
\end{align*}
\]

Unlike its Johannine counterpart (cf. John 3:14—21), Mark 16:16 does not specify the type of faith that distinguishes between salvation and condemnation.164 Nonetheless, the influence of John 3:18ab on v. 16 is possible.

* τὸν τῆς κτίσεως

W. Farmer argues that, since Mark uses the substantive participle twice (9:23 and 9:42), the evangelist could have written ὁ πίστευσας again here and τὸν ἀπετύχας in 16:17a.165 As noted above, the different meanings Mark and the LE’s author typically associate with πίστευσα exclude the possibility of Markan authorship. It is possible, but unlikely, that the author of 16:16 used the grammatical form of Mark 9:23b with new meaning in light of Johannine terminology (cf. John 3:16—18).

* ὁ πίστευσας

Most of the times Mark mentions baptism are in connection with the person and eschatological message of John the Baptist (Mark 1:7—8). One verse concerns ritual purity (7:4), and another passage states that the experience of the disciples will correspond to a future (and unexplained) baptism of Jesus (10:38—39). From Mark one never learns that receiving baptism has salvific implications. Moreover, of the thirteen Markan uses of σώζει, six relate the wellness resulting from Jesus’ healing (3:4, 5:23, 5:28, 5:34, 5:39, 5:41, 5:43).

163 Against Erna Lisaemans, who argues that vv. 15—20 were originally independent of vv. 9—14 and an authentic part of Mark ("Der wiedergesehene Markusschuss," ZTK 66 [1969] 255—287), I will interpret v. 16 (and vv. 17—18) in light of vv. 9—14. See the discussion of Lisaemans in chapter 1. Although one could imagine the promise/warning of 16:16 in a variety of different contexts, and thus with a variety of corresponding implications depending on the context of “belief,” there is no good reason for removing the verse from the context of the LE. On this point see also the argument in chapter 4 for the compositional unity of the LE.


165 W. Farmer, Last Twelve Verses, p. 96. Mark 9:23b (μίαν, σουδαὶ, αὐτοῦ) is the more analogous of the two Markan verses to the participles occurring in Mark 16:16.
534, 656, 10:52). Another four concern the cost of discipleship (Mark 8:35 [two occurrences], 10:26, 13:13), but of these only 10:26 demands any specific requirement for salvation except abandoning worldly riches. Three other occurrences of this verb in Mark (13:20, 15:30—31) do not detail any specific prerequisites as one finds in the LE. The only NT passage having implications similar to 16:16 is 1 Peter 3:21 (ὁ κακὸν ἐκτείναν ἑαυτόν τῷ παιδίῳ τῷ ἄνω), a letter likely to have been written later than the Second Gospel and independently of the LE.

• οὕτως ἤκοικα κατακράτησεν

With regard to the ways in which this word differs from Markan style, see the discussion above of verse 11. Luke 24:11 is a possible source for this relatively infrequent NT verb. The concerns of Luke 24:11 about believing the women’s testimony and of John 20 about belief in the resurrection are central to the understanding of belief in belief in Mark 16:9—14. Verse 16 probably reflects the author’s own view about baptism in conjunction with the condemnation the author of the Fourth Gospel impugns to those who do not believe in God’s Son.166

Summary of the Analysis of Verse 16

The interpretation offered above of this verse in light of the definitions of faith in 16:9—14 further confirms that the authors of Mark and the LE assign different meanings to ἡ πιστεύει. The influence of the Fourth Gospel continues to be felt in the LE’s emphasis on faith. There is also nothing in Mark to suggest that baptism is required for salvation, the only alternative being condemnation. It is perhaps not a coincidence that the NT author who most clearly evidences such an “either/or” dualism is John, particularly in 3:18ab, which has a markedly similar structure to v. 16. If the LE’s author was familiar with the Fourth Gospel, it is possible that the former added the element of baptism to John’s dualism in constructing this dichotomy between salvation and condemnation.

Verses 17—18

This promise of five signs (σημεία) follows on the heels of the commissioning (16:15) and the exhortation to faith and disbelief (16:16) and makes up the third and final unit of the risen Jesus’ missionary instructions. These two verses will be treated together because they comprise a single, continuous list that yields additional information about this author’s strategy for composition. It will be argued that the LE’s author intentionally copied parts of Mark for the first and the last of these signs, namely exorcisms and healings. Within this traditionally-crafted framework, this author offers a novel wording of a phenomenon known elsewhere in the NT (speaking in new languages) and two rather distinctive signs (picking up snakes and drinking poison with impunity).

• σημεία... ταῦτα

The importance of “these signs” to the author of the LE is another indication that he wrote with emphases distinct from those of the Second Gospel.167 Most other NT passages mentioning “signs” in connection with preaching the gospel describe them as “signs and wonders (σημεία καὶ θαύματα)” and usually do not offer a specific list of miracles.168 Also noteworthy here is the importance of such signs in the Fourth Gospel, which, as will be discussed in chapter 5, could have influenced the occurrences of the term σημεῖον in Mark 16:17a and 20a. With regard to the syntax of v. 17a, the author of the LE places ἀπὸ τούτων ἀνακοίμησαν between σημεία... ταῦτα. The word ταῦτα is a demonstrative pronoun standing in attributive position to σημεία. The contrast with the fourteen Markan uses of ταῦτα is illuminating: the evangelist always uses ταῦτα absolutely or with πάντα.169 As a result, both the use of ταῦτα in Mark and the more complicated syntax of 16:17a point to distinctiveness of σημεία... ταῦτα.

166 Of the five times Mark uses the word σημείον, four are in the singular and refer to a particular “sign” of Jesus. Once Jesus is asked for a sign (8:11—12 [three occurrences], and on another occasion he describes the sign of eschatological fulfillment (13:4). The former passage (Mark 8:11—12; cf. 1 Cor 1:22) reflects negatively on those who ask for a sign from Jesus, but the LE views many σημεῖα accompanying those who proclaim the Gospel of Jesus. The two occurrences of σημεῖον in the LE (vv. 17a and 20a) correspond most closely to the description of the false messiahs and prophets about whom Mark warns (σημεῖον σημεῖον καὶ τέρατα, Mark 12:22; cf. Matt. 7:21—23). Such a warning about deceivers offering signs does not stop the evangelist from highlighting miracles performed by the twelve disciples (Mark 6:13—15). There is also a positive view of at least some others who cast out demons (Mark 9:36—41). One text the LE’s author might have used to justify the addition of vv. 17—18 is Mark 11:22—24, in which Jesus promises the disciples whatever the disciples ask in prayer if they believe that they have received it (ταῦτα τά καθαρτικά); καὶ τά σημεῖα καὶ τά θαύματα, Mark 11:24). The author of Mark 16:17—18 could perhaps have interpreted such a promise as the granting by Jesus to those who believe the power to work miracles.


of casting out demons ‘in the name of’ Jesus. The LE’s author—may have found what he was looking for in Mark 9:38:

Mark 9:38: ἐκόλοου ἡμών ἐξ ἐκ τῶν διαμαχῶν μετὰ ἑβαλλοντος. Mark 16:17 ἐξ ἐκ τῶν διαμαχῶν ἑβαλλοντος. 170

If the evangelist Mark were to write the first sign in 16:17b, this is exactly how one would expect him to do so. One need only change the present participle of 9:38—or the imperfect indicative of 6:13 (ἐξ ἐκβάλλον) — to future indicative of 16:17b. Consequently, if Mark’s summary of the disciples’ activities (Mark 6:12—13) offers the original impetus to mention exorcisms, Mark 9:38 may well have guided the specific wording of this first sign.

• γιάλώσας λαλήσουσιν καίνας

In none of the NT Gospels does one encounter speaking in “new” languages. It is likely, however, that such a phenomenon would not be unknown to an author of the second century, regardless of whether he was familiar with Acts 2 or 1 Corinthians 12—14. The uniqueness of the feminine, dative plural form of καίνας (Mark 16:17a) within the NT may be explained at least in part by the fact that, as an adjective, it must agree with the word it modifies in gender, number, and case. This description of speaking in “new” tongues may nonetheless support the theory discussed hereof—a later author mimicking traditional descriptions, albeit sometimes without adhering rigidly to them. For one thing, both Paul and the author of Acts use the verb λαλέω with the dative of γάλακτος. 171 In particular, both verses in Acts 2 offer an analogy to καίνας in 16:17:


Both of these verses, like Mark 16:17a, contain an adjective modifying γάλακτος. If the LE’s author possessed some knowledge of Acts 2, the jump from languages “other” than the speakers’ own (2:4) to “new” languages

in the LE is not large.\textsuperscript{172} Within the context of 16:17—18, it is plausible that this second sign was not purposely written in Markan style but rather was tailored after Acts 2.

\textit{Note on Verse 17}

Above was discussed the introduction to vv. 17—18 and the first two signs, the first of which appears to have been modeled after Mark 6:12—13. A summary of both of these verses will be offered following an examination of the final three signs in verse 18.

*δὲ ἐξετάσας* [v. 18a]

It was noted above that Mark presents the twelve disciples performing exorcisms, preaching, and healing (Mark 6:6—13). Luke, in addition to offering a parallel to this Markan passage (Luke 9:1—6; cf. Matt 9:35, 10:1, 10:7—11), discusses the ministry of the seventy after that of the twelve (Luke 10:1—24). While Mark never uses the key word of this third sign, *δὲ*, the closest analogy to Mark 16:18a in the Synoptics is Luke 10:19. After the seventy of Luke 10 return from their mission, they marvel to Jesus, καὶ τὰ διάμονα ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὁμοίῳ σῷ (Luke 10:17). Jesus replies,

*Ἐφετεύου τὸν ἐκατέρτην ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ προσεύχεται, ἵνα δέδοκαν εἰς τὴν κάτωτα πάντες δόξας καὶ ὀνομάτα πᾶσας τῶν φύσεων τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ φωνὴ ἡμῶν ἐν δόξα τῆς ἀνθρώπου* (Luke 10:18—19)

Mark 16:18a shares certain similarities with Luke 10:17—19, which could support the conclusion that the LE’s author modeled his passage in light of it.\textsuperscript{173} Nonetheless, the numerous ancient depictions of snakes in the hand, which are discussed in chapter 6, suggest that a direct shift from trampling on snakes (Luke) to picking them up (LE) is unlikely.

*Σαλάμαριον*

A hapax legomenon in the NT which also never occurs in the LXX, this word cannot reflect borrowing from any of the traditions discussed thus far.

*τι*

William Farmer writes that, when Mark uses *τί* in a conditional sentence, the word “is never separated from the conditional particle [κἂν] as here.”\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{172} See further in chapter 4 on the parallelism in vv. 175—18 (διάμονα ὑποτάσσομαι, ἀχάριν ἐλεημόριαν ... δὲ ἐξετάσας ... ἔχειρα ἐνθρόνισαν).

\textsuperscript{173} Both passages record the words of Jesus to his followers in the context of mission and mention what these followers will do “in the name” of Jesus, which includes some manipulation of snakes. In addition, the subjunctive of emphatic negation (οὐ μὴ) could have influenced the following sign regarding how believers will be able to drink a poisonous substance with impunity.

\textsuperscript{174} W. Farmer, \textit{Last Twelve Verses}, p. 97—98.

Such a generalization is valid for Mark 4:23, 6:23, 8:23, 8:34, 9:22, 9:35, 11:3, 11:25, 13:21, but not for Mark 11:13 (οὐ δὲ ἔδωκεν). Nonetheless, the difference between the usual style of these two authors is valid. It is even more apparent when one considers that Mark never uses another term like ἀκατάραξιν (“deadly thing,” 16:18b) in conjunction with *τι*.

*πᾶν μὴ*

Six occurrences of this verb in Mark (2:16, 10:38—39 [three occurrences], 14:23—25 [two occurrences]) include five uses of the indicative mood and one infinitive (10:38). None has the subjunctive mood in a conditional statement as in 16:18b. Moreover, the contexts of the three Markan passages do not point to any intentional borrowing by the LE’s author.

*οὐ μὴ*

As mentioned above, the explanation that the LE’s author based this fourth sign on Luke 10:19b (καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς ἀκατάραξιν) does not explain the impetus to mention drinking poison. Also noteworthy is the fact that the subjunctive of emphatic negation is a recognizably Markan feature.\textsuperscript{175} In particular, Mark 9:1 may reveal why the LE’s author composed this fourth sign: καὶ ἔλησαν αὐτός, ἀλήθεια ἔλησεν ὅτι οὐκ θέλεις γενέσθαι ... θάνατον ἐκ τοῦ ναῦρου τής καταστροφῆς τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 10:18—19).

Mark 16:18b shares certain similarities with Luke 10:17—19, which could support the conclusion that the LE’s author modeled his passage in light of it.\textsuperscript{176} Nonetheless, the numerous ancient depictions of snakes in the hand, which are discussed in chapter 6, suggest that a direct shift from trampling on snakes (Luke) to picking them up (LE) is unlikely.

*Σαλάμαριον*

A hapax legomenon in the NT which also never occurs in the LXX, this word cannot reflect borrowing from any of the traditions discussed thus far.

*τι*

William Farmer writes that, when Mark uses *τι* in a conditional sentence, the word “is never separated from the conditional particle [κἂν] as here.”\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{175} This is also true for the vast majority of instances in which these words do not occur in conditional sentences. See Mark 2:6, 4:20, 7:1, 7:2, 8:3, 8:4, 8:27, 8:29, 9:11, 9:30, 9:38, 9:50, 10:1, 10:5, 11:16, 11:23, 12:2, 12:12, 12:14, 19:5, 14:4, 14:35, 14:37, 14:45, 15:21, 15:35, 15:36.

\textsuperscript{176} See Mark 9:1, 9:41, 10:15, 13:2 [two occurrences], 13:19, 13:30—31 [two occurrences], 14:25, 14:38.

\textsuperscript{177} See further on the LE’s fourth sign in chapter 7.
• εἰς ἄφορτον τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθύμησιν καί.

The discussion now turns to the fifth and final sign of 16:17—18. The analysis of the first sign, exorcisms, suggested that the LE's author intentionally constructed the first and the last signs, as well as 16:20a, in light of Mark 6:12—13. The presence of εἰς in this phrase supports the theory that a later imitator could copy most, but not all, of Mark's usual style correctly. Farmer rightly notes that, when Mark uses the verb ἐπιθυμήσει in connection with healing, "the indirect object is generally placed in the simple dative case without the preposition εἰς." Of the seven times Mark uses this verb, the thing being "placed" (a hand or a name) appears in the accusative case, and the person on whom it is "placed" is the dative. For example, in Mark 3:16 (καί ἐπέθηκεν [ἡμών] τοῖς Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ) τοῖς Σίμωνι is dative, and ἄφορτος is accusative.

Concerning the preposition εἰς in Mark 16:18c, the only other NT examples of the word ἄφορτος are also plural and appear in Matt 14:14, Mark 6:5, 6:13 and 1 Cor 11:30. Of these, the two texts of Mark are probably the most relevant. Mark 6:5 conforms to the Markian use of the dative and accusative with the verb ἐπιθυμήσει noted above: εἰ μὴ ὁλίγους ἄφορτος καὶ ἐπιθυμήσεις τῶν χειρῶν ἐπεκοίμησεν. In the summary statement of Mark 6:13, however, there is a different verb, τερατεύων, and ἄφορτος appears in the accusative case: πολλοὺς ἄφορτος καὶ ἐπεκοίμησεν. It may thus be inferred that the author of the LE went through the following steps in composing 16:18c. First, he consulted Mark 6:13 (πολλοὺς ἄφορτος καὶ ἐπεκοίμησεν) and then embellished this summary by substituting the verb ἐπιθυμήσει and mentioning the laying on of hands in the slightly longer summary of Jesus' own activity in Mark 6:5 (εἰ μὴ ὁλίγους ἄφορτος ἐπιθυμήσεις τῶν χειρῶν ἐπεκοίμησεν). Moreover, the LE's author found it awkward to start a phrase with the ἄφορτος of 6:5 and added the preposition εἰς to signal the beginning of a new thought to the reader. In changing the participle (ἐπιθυμήσεις, εἰς) to the main verb of the sentence, he had no need of the verb τερατεύων used in both 6:5 and 6:13. In eliminating this verb, however, he had another problem: to write only εἰς ἄφορτος χειρῶν ἐπιθυμήσεις would end this list of signs rather abruptly. It is probably for this reason that the LE's author himself composed καὶ καλὸς ἔσυν αὐτός at the end of 16:18c to complete the thought.

• καὶ καλὸς ἔσυν 

The idiom in the NT for being sick uses the present participle of ἔσυν with the adverb καλῶς. All ten NT occurrences are in the Synoptic Gospels, and four of them are in Mark. Although no NT author uses the formulation of v. 18c, in Greek this is not an uncommon way to express recovery from an illness. Such a formulation would thus set apart the author of the LE from earlier Christian writers.

Summary of the Analysis of Verses 17—18

Mark 16:17—18 contains a number of individual words, like τίτονυ, ὥσ, ἄφορτος, καὶ ἐπιθυμήσεις, that bear a certain resemblance to Markan style. This analysis of vv. 17—18 in terms of how this author intended to use traditional material explains why so many Markan features are present together with other vocabulary and ideas foreign to both Mark and the rest of the NT. The summary statement of Mark 6:12—13 is one of the most important texts for understanding these verses and was probably this author's starting point for composing this list of five signs. From Mark's description of the mission of the twelve, the LE's author borrowed the signs of exorcism and healing. He intentionally placed these first and last to give vv. 17—18 a Markan framework. The first sign, exorcism ἐν τῷ ἄφορτος, imitates Markan style perfectly and could reflect the combined influence of Mark 6:13 and 9:38. In the fifth sign, healing, both the same intent to imitate Mark (Mark 6:5 and 6:13) and more distinct traces of a later author are evident.

Other parts of vv. 17—18, however, leave no indication of an exclusive imitation of only Markan material. For example, the portrayal of τοῖς πονεούσιν in 16:17—18, like ἐὰν πίστευον ... ἐπιθυμήσεις in 16:16, represents an extension by the LE's author of a Johannine understanding of faith. In addition, between the "Markan" signs of exorcism and healing are three others that do not line up exactly with any other NT text. Such differences do not preclude the possibility that the LE's author, following his usual pattern, attempted to reflect traditional materials when writing about new languages, snakes and poison. The author of Mark 16:17c resembles

---

178 W. Farmer, Last Twelve Verses, p. 99, emphasis added.
179 See also Mark 3:17, καὶ ἑξάχρησκον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐκεῖνος τῆς ἀγαθοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐκπροφητήσεις ὁ ἀγαθός Ἰησοῦς, Mark 5:23: ἐκπροφητεύει τοῖς ἄνθρωποι, Mark 6:5: εἰ μὴ ὁλίγους ἄφορτος ἐπιθυμήσεις τῶν χειρῶν ἐπεκοίμησεν, Mark 7:32: και παρακληθέντας αὐτόν εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς τῆς ἀγαθοῦ ἐκκλησίας, καὶ καλῶς ἔσυν, Εἰ τι βλέπεις: The only exception is Mark 8:23, which uses the preposition εἰς rather than the dative, as in the other verses: εἰς εἷνα ἐκπροφητεύει τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθυμήσεις. It is highly unlikely, however, that the author of Mark 16:18c copied the use of εἰς with ἐπιθυμήσεις from Mark 8:23.
180 Compare also Matt 14:14b, which also uses the verb τερατεύων καὶ ἐπεκοίμησεν τῶν ἄφορτος αὐτῶν.
181 See, e.g., Mark 1:32 (πάντας τοὺς κακοὺς ἐχοντας), 1:34 (πολλοὺς κακοὺς ἐχοντας), 2:7 (ὁ κακὸς ἐχοντας), and 6:55 (τοὺς κακοὺς ἐχοντας). On this point see J. K. Elliott, who rightly calls attention to καλὸς ἔσυν as a "classical phrase...not found elsewhere in the New Testament" (Text and Language, p. 261).
both Paul and the author of Acts, who use the verb λαλέω with a dative form of γλώσσα to describe the phenomenon of glossolalia. If the LE’s author knew Acts 2, the distinctive adjective καινόνιον may be a substitute for ξένης in Acts 2:4 (cf. ἑξενήξης in Acts 2:11).

Verse 19

The LE’s penultimate verse marks the beginning of passage’s final sentence. This author constructed the opening words of verses 19 and 20 to complement each other: ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος (v. 19α) begins a single thought complemented by ἐκεῖνος δὲ (v. 20α). This author thus denotes a direct relationship between the Journey of Jesus to the right hand of God (v. 19) and the risen Lord’s continued self-manifestation among the disciples (v. 20).183

* ὁ μὲν κύριος

It is not difficult to surmise the intentions of the LE’s author when comparing Mark 16:19a with the Gospels of Mark and John. On the one hand, Mark never refers to Jesus as ὁ κύριος. Nine occurrences of this title for Jesus in John 20—21 indicate where the author of the LE probably borrowed this title.184 Thus, while readers familiar with only Mark may find ὁ κύριος an unusual expression, those familiar with the narratives of John 20—21 would probably also find the title a welcome conclusion to Mark’s Gospel.

* μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτῶς

It remains to discuss whether the similarities of 16:19a to Mark 1:14 and 14:28 offer sufficient evidence for considering this articulate infinitive an imitation of Markan style.185

Mark 1:14: μετὰ τοῦ παρακλήσαντος τόν λόγον ἐλεύθερον ἐλεύθερον
Mark 14:28: ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐνεργῆσαι ἐπὶ πρᾶξιν ἐκεῖνος τῷ Γαλαταῖον.
Mark 16:19: μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτῶς ἐνεργήσατο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

183 On this point see H. Lug. Le finale de l’évangile de Marc, p. 129.

185 W. Farmer (Last Twelve Years, p. 100) cites Mark 1:14 and 14:28 as evidence for the Markan style of μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτῶς (v. 19α).

The syntactical order of preposition (μετὰ), articulate infinitive and personal pronoun is same in Mark 14:28 and 16:19. On the other hand, both Markan verses follow the pattern: preposition (μετὰ), passive (not active) infinitive, subject of the infinitive in the accusative case. This does not exclude the possibility that the LE’s author both intends for μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτῶς to look Markan and writes ἐνεργήσατο καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν in light of other traditional material. Such a combination of diverse traditions would correspond to what has observed heretofore about this author.

* ἐνεργήσατο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν

The other four NT occurrences of the verb ἐνεργήσατο referring to the ascension of Jesus appear in Acts 1:10, 1:11, 1:12 and 1 Tim 3:16.186 It has been argued above that the author of Mark 16:9—20 wrote with some knowledge of Luke 24. The ascension account of Luke (24:50) contains the same wording as v. 19b about Jesus’ being taken up εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, but the main verb is different. Luke 24:51 employs the imperfect passive of ἐνεργήσατο, while the LE’s author uses the aorist passive of ἐνεργήσατο. Both texts convey the same idea, but a direct connection between the LE and the end of Luke is not certain because of the different verbs used in each text. When the author of Luke returns to the ascension narrative in Acts 1, his wording is closer to that of the LXX texts and the LE. Acts 1:11 repeats that Jesus was taken up εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, and Acts 1:2 and 1:22 contain the aorist passive indicative form of ἐνεργήσατο used in Mark 16:19b. While the four words of Mark 16:19b occur within Acts 1, no one of the three verses contains both the same verb form as the LE (ἐνεργήσατο) and εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

For the first time in this examination of Mark 16:9—20, the closest parallels to the wording of the LE appear not in the NT but rather in the LXX (2 Kgs 2:11; 1 Macc 2:58, Sir 48:9, 49:14). 2 Kgs 2:11 concludes its description of Elijah as follows: καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῶν παρευμένων ἐπήρωσεν καὶ ἐξέφυγεν, καὶ ἑδίκα ἐμφανίστηκεν διὰ παρευμένων καὶ ἑδίκα ἐμφανίστηκεν εὐφράειστη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Writing around 200 BCE, Ben Sira probably alludes to 2 Kgs 2:11 when he mentions the ascensions of Elijah and Enoch.187 The author of 1 Macc 2:58 also seems to echo the language of


187 Sir 48:9, διὰ παρευμένων ἐν εὐφράειστη ἐπῆρωσεν καὶ ἐξέφυγεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Note that Sir 28:13, like the passages discussed above in 2 Kings and 1 Maccabees,
2 Kings: Ἡλίας ἐν τῷ ζηλωταί ζῆλον νόμου ἀνελθείς εἰς τὰν ὀλίσσεαν

The similarities in wording to various texts raise the question whether the LE’s author intended to imitate the style of Luke, one or more of the LXX texts, a combination of these or none of them. The lack of verbal parallels to Sir 48:9 and 14:14 discounts Ben Sira as a likely source. The other two Septuagint texts contain the four words of Mark 16:19b. The explanation that Elijah was taken up because of his zeal for the law in 1 Macc 2:58, the only other text where the four words of Mark 16:19b appear together and in the same order, probably would not have been useful to the LE’s author. Perhaps an argument could be made that the transferal of the ministry from Elijah to Elisha in 2 Kings 2 inspired the LE’s author to write about the going out of the disciples (Mark 16:20) after the ascension of Jesus (16:19). Joseph Hug maintains that the LE’s author was dependent upon the text of the LXX in 16:19b. He writes in response to Gerhard Lohfink’s thesis that all second-century references to the ascension, including the LE, reflect some dependence on Luke. Hug agrees with Lohfink on how Mark 16:19 compares to the ascension narratives in Luke-Acts: “Par la structure générale, ... et se rapproche indéniablement du cadre lucicien.” Hug and Lohfink were certainly right concerning general agreements of structure between the LE and Luke’s writings. Such a concept, however, could hardly be original to the author of the Longer Ending, since the author of Luke had already narrated such an account at the end of Luke and the beginning of Acts.

Five observations support the inference that the LE’s author wrote δικαίωσεν εἰς τὸν θρόνον in light of Luke-Acts. First, although there are verbal similarities to the LXX, the contexts of 2 Kings and 1 Maccabees do not correspond to that of the LE. Second, the combined influence of Luke-Acts and the Septuagint is also unlikely. There is nothing in Luke 24 or in Acts 1 that could have motivated the LE’s author to find a more complete description in the Septuagint, and no LXX text adds a detail incorporated into the LE that is lacking in Acts 1. Third, Mark 16:19b may attest to the influence of the Septuagint on how Luke described Jesus’ ascension in terms of Elijah’s having been taken up. The similarities of the LE to these LXX texts would then be a matter of indirect influence and not reflect this author’s desire to emulate the Jewish scriptures at this point. Fourth, as noted above, Acts 1 contains all four words of Mark 16:19b. The LE’s author could have easily combined them into his brief mention of the ascension. Finally, the use of the verb δικαίωσεν for the ascension is unusual and suggests that, if the LE’s author had any early Christian source in mind, it was Acts 1. Contra Hug, then, it is thus highly unlikely that Mark 16:19b stems directly from any LXX passage.

The solution offered here deserves to be treated with some caution, however. As discussed in chapter 3, the indications that the LE’s author knew the NT book of Acts are considerably fewer than those pointing to some knowledge of Matthew, Luke, and John. Other observations stemming from this analysis of the LE’s style and purpose in writing support the inference that knowledge of Acts is the most plausible solution. The author of Mark 16:9—20 has consistently composed verses 9–19a in dialogue with a number of other early Christian traditions. If the analysis of this chapter has been persuasive to this point, the burden of proof would rest upon those who would posit that the LE’s author changed his compositional strategy suddenly at this point.

Furthermore, the way in which the LE’s author has used earlier traditions suggests that Mark 16:19b is based upon an accepted formula. In the first appearance to Mary Magdalene, the initial wording (16:9—10) reflects the use of sources, while the later paraphrase (16:11) for the most part does not. Likewise, the LE’s author borrowed parts of Luke’s Emmaus story (16:12) before mentioning the subsequent disciples (16:13). As mentioned above, it

There is no reason to doubt that this second-century Christian author had access to the same “Bible” — i.e., the LXX — which Hellenistic Jews possessed for centuries and which was also influential in many of the earliest Christian communities. Possessing access to texts and desiring to emulate them, however, are two different things.
would be difficult for the author of Mark 16:12 to do more than allude to the extended narrative of Luke 24:13—35 without disrupting his own passage. The various pieces of the story in Mark 16:12 reflect an author who not only knows the Lukan passage but also writes for an audience who is familiar with it. The theme of belief/disbelief based on John 20 also supports this pattern: words in 16:11—14 closely parallel a Johannine definition while later developments in 16:16—17 reflect the interests of the LE’s author.

It follows that the author of Mark 16:15b—20 would probably have had interest not in narrating the early chapters of Acts but only in making the ascension and reception language look traditional (16:19bc) before making a further point about the assistance of Jesus (16:20). His own intention is to rehabilitate the faithless disciples into sign-working world missionaries. The LE’s concluding verse (Mark 16:20) would probably come as a surprise to an audience not familiar with the progression of events in Luke 24—Acts 1. An allusion to a familiar narrative (Acts 1), however, would probably make the end of the LE more credible. As a result, the conclusion that the LE’s author wrote Mark 16:19b in light of Luke 24 and Acts 1 rests on the dissimilarity of the LE to the contexts of LXX texts with similar wording, as well as the characterization of this author’s consistent combination of various esteemed Christian traditions in 16:13—19a. The most plausible solution is that the LE’s author borrowed ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ from Acts 1:2 and 2:22 and εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν from Luke 24:51 and Acts 1:11.

Having explored a number of non-Markan texts for possible parallels to the ascension (16:19b), the analysis now turns to the session of Jesus (16:19c).

Two passages in Mark discuss sitting at the right hand of God (10:35—45) and of God (14:62). In the former passage James and John recognize the importance of Jesus and ask to have a place, one on each side of him (βασιλεύς ὑμῶν ἐστιν εἰς σοῦ ἐκ βασιλείας καὶ εἰς ἐξουσίας καθίσοντα εἰς τῷ θεῷ σου, 10:37). More analogous to Mark 16:19c is Mark 14:62: καὶ ὄψθη τὸν θεὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ βασιλείας καθίσοντας τῇ δυνάμει καὶ ἐρχομένων μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

In addition, uses of Ps 110:1 in Mark 12:35—37a and 14:62 reflect interests in the interpretation of the son of David and eschatology, emphasizes absent in the LE.194 Rather than interests in the son of David (12:35—37a) and eschatology (14:62), Mark 16:19c draws yet a third point of significance out of this tradition: the seated Christ grants signs to aid the process of preaching “to all creation” (cf. vv. 15—17). Accordingly, following the resurrection (v. 9) and threefold appearance (vv. 9—14), Jesus offers a commission to proclaim the Gospel to preach to all creation (vv. 15—18), after which point he was taken up to heaven (v. 19) and aided the disciples as they carried out this mission (v. 20).

It remains to ask whether the wording of 16:19c reflects an adaptation of a Markan text, the use of some other tradition, or both. One difference between Mark 14:62 and the LE is that the former uses a circumlocution for God (τῷ θεῷ) while the LE’s author writes τοῦ θεοῦ:

Mark 14:62: καὶ ὄψθη τὸν θεὸν ἐκ βασιλείας καθίσοντας τῇ δυνάμει καὶ ἐρχομένων μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Mark 16:19c: καὶ ἐκβασιλεύῃ ἐκ βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

Perhaps more significantly, Mark anticipates a future eschatological event, while the LE’s author draws upon the implications of a past event for the present mission (cf. 16:20). This discussion will return to Mark 14:62 after considering the possible relation of Mark 16:19c to other Christian traditions.

The Lukans’ parallel to Mark 16:6 (Luke 24:50—53 is somewhat more analogous to Mark 16:19c in that it adds τοῦ θεοῦ to the end of Mark’s ἐκ βασιλείας. The modification in Luke probably reflects this evangelist’s interest, attested also in three passages in Acts, in describing Jesus at the “right hand of God.” In their speeches, Peter (Acts 2:33 and 5:31) and Stephen (7:56) mention Jesus at God’s right hand:


tοῦ θεοῦ δὲ ἐρχόμενον καὶ ἐρχόμενον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. Τότε δὲ ἐρχόμενον τῷ ἐρχόμενον τῷ θεῷ (Acts 5:31)

Neither of these passages in Acts, however, mentions Jesus as seated (καθίστημι) at God’s right hand. The text closest to the LE presents Jesus

194 The first of two Markan passages (12:35—37a) bears no direct relation to 16:19c. Even though the whole of Ps 110:1 is cited, the controversy of Mark 12 concerns only the opening words of the Psalm (πάντα ἐν χείρι τοῦ θεοῦ). Ps 110:1a and not the promises about session (110:1b) or victory over enemies (110:1c). The issue in Mark 12 thus seems to be whether or not the epithet “son of David” is appropriate for the messiah. This, of course, is not a concern in Mark 16:19c. In addition, the difference between Mark 12:35—37a, on the one hand, and 14:62 and 16:19c, on the other, is great. Both of the latter verses describe a divine intermediary seated with God (τῷ θεῷ) (14:62; τοῦ θεοῦ, 16:19c) at a time subsequent to the passion. The verse from the Markan passion narrative (14:62) combines an allusion to Ps 110:1b with a more explicit citation of Daniel 7:13. By contrast, the eschatological emphasis on the Son of Man, who will be seen "coming with the clouds of heaven," is never mentioned in the LE.
as standing (Ἰστήμι, Acts 7:56), while the other two highlight Jesus’ having been exalted (ὑψόθη). Therefore, neither the NT Gospels nor Acts offers a singular source for καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἐγείροντο τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 16:19). Numerous other NT passages, however, build on the imperative of Psalm 110:1 (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) and present Jesus sitting at God’s right hand. 192 One feature each of the passages from Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, Hebrews and 1 Peter shares in common in contrast with Mark 16:19c is the locative use of the preposition ἐν with ἐξῆλθεν. 196

To summarize, different NT texts agree with the various parts of Mark 16:19c, namely the verb ἐκτίθησεν, the prepositional phrase καὶ ἐγείροντο τοῦ θεοῦ and the genitive of τοῦ θεοῦ. Only Hebrews 1:3, 8:1 and 10:12 use the aorist indicative ἐκτίθησεν (cf. Heb 1:13). Passages other than the LE following the Septuagint form of Ps 110:1b (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) are Mark 14:62 par. (ἐκ θεοῦ καθήμενον τῆς συνόντος) and Acts 7:55—56 (ὑποτάσσεν τοῖς θεοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ εὐφραίνοντο τῷ θεοῦ). Finally, verses specifying τοῦ θεοῦ are Luke 22:69, Acts 2:33, 7:55—56, Rom 8:34, Col 3:1, Heb 10:11—13, 12:2 and 1 Pet 3:22. As a result, the LE’s author cannot have copied any single NT tradition without alteration.

This observation, however, does not rule out the possibility that he modified or more of his sources as noted elsewhere in Mark 16:19—20. The following paragraph will discuss why the conscious adaptation of Mark 14:62 in light of other traditional material is the most likely explanation for the formulation of Mark 16:19c. It is a given that the LE’s author was working with a copy of Mark’s Gospel when writing a more suitable ending to it. This author’s close familiarity with Mark, which has been argued above, supports the inference that he had direct knowledge of both Mark 14:62 and the citation of Ps 110:1 in Mark 12:36. 197 Perhaps the most distinctive feature of Mark 16:19c is the use of the preposition ἐκ (ἐκ ἐξῆλθεν) as opposed to the more common ἐν ἐξῆλθεν. 198 This word choice agrees with the LXX, Mark 14:62 and only one other NT passage, Acts 7:55—56. The remaining forms of Mark 16:19c (the verb and the genitive of τοῦ θεοῦ) can also be explained in light of Mark. The LE, like Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews, can speak of the ascension as a past event. It would not be difficult for the LE’s author to change the LXX’s imperative (κατὰ θεοῦ, also in Mark 12:36) or the participle referring to a future eschatological event (κατὰ θεοῦ, Mark 14:62) to the aorist indicative ἐκτίθησεν. This verbal form could, but does not necessarily, reflect awareness of other traditional formulations. Finally, the change from τοῦ δυναμοῦ in Mark 14:62 to τοῦ θεοῦ does not alter the meaning of the phrase and agrees with a plethora of NT traditions, perhaps most significantly three Lukan passages (cf. Luke 22:69, Acts 2:33 and 7:55—56).

Summary of the Analysis of Verses 19

The author of the LE begins this verse with ὦ μον ὁ ὅρος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ in order to denote a direct relationship between Jesus’ ascension (v. 19) and continued activity among the mission of the disciples (v. 20). The narratives of John 20—21 offer the closest parallels to ὦ μον ὁ ὅρος in Mark 16:19a. The articular infinitive μετά τοῦ λαλήσας αὐτοῖς may reflect an imitation of Mark 1:14 and 14:28. The construction of 16:19b (ἐν δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ) probably indicates use of traditional material. Despite the similar usages of 2 Kgs 2:11 and 1 Mac 2:58 in the LXX, the most likely sources for the description in ascension in Mark 16:19b are Acts 1:2 and 1:22 (ἐγείροντες τοῦ θεοῦ), and Luke 24:51 and Acts 1:11 (ἐγείροντες τοῦ θεοῦ). Finally, the closest NT analogues to the session of Mark 16:19a are Mark 14:62 and Acts 7:55—56.

Verse 20

The beginning of the LE’s final sentence reflects the skill of this author who brings together two different lines of thought to conclusion. The portrayals of both the disciples and the ascended Jesus find resolution in Mark 16:20:

193 See, for example: Col 2:1 (ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ κατακλύσων), Eph 1:19—20 (κατακλύσων ἐκ θεοῦ), Heb 13 (ἐκτίθησεν ἐκ θεοῦ), Heb 8:1 (ἐκτίθησαι ἐκ θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), Heb 9:12—13 (ἐκτίθησαι ἐκ θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ), Heb 12:2 (ἐν θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κατακλύσων). Other passages mentioning Jesus at the right hand of God, but without the verb κατακλύσων, are Rom 8:34 (ὅτα καὶ ἐστίν ἐν θεοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ) and 1 Pet 3:22 (διέγένετο ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) (cf. Rev 5:21: b νῦν δόθη ἡ κρίσις ἡ καθήμενος ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ θεοῦ, διέγένεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου θεοῦ κατακλύσων καὶ εἰρήνη κατὰ πάντα). See also, however, 1 Pet 3:22 (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ).

194 Note also uses the locative derivative without the preposition ἐν in Acts 2:33 (ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ) and Acts 5:31 (ἐν θεοῦ ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς).

195 Mark 12:36: σύνει ἐν τῷ καινώματι ἐξῆλθεν . . . ἐξῆλθε εὐφραίνοντο τοῦ θεοῦ. The only difference between Mark and the LXX, which does not affect this discussion, is that Mark reads οὐκ ηδονή ("beneath"), instead of οὐκ ηδονή ("a footnote").
The Disciples in the LE

16:10-11: έχειν ἐξελθόντας
διακοσμήσαντι τοὺς... κύκλους
θείους.

16:13: κύκλος διακοσμήσας
διακοσμήσαντι τοὺς... ἐστάσεται.

16:20: ἔχειν δὲ ἐξελθόντες
ἐκτίμησαν
πανταχώρ, τούς κύκλους
συμεργοῦντος
cαὶ τὸν λόγον
βεβαιοῦντος. Νῦν τῶν
ἐπικοινωνίων
στημένων.

The ascension and the missionary

16:19: ἔχειν δὲ ἐξελθόντας
ἐκτίμησαν
cαὶ ἐξελθόντας ἐπεξηγοῦσαν
cαὶ τὸν λόγον
βεβαιοῦντος. Νῦν τῶν
eπικοινωνίων στημένων.

Such organization indicates that the author of the LE highlights that something remarkably different comes to pass in the LE's final verse: the depiction of the ascended Jesus, who aids the preached word, strikes a contrast with the disbelief depicted in 16:9-14.

* ἔχειν δὲ

This is the third of three (cf. vv. 10a, 13b) occurrences of an absolute use of ἔχειν, for which Mark has no parallel. It is not unexpected to find a non-Markan use of ἔχειν where this author's redactional work is so prominent.

* ἐξελθόντες

An exact parallel to ἐξελθόντες ἐκτίμησαν occurs in the summary of the mission of the twelve in Mark: καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκτίμησαν ἱνα μετανοήσωσιν (Mark 6:12). The influence of Mark 6:12-13 on the LE's first and fifth signs (16:17b, 18c) is noted above, and it is thus not surprising that the LE's author returns to Mark 6 to portray the disciples' mission at the end of the LE.

With regard to the adverb πανταχώρ, this term occurs in the writings of Mark (Mark 1:28), Luke (Luke 9:5, Acts 17:30, 24:3, 28:22) and Paul (1 Cor 4:17). The word could stem from Mark 1:28a (καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης πανταχώρ), but the closest analogy to πανταχώρ is Luke 9:6. In this verse Luke concludes his version of the mission of the twelve disciples, which parallels Mark 6:6b-13: ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐπεξηγοῦσαν κατὰ τὰς κώμας ἐστάσεται καὶ περιηγηθεὶσαν πανταχώρ (Luke 9:6). This adverb in Mark 16:20a likely stems from Luke, since Mark and Matthew have no parallel for it in an analogous context. Accordingly, it follows that the first two words from Mark and the third from the parallel narrative in Luke are combined in v. 20a: ἔχειν ἐξελθόντες ἐκτίμησαν πανταχώρ.

200 Rom 15:18: Κρυστάλλον δικαίως γεγονότας περαστική ὑπόκρισιν Θεοῦ, ἐπεξηγοῦσαν τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῶν έκκλησιῶν... There are seven other occurrences in the NT. Paul indicates in two passages that God is the one who does the confirming (1 Cor 1:6-8, 2 Cor 12:1). In two other NT letters the form is passive, and there is no explicit subject (Col 2:7, Heb 13:5); there is no indication that either author ascribes Christ as the subject. The author of Hebrews at another point discusses the salvation was spoken by "the Lord" and confirmed "to us" by those who heard (Heb 2:1-3); they are thus human beings who "confirm" the word (Heb 2:2). See further on Hebrews 2 in chapter 5.
definition of “the word” as referring to the resurrection.\(^{201}\) There is a difference between the two writings, however: Mark also emphasizes the suffering and death of the Messiah (Mark 8:31), while the LE does not.\(^{202}\) To the extent that the LE’s author apparently makes use of a Markan word, Farmer is correct. In passages like Mark 1:45 and 4:15, for example, ὁ λόγος can refer to the entire content of the message being preached. In the case of the LE’s author, this would certainly include the resurrection (cf. 16:9—14) but, as in Mark, could include other things as well.

\(^{201}\) See Mark 1:45, 2:2, 4:14—20, 4:33, 8:32 and W. Farmer, Last Twelve Verses, pp. 109—102. Farmer maintains that ὁ λόγος is more prominent in Mark than in Matthew and Luke and offers Mark 4:15, in contrast with Matt 13:19, as an example. With the exception of this point, Farmer’s discussion is sound.

\(^{202}\) In this regard one may contrast the LE with Luke 24:44—46, ἐστιν δὲ πάντα τὰ οἰκεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσεως ἐν νεκρῶν τῇ φωτεινῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

Summary of the Analysis of Verse 20

A third non-Markan occurrence of an absolute use of the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος both parallels earlier occurrences in verses 10a and 13b and completes the thought begun in Mark 16:19. The LE’s author wrote ἐξέλθηντας ἐκτραχεῖαν πανταχου, imitating part of both Mark 6:12 and Luke 9:6 (where Luke’s account parallels Mark 6:12 but uses the distinctive adverb πανταχοῖς). The non-Markan title for Jesus (τοῦ κυρίου) appears for the second time in two verses. The technical term τὸν λόγον could easily have been borrowed from Mark but does not reflect a Markan meaning in v. 20b. The two participles (συνεργούντος καὶ ... βεβαιότερον) have no Markan analogy and reflect a distinctive formulation by the LE’s author. This final verse of the LE, perhaps as much as any of the others, illustrates the three elements that throughout this analysis have been deemed as crucial to understanding the style and compositional purpose of Mark’s Longer Ending: 1) likely borrowing from Mark and other sources (ἐξέλθηντας ἐκτραχεῖαν πανταχοῖς); 2) an attempt to imitate traditional material without reproducing it exactly (τὸν λόγον); and 3) both a distinctive style and ideas that point conclusively to a hand other than the author of the Second Gospel (συνεργούντος καὶ ... βεβαιότερον).

C. Preliminary Conclusion

This chapter has offered a number of observations concerning the writing style of the author of Mark 16:9—20 and the likelihood that this author had at least some knowledge of the four Gospels which eventually became part of the NT. This examination of the LE’s style and use of traditional materials has also left no doubt about whether Mark the evangelist could have written these twelve verses. Taking up the earlier metaphor from an American baseball game, there are enough “strikes” against the LE to “strike out” the case for its authenticity many times over.

The primary purpose of this chapter has been to demonstrate that the LE’s author did not intend to create a novel account, but wrote in conscious imitation of traditions which he, for whatever reason, esteemed. The analysis has moved beyond the results of previous studies, which have focused primarily on the existence of Markan and non-Markan elements in the LE, and has argued that the LE’s numerous Markan words and phrases reflect an effort to imitate the style of the work which this author augmented. The influence of Matthew, Luke and John further reinforce this argument. The evidence of John, Matthew and Luke should be perceived as novel composition. These allusions also point to the intentional imitation of all four of the NT Gospels.

This chapter’s observations concerning the points at which the LE contains material similar to that of the NT Gospels and Acts may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Longer Ending</th>
<th>Parallel NT Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:9: κριτήριας σεβόμενος</td>
<td>Mark 16:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:9: Μαρία τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς</td>
<td>John 20:11—18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:10: Ἑρώτησάς με, ἄνθρωπε ἵνα οὗτος γνωμήν έχῃ</td>
<td>Luke 8:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:10: Ἠρώτησα</td>
<td>John 20:15—16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:11: πρόσεκερα</td>
<td>Mark 28:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:11: τὸν παρακλητόν, ὁ γὰρ τοῦτον γνωμήν έχει</td>
<td>Mark 3:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12: ἐπέμενεν</td>
<td>John 21:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12: αὐτὸς ἐπέμενεν (ὑπάρχει μὲν τοῦτο)</td>
<td>John 21:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12: ἐπέμενεν</td>
<td>Luke 24:13a, 28a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3

Literary Dependence: The Use of Matthew, Luke, John (and Acts) by the Author of Mark 16:9—20

Der sekundäre Markusschluß [16:9-20] und die ebenfalls in der 1. Hälfte des 2. Th. anzusetzende episodia apostolorum sind die frühesten christlichen Texte, die alle Evangelien und die Avg voraussagten.¹

In chapter 2 it was argued that the author of the Longer Ending intended for much of Mark 16:9—20 to resemble traditional materials, many of which resemble strikingly formulations preserved in the NT. Chapter 3 builds upon the previous chapter’s conclusion that the LE’s author wrote in conscious imitation of other valued traditions. In particular, this chapter will investigate what can be known about the materials this author incorporated into these twelve verses. In principle, the author of the LE could have consulted independent oral traditions, written traditions other than copies of the Gospels, oral traditions stemming from the reading of the Gospels in the Christian communities, MSS of the Gospels themselves, or all of these. It turns out that literary dependence upon actual copies of the four NT Gospels and probably of Acts best explains the numerous similarities between the LE and various parts of the NT.

A. Gospel Traditions in the Second Century

Recent scholarship has contributed much to understanding the significance of oral tradition to many second-century Christian writers. It has also shown the need for caution when considering the importance of written traditions like the NT Gospels for these same communities. Consequently, it would be imprudent to discuss Mark’s Longer Ending without considering certain aspects of this larger debate.