

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1964

### The Ending of Mark Reconsidered

Louis Brighton

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Brighton, Louis, "The Ending of Mark Reconsidered" (1964). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 420.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/420>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

28453

THE ENDING OF MARK  
RECONSIDERED



A Thesis Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Exegetical Theology  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirement for the degree of  
Master of Sacred Theology



by

Louis A. Brighton

May 1964

28459

Approved by: Paul M. Bretcher  
Advisor

Frederic W. Danker  
Reader

BV  
4070  
C69  
M3  
1964  
NO.6  
C.2

28459

	Page
.....	1
.....	1
.....	5
.....	7
.....	7
.....	12
.....	14
.....	17
.....	22
.....	24
.....	25
.....	27
.....	43
.....	43
.....	50
.....	59
.....	63
.....	64
.....	66
.....	68
.....	90
.....	92
.....	94

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem of the Ending of Mark, Why Consider it again? . . . . .	1
The Ending of Mark as an Example . . . . .	5
II. THE ENDING OF MARK CONSIDERED ACCORDING TO CRITERIA OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM, EXTERNAL EVIDENCE . . . . .	7
The Greek Manuscripts and the Versions . . . . .	7
The Church Fathers . . . . .	12
The Lectionaries . . . . .	14
Summary of the Evidence. . . . .	17
Summary of Textual Evidence in Outline . . . . .	22
III. THE ENDING OF MARK CONSIDERED ACCORDING TO CRITERIA OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM, INTERNAL EVIDENCE . . . . .	24
The Longer Ending and its Internal Rela- tionship to the Gospel of Mark . . . . .	25
The Ending of Verse Eight and its Inter- nal Relationship to the Gospel of Mark . . . . .	33
IV. THE ENDING OF MARK CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF THE THEOLOGICAL CONTENT OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK . . . . .	43
Theological Implications of Ending Mark at 16:8. . . . .	43
The Silence and Fear Referred to by Mark 16:8. . . . .	50
V. CONCLUSION . . . . .	59
APPENDIX I. . . . .	65
APPENDIX II . . . . .	84
APPENDIX III. . . . .	86
APPENDIX IV . . . . .	88
APPENDIX V. . . . .	90
APPENDIX VI . . . . .	92
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	94

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### The Problem of the Ending of Mark, Why Consider it again?

Ever since the time of Eusebius of Caesarea in the fourth century the Church has been uncertain of the ending of Mark. This concern and doubt about the ending of Mark has intrigued and perplexed Christians. Though the truth about the ending of the second Gospel has been sought and wooed, it has remained ever illusive. Are we today with all of our textual and historical advancement any closer to discovering the truth about the ending of Mark? It will be the burden of this study to show that though we cannot definitely or conclusively answer this perplexing question, we are in a better position to approach the answer, especially in the light of theological research that has been going on in the study of the Gospel of Mark.

At one time it was believed that the Gospel of Mark was so little used in the early Church that it suffered least of the four gospels from textual corruptions.<sup>1</sup> However, we are now in the position to know that though the Gospel of Mark was not as popular as Matthew and John and hence not copied as extensively, its text nevertheless suf-

---

<sup>1</sup>F. S. Grant, "Studies in the Text of Mark," Anglican Theological Review, XX (1938), 109-111.

ferred as much and many times more corruption than either Matthew or John. For the whole text of Mark was again and again assimilated by copyists to Matthew and Luke. Compared with Mark, the text of Matthew is relatively uncorrupt.

Our general impression is that of the three Gospels, Matthew's present text is closest to the autograph, Luke's next, Mark's last; and this no doubt reflects their popularity.<sup>2</sup>

The Gospel of Mark is then more difficult for the textual critic to work with and not the easiest as was once believed.

In the day of Westcott-Hort, rules for textual critics to follow when working with a New Testament text could not only be set up but also be religiously followed. The rules that were set up in the nineteenth century have been followed ever since and only in the last two or three decades have they been losing their grip on the textual critic and his work. For today no one family or manuscript is established as a base from which to work. Today more emphasis is being placed upon internal evidence. This is especially so with respect to the synoptic Gospels where much assimilation has taken place and where the internal study of the Gospel helps to determine a reading.<sup>3</sup> More attention also is being placed on a writer's content and style than was the case in the past to help determine a correct reading.

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>3</sup>A. H. McNeile, An Introduction To the Study Of The New Testament (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), pp. 447-52.

Textual criticism is not so tied to set rules today as it tended to be during the nineteenth century. It involves not only a study of the manuscripts and their relationship to each other, but also a keen awareness of the content and theology of the text under study. Furthermore, recent finds in the field of the manuscripts have deepened, if not our grasp, then our understanding of the history of the text and its transmission.

Despite the advanced state in the various disciplines of Biblical studies and textual studies, scholars seem to be less sure of the ending of Mark than in the day of Westcott-Hort. That is, there is less agreement. Most scholars today accept the view that Mark ends at verse 8 of chapter 16 and that verses 9-20 are to be rejected as a genuine part of the Gospel of Mark. However, scholars are not agreed as to whether Mark intended to end his Gospel at verse 8 or not. Near the end of the nineteenth century all those who accepted the view that Mark's Gospel ended at verse 8 were sure that this was not his intentional ending but that there was something more somewhere.<sup>4</sup> But today there is a growing acceptance that Mark did intend to close his Gospel either at the end of verse 8 with the words *εφοβουτο γαρ* or with a short rounding-off phrase immediately after verse 8.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>H. P. Hamann, "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel - A Study in Textual Criticism," (St. Louis: An unpublished thesis presented to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, 1949), pp. 57-70.

<sup>5</sup>Austin Farrer, St. Matthew and St. Mark (London: Dacre

We thus have more possible alternatives than there were in the nineteenth century. Did Mark end his Gospel at verse 20 of chapter 16, at verse 8, or with an ending which included in some detail the appearances of the risen Christ and the Ascension, or with a short rounded-off phrase after verse 8? The advanced knowledge of new New Testament materials at this point do not make the outcome of our research necessarily more assured. Nevertheless we are finding more alternatives from which to choose. It is, however, the intention of this study to show that there is a good chance with all the materials involved to arrive at a fairly assured conclusion.

One thing that seems to become increasingly true in the opinion of this writer is that we can no longer readily separate purely textual studies from theological studies in determining which variant reading is to be accepted. The discipline of textual criticism must increasingly take into consideration the theological implications which any certain reading chosen over another suggests. That is, a variant must be chosen not only from a study of the textual aspects both externally and internally but also from a study of the theological emphasis which that reading makes. If from a study of the text, the external evidence of the manuscripts

---

Press: A. and C. Black Ltd., 1954), p. 147.

C. F. D. Moule, "St. Mark 16:8 once more," New Testament Studies, II (1955-56), 58-59.

R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (London: Dacre Press: A. and C. Black Ltd., 1954), pp. 80-97.



and the internal evidence of the style would lead us to choose a reading which would not fit into the theological content and emphasis of the context, we would do well to reevaluate our textual evidence. It may even be possible that a reading would be chosen because of the strong theological demands placed upon it from the context or general content of the text or book under study. This does not imply, however, that any theological fancy may determine readings with the result that our choice of a reading would be mere conjecture. Rather, the reading which fits both the textual and theological demands is to be chosen. There must be a careful blending of the two, and the textual critic must therefore know not only the discipline of textual studies but also be well acquainted with the theology and content of his subject.

#### The Ending of Mark as an Example

When we come to consider the ending of Mark it is especially important that we consider both the textual and the theological structure of the text. The study of the ending of Mark is unique in the discipline of textual criticism. Because there is so much material to work with, there are many possibilities which the manuscripts and the internal evidence of the vocabulary, grammar, and style suggest that it is oftentimes perplexing not to be able to arrive at a definite conclusion regarding the more authentic reading of a word or phrase or passage. Happily we are not left only

to a textual study of the manuscripts to help us determine the ending of Mark for also the theological emphasis of Mark plays an important role in helping us to come to a conclusion about the ending of Mark.<sup>6</sup>

This study of the ending of Mark then intends to show the importance of weighing together both the textual aspects and the theological considerations in determining Mark's ending. It will be demonstrated that the text of Mark ends at verse 8. It will also be shown from a theological consideration that Mark intended to end his Gospel at verse 8. We are considering the problem of the ending of Mark once again because our conclusion that Mark intended to end his Gospel at chapter 16, verse 8 has received only little attention.<sup>7</sup> It is considered again because if Mark did intend to end his Gospel at verse 8, his Gospel then holds forth a theological direction that has been largely disregarded and which makes Mark a distinctive Gospel rather than just a Gospel to be used as a basis of or a comparison with the other three Gospels.

---

<sup>6</sup>N. B. Stonehouse, The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Guardian, 1944), p. 88.

Grant, op. cit., pp. 103-119.

<sup>7</sup>Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 80.

## CHAPTER II

### THE ENDING OF MARK CONSIDERED ACCORDING TO CRITERIA OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM, EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

The criteria of textual criticism include both the study of the external evidence of the various manuscripts upon which the text is based and the study of internal evidence of the style and grammatical structure of the text. The external evidence of the manuscripts of the text include the evaluation of the manuscripts of the Greek copies of the original text, a comparison of the manuscripts of the various translated versions made from the Greek manuscripts, and a study of the quotations made by the church fathers in their writings in both the Greek and the Latin. The internal evidence includes the study of the linguistic and grammatical structure of the text with a comparison of the variant readings to that structure, and an analysis of the purpose and content of the whole work from which the text under consideration receives its meaning and linguistic sense.

#### The Greek Manuscripts and the Versions

The Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of Mark and the manuscripts of the versions suggest three possible endings to the gospel. Some manuscripts end the gospel at verse 8 of chapter 16, a second group ends the gospel at verse 20,

and a third group of manuscripts end the gospel at verse 8 but with an additional short verse not found in the first two groups of manuscripts. While some of the manuscripts give evidence of the gospel ending in only one of the above three alternatives without suggesting any other kind of ending, other manuscripts give evidence that the scribe who wrote the manuscript was aware of more than one possible ending to the gospel.

The following manuscripts of the Greek text and of the various versions suggest and support termination of the Gospel of Mark at verse 8:

Codex Vaticanus, siglum B, IV century,

Codex Sinaiticus, siglum Ⲛ, IV century,<sup>1</sup>

Codex Vercellensis of the Old Latin version,  
siglum a, IV century,<sup>2</sup>

Syriac Sinaiticus of the Old Syriac version,  
IV/V century,

Some ninety-nine codices of the Armenian  
version, from the IX century onward,<sup>3</sup>

Two codices of the Georgian version, the

Adysh and the 'A' codices, IX and X century,<sup>4</sup> and

Three codices of the Ethiopic version, XIII century.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix I, note A.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix I, note B.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix I, note C.

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix I, note D.

The ending of the Gospel of Mark at verse 20, called the Longer Ending, is suggested and supported by:

Most of the uncial Greek manuscripts,

sigla A C (D)<sup>5</sup> E F G H K M S U V X Θ Γ Δ Π Ξ

Ω Υ W and others, IV to IX century,

Most of the minuscules Greek Manuscripts,

IX to XV century

All the Old Latin codices excepting codices

sigla a and k, V century onward,

The Vulgate codices, VII century onward,

Eighty-eight codices of the Armenian version,

IX century onward,

The codices of the Georgian version excepting

the two listed above, IX century onward,

The codices of the Coptic version, IV century,

onward,

The Syriac Cureton codex of the Old Syriac

version, IV/V century,

The codices of the Syriac Peshitta version,

IV century onward, and

A majority of the Ethiopic codices, XII century,

onward.

The evidence for Mark ending at 16:8 with the additional short verse, called the Shorter Ending is suggested and supported by:

---

<sup>5</sup>Codex Bezae (D) from Mark 16:15 to 16:20 is by a second and/or later hand.

Codex Bobiensis, siglum k, of the Old Latin  
 version, V century, and  
 Seven codices of the Ethiopic version,  
 XII century onward.

Many of the above manuscripts show a confusion as to what was the real ending of Mark or an awareness of more than one way of ending the gospel. For some of the manuscripts contain the Longer Ending, verses 9-20, but note either by a gap or by asterisks between verse 8 and 9 and/or by a note in the text or in the margin that some manuscripts do not contain verses 9-20:

Asterisks accompanied by a note, Minuscules  
 137 and 138,<sup>6</sup>

A  $TE \lambda OC$  after verse eight accompanied by a  
 note, Minuscule 15 22 24 36 and 199,<sup>7</sup>

No marks in the text but have a note, Minuscules 1  
 205 206 209 1582 20 215 and 300,<sup>8</sup>

No marks in the text, but a note at John 21:12,  
 Minuscules 239 259 and 237,<sup>9</sup>

A  $TE \lambda OC$  after verse eight but no note,  
 Minuscules 161 282 and 268,<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>See Appendix I, note E.

<sup>7</sup>See Appendix I, note F.

<sup>8</sup>See Appendix I, note G.

<sup>9</sup>See Appendix I, note H.

<sup>10</sup>See Appendix I, note I.

Large note at the end of the gospel but no marks in  
 the text, Minuscules 12 34 37 38 39 40 41  
 108 129 137 138 143 181 186 195 210 221  
 222 237 238 255 259 299 329 374.<sup>11</sup>

Some thirty-three codices of the Armenian version also employ either asterisks or notes or both to indicate that verses 9-20 are not found in all manuscripts.<sup>12</sup>

Other manuscripts indicate that in some codices Mark ends at verse 8 but then give both the Shorter Ending, verse 8<sup>b</sup>, and the Longer Ending, verses 9-20:

Uncials sigla L Ψ 099 and 0112,<sup>13</sup>

Minuscules 274<sup>mg</sup> and 579,

Five codices of the Coptic version,<sup>14</sup> and

Syriac Harclean<sup>mg</sup>.<sup>15</sup>

The Washington Manuscript of the Gospels, Códex W, gives the Longer Ending without any indication of a division be-

<sup>11</sup>See Appendix I, note J.

<sup>12</sup>E. C. Colwell, "Mark 16:9-20 in the Armenian Version," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 369-86.

<sup>13</sup>See Appendix I, note K.

<sup>14</sup>P. E. Kahle, "The End of St. Mark's Gospel - The Witnesses of the Coptic Versions," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, XX (1951), 49-57.

<sup>15</sup>S. C. E. Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum - Evangelium Secundum Marcum, (Oxford: University Press, 1935), pp. covering notes and criticus apparatus for Mark 16:8-20.

cf. J. W. Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1871), pp. 114-23.

tween verses 8 and 9. But between verses 14 and 15 it gives its own peculiar insertion, the Freer Logion. Because of this lengthy interpolation Codex W could be said to offer a fourth possible ending to Mark. (See also Jerome's testimony to the Freer Logion in Appendix IV.)

### The Church Fathers

The Church Fathers evidence early that Mark was known to exist with two alternative endings, either ending at verse 8 or at verse 20. The earliest Fathers from which we can derive any evidence all point to a certain knowledge of the Longer Ending, verses 9-20. There is a possible reference to Mark 16:18 in Papias, to Mark 16:20 in Justin Martyr. There is a definite quote of Mark 16:19 in the Latin version of Irenaeus, and it is almost certain that the Longer Ending was present in the text used by Tatian when he formed his Diatessaron. There are also indications that verses 9-20 were used in Hermas. And there is a quote of Mark 16:17-18 in the Latin works of Cyprian where Vincentius, Bishop of Thibari, is said to have spoken the quote at the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256. Hippolytus also used a text which included the Longer Ending.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 223 and footnote pp. 24-5.  
 Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Reprint of First Edition; London and New York: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1959), p. 610.  
 B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels - A Study of Origins (Ninth Impression; London and New York: MacMillan and Company, 1956), pp. 336-37.



The earliest certain evidence in the Fathers for Mark ending at verse 8 is in Eusebius of Caesarea. Eusebius in his own writings quite freely uses verses 9-20. But in a long quote in which he answers the question about the differences in the time element of the resurrection between Matthew and Mark he asserts that the best manuscripts did not have the Longer Ending which contains the assumed differences. Jerome also maintained that many and better manuscripts did not have the Longer Ending, but he too uses and quotes verses 9-20. And Victor of Antioch also witnesses to many manuscripts ending at verse 8 in his commentary on Mark, but he himself still considered verses 9-20 genuine.<sup>17</sup>

One other important witness to Mark ending at verse 8 is Hesychius. He is quoted to have said that the Gospel ended at verse 8 after the message of the angel. However, this reference is not completely certain because of the identity of this Hesychius, but if it were it would be an important witness independent of and along side of Eusebius. For possibly both Jerome and Victor of Antioch leaned on Eusebius.<sup>18</sup> The only other Father that is a witness to Mark ending at verse 8 is Severus of Aquitania and Tours who maintained also that the more exact and better manuscripts

---

H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to Mark, Reprint of reprinted Third Edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. cix.

<sup>17</sup>See Appendix I, note L.

<sup>18</sup>Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

ended at verse 8, though he too was acquainted with manuscripts with the Longer Ending.<sup>19</sup>

All the remainder of the early Fathers who use the end of Mark or make reference to it know only of the Longer Ending. Such Fathers as Hippolytus, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Nestorius, and Cyril use or refer to the Longer Ending and show no awareness of any manuscripts ending at verse 8.<sup>20</sup>

### The Lectionaries

In recent years the Lectionaries of the Ancient Church are increasing in importance for textual studies. The use of Lectionaries in the various churches as the Greek Church, Syrian and Latin Churches was early in origin. Even before the written Greek Testament existed certain fixed portions of Holy Writ were publicly read before the congregations. Though there does not exist any Lectionary older than the eighth century, yet the scheme itself is older than most of the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament.<sup>21</sup> And the Lectionaries which do exist contain much older lections ap-

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Streeter, op. cit., p. 336.  
Burgon, op. cit., pp. 24-5, 27-9, 39-41, and 57-9.  
Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

<sup>21</sup> J. W. Burgon and Edward Miller, The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896), pp. 194-95.

pointed for Holy Days than the dates of the various Lectionary manuscripts. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Augustine all speak of lections for appointed days. Eusebius, Origen, and Clement of Alexander all use the technical term for an Ecclesiastical Lection, ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΗ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΙΣ, ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΜΑ and thus remind us that in their day in the East the Lectionary practice was established.<sup>22</sup> The testimony therefore of the Lectionaries is of interest in helping to determine the ending of Mark. And while the testimony is not decisive in deciding the ending,<sup>23</sup> it is worthy of consideration.

The Longer Ending, verses 9-20, was used as a lection in many of the Lectionaries of the Greek Church. It was in use as one of the lections during the Feast of the Resurrection in the days of Gregory of Nyssa.<sup>24</sup> In other Lectionaries it was used as either a lection during Easter or for the Feast of the Ascension.<sup>25</sup> From all the evidence available verses 9-20 was accepted as a genuine part of the Gospel of Mark. Burgon claims that "no unauthorized 'fragment', however 'remarkable', could by possibility have so established itself in the regards of the East and of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 196.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 191.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 204.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 205.

West, from the very first."<sup>26</sup>

There is no evidence from the Lectionaries that verse 8 was known or considered as the ending of Mark. Though the ending of Mark was never considered a prime reading for the Feast Days of Easter or Ascension but rather a minor reading, one might still have expected some hint from the Lectionaries that verse 8 was known as an alternative ending. But of this there is no hint of evidence. Burgon even thinks that the Lectionaries may have been the cause for some of the omissions in the Greek codices of the New Testament.<sup>27</sup>

The evidence from the Ammonian sections and the Eusebian canons is of little value since the last sections numbered could suggest either the omission or the retention of verses 9-20. However, a very few codices of the Greek New Testament seem to support that there was some confusion as to where the Gospel of Mark did end.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 210.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 226.

cf. Karl W. Rutz, "A Search For The Archetype of the Greek Gospel Lectionary" (St. Louis: An unpublished Th.D. thesis presented to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, 1961), p. 10, footnote 3.

F. H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Fourth Edition, Vol I. (Cambridge: George Bell & Sons, 1894), pp. 80-89.

B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Appendix (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), pp. 41-4.

<sup>28</sup> Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

Burgon, op. cit., pp. 123-35.

The only evidence that can be cited from apocryphal or extra canonical literature is that of the Acts of Pilate which quotes verses from the Longer Ending.<sup>29</sup>

#### Summary of the Evidence

How did Mark end his gospel? The external evidence of the manuscripts attest to three possible endings. Of these three possible endings the Shorter Ending, verse 8<sup>b</sup>, can be ruled out because of lack of sustained evidence. Though the Shorter Ending is of high antiquity, because of its scarcity in appearance in the manuscripts it has no real claim to be considered a part of St. Mark's Gospel.<sup>30</sup> The choice which the manuscripts then offer lies between the Longer Ending, verses 9-20, and the ending with verse 8. The possibility of an hypothetical ending now lost and yet to be recovered is too conjectural, for the manuscripts do not of themselves offer such a possibility. According to the manuscripts now available Mark either ended his gospel at verse 8 or at verse 20.<sup>31</sup>

In mere number of manuscripts the Longer Ending, verses 9-20 is heavily favored. The earliest evidence now known attests to the Longer Ending, beginning in the second century.

---

<sup>29</sup>Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

<sup>30</sup>Westcott-Hort, op. cit., Appendix, pp. 44-6.

<sup>31</sup>See Appendix I, note M.

For ending Mark at verse 8 there is no evidence until the fourth century. From these two points then it would seem the external evidence of the manuscripts, the versions, and quotations from the Church Fathers would suggest that the Longer Ending is to be favored as the ending of Mark.

However, from the evidence that Eusebius, Jerome, and Victor of Antioch, together with some of the minuscules and a few uncials, it is clear that there were many manuscripts older than the fourth century which knew of or which themselves ended at verse 8. During the fourth century evidence for ending Mark at verse 8 becomes strong, especially at Alexandria. And though in weaker form than that of the Longer Ending evidence for ending Mark at verse 8 persists all the way up to the eleventh century. From the eleventh century onward the evidence for the Longer Ending becomes overwhelming while all evidence for Mark ending at verse 8 disappears.

Geographically the strongest evidence for ending Mark at verse 8 is at Alexandria. But there is also evidence that the Longer Ending did exist along side of the ending of verse 8 in Egypt south of Alexandria, Codex W and the Coptic. In the West, in Rome and Europe, the text of Mark contained the Longer Ending, and although the ending of verse 8 was known, it was never entertained as the true ending of Mark. In North Africa the text of Mark also contained the Longer Ending, though again there is some evidence that the ending of verse 8 was known. In the Byzan-

tine East the text of Mark also contained the Longer Ending with slight evidence that verse 8 as the ending was known. In the Syrian and Palestinian East the first evidence points to the Longer Ending, in the second century. But in the fourth century the evidence becomes strong for the ending at verse 8. In the sixth century, however, the evidence swings back again to the Longer Ending. It is possible that the influence of the Alexandrian School moved Palestine in the fourth century to consider verse 8 as the true ending of Mark.<sup>32</sup> Thus in the West, in Europe and in Africa, the text of Mark contained the Longer Ending. The text also of the Byzantine East contained the Longer Ending. Opposed to the West and Byzantine East is Egypt which ended Mark at verse 8. The Palestinian East stands between Europe and Egypt.

From the above picture of the external evidence of the manuscripts and the Church Fathers scholars have been divided and undecided as to the ending of Mark. While in the past scholars traditionally held that verse 9-20 was the ending of Mark, most scholars today no longer seriously consider the Longer Ending as a part of the Gospel of Mark. Wellhausen and Meyer were the first to sponsor verse 8 as the ending of Mark. And scholars such as Loisy, Loofs, and Stonehouse followed their lead. However, since the time of Wellhausen the majority of scholars have been dissatisfied with verse 8 being the ending and instead favor a lost ending

---

<sup>32</sup>See Appendix I, note N.

still possibly to be recovered. They receive the gospel today as ending at verse 8, because of the manuscript evidence, but hold that the original text of Mark contained an ending which was lost and no longer available to us. And the Longer Ending and the Shorter Ending of verse 8<sup>b</sup> were attempts to make up this loss on the part of later scribes (Westcott, Hort, Streeter, Gregory, Zahn, to name only a few).<sup>33</sup> Scholars today reject verses 9-20 as the ending of Mark and either favor the ending as being verse 8 or a lost ending still possibly to be recovered.

The judgment of the scholars of today that verses 9-20 are not to be considered a part of the Gospel of Mark is in the judgment of this present study correct. While the majority of manuscripts of the Greek New Testament support verses 9-20 as the ending of Mark, yet the oldest and most consistently reliable manuscripts support verse 8 as the ending. And the evidence of the early Church Fathers is more evenly divided between supporting verses 9-20 and verse 8.

One argument has not yet been mentioned, which argument certainly supports verse 8 over and against verse 9-20. The textual critical school of Alexandria judged the ending of verse 8 to be the best text. There is evidence from the manuscripts themselves, especially from Vaticanus and Sina-

---

<sup>33</sup>H. P. Hamann, "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel - A Study in Textual Criticism," (St. Louis: An unpublished STM thesis presented to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, 1949), p. 59.



iticus, that the Alexandrian school carefully weighed the two alternative endings before coming to their decision. This judgment of an historical critical science as it was practiced in the school at Alexandria must receive considerable attention. While it is true that we can not now evaluate their judgment because of lack of manuscript evidence before the fourth century, which manuscript evidence they certainly had but which is no longer available to us, it nevertheless commends respect.

This study then suggests that from the external evidence available verses 9-20 are to be rejected as the ending of Mark in favor of verse 8. This judgment however can not be an absolute and categorical one. There is not enough support for verse 8 from the manuscripts. The ending of Mark at verse 8 is of the Alexandrian tradition while the Longer Ending of verses 9-20 is of the Western tradition. Until we know more about the Western Text, its origins, and its value in judging the original Greek text, and until we perhaps uncover more manuscript evidence, a categorical judgment can not be made alone on the basis of external evidence of existing manuscripts.

That there may possibly be a "lost ending" still to be recovered, receives no support whatsoever from the external evidence of the manuscripts. There is no hint of such an ending. Again it is the conclusion of this study that there is no evidence from the manuscripts or from the Church Fathers that there ever was a "lost ending". Such a conjec-

ture can at the present time be derived only from the external evidence by way of deduction through a study of the internal study of the content and structure of the Gospel of Mark.

### Summary of Textual Evidence in Outline

#### Evidence for Mark ending at 16:8 (No Ending):

##### Manuscript evidence

*Sinaiticus?*

B,  
Old Latin 'a'  
Old Syriac Syr. Sin  
Armenian  
Georgian

##### Patristic evidence

Eusebius	Jerome
Hesychius	Severus

#### Evidence for Mark ending at 16:20 (Longer Ending):

##### Manuscript evidence

All remaining Uncials  
Minuscules  
All remaining Old Latin manuscripts  
Vulgate  
Coptic  
Old Syriac Syr. Cur  
Syriac Peshitta  
Ethiopic

##### Patristic evidence

Papias	Tatian
Justine Martyr	Vincentius
Irenaeus	Hippolytus
Ambrose	Nestorius
Augustine	Cyril
Chrysostom	
Victor of Antioch	

Evidence for Mark ending at 16:8<sup>b</sup> (Shorter Ending):

Manuscript evidence  
 Old Latin 'k'  
 L,  $\Upsilon$ , 099, 0112  
 Minuscules 274<sup>mg</sup>, 579  
 Coptic (five codices)  
 Syriac Harc.<sup>mg</sup>  
 Ethiopic (seven codices)

### CHAPTER III

#### THE ENDING OF MARK CONSIDERED ACCORDING TO CRITERIA OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM, INTERNAL EVIDENCE

While it is true that it cannot be stated with certainty from a study of the manuscripts that Mark ended his Gospel at verse 8, the evidence from a study of the internal style and content of the ending of Mark helps to support such a conclusion. A study of the internal structure of a text can help to determine which of two alternative readings is the genuine one if the two readings are far enough apart as to style, grammar, vocabulary, and content. But when the two readings are close together in their internal structure, then it becomes dangerous to use internal textual evidence to decide or help decide a genuine reading. Can such an internal study of the last chapter of Mark help to determine the ending of Mark? Do verses 9-20 agree with the Gospel of Mark when the canons of internal evidence are brought to bear? Does the ending of the Gospel at verse 8 agree best with the internal structure and content of chapter 16 and with the rest of the Gospel? Of the scholars who have undertaken such an internal study of the ending of Mark two scholars are representative of the two different conclusions derived from such a study. Burgon comes to the conclusion that the internal evidence from the study of the last chapter of Mark supports verses 9-20 as the gen-

uine ending of the Gospel.<sup>1</sup> Stonehouse comes to the opposite conclusion that verse 8 is the true ending of the Gospel.<sup>2</sup> Despite however, the subjectivity involved in such an internal study of a text, it is the contention of this present study that such evidence can be useful in helping to determine the ending of Mark if it is not treated in isolation from the external study of the manuscripts and if it is used in a secondary roll to support the external evidence of the manuscripts.

Such a study of the internal structure and content of the last chapter of Mark will involve a study of the Longer Ending, verses 9-20 and its connection to the Gospel of Mark. Then a study of the possibility of ending the Gospel at verse 8 in view of such an ending in relationship to the rest of the Gospel of Mark. From such a study then there will be enough evidence to support the conclusion of the manuscripts that Mark ended his Gospel at verse 8.

#### The Longer Ending and its Internal Relationship to the Gospel of Mark

In a study of the internal structure of a text two things present themselves as indications as to whether a

---

<sup>1</sup>J. W. Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1871), pp. 137-90.

<sup>2</sup>N. B. Stonehouse, The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Guardian, 1944), pp. 90-117.

certain text is by the same author or of the same writing. The grammatical construction of the text, its vocabulary and phraseology, its sentence structure. And the style and content of the text.

When one reads the Gospel of Mark he is immediately struck by the difference between verses 9-20 and the rest of Gospel. For nowhere else in the Gospel is there such an abrupt change in grammar and style as there is between verse 8 and 9 of chapter 16. While the Gospel of Mark is chiefly historical in character, verses 9-20 seem to be more didactic in intention, more Johannine rather than Marcan.<sup>3</sup> Instead of the succession of short paragraphs linked together by *καί* and sometimes *δέ*, which is common throughout the Gospel of Mark, there is in verse 9-20 a carefully constructed passage in which *ΜΕΤΑ ΔΕ ΤΑΥΤΑ, ΟΥΤΕΞΟΥΝ ΔΕ, Ο ΜΕΝ ΟΥΡ, ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ ΔΕ* mark the successive points of juncture. Throughout his Gospel Mark presents short paragraphs relating historical events, and his practice is to join them together loosely with a *καί* or less frequently with a *δέ*. This connecting *καί* and *δέ* are missing in verses 9-20.

The thrust of verses 9-20 seems to be more theological than historical. That does not mean that verses 9-20 do not relate historical events, but that in relating them

---

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Swete, The Four Gospels - A Study of Origins, Reprint of reprinted Third Edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), pp. cx-cxi.

they are used for a theological purpose. The author carries the Risen Lord beyond the sphere of history to His place at the right hand of God and points out His leadership and cooperation in the work of the Church during the events and time which followed the Ascension. These verses are more in keeping with the Gospel of John which uses the historical events of Christ's life for a theological purpose. This use of the historical events of the ministry and life of Christ is not in keeping with Mark's usage. He rather relates the events of Christ's life in his Gospel in such a way as to leave them with just a simple telling of them without any interpretation, or without their being used to show any particular interpretation. Mark wants the events to make their own impression upon the reader without any direction from the author.<sup>4</sup>

The following peculiarities of verses 9-20 can be pointed out as to vocabulary and grammatical style, keeping in mind however, Burgon's dictum, "The Concordance Test . . . is about the coarsest as well as about the most delusive that could be devised."<sup>5</sup> And also the warning of Westcott-Hort can be cited that the intrinsic evidence of style and vocabulary are too inconclusive to point one way or the other.<sup>6</sup> ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ is used absolutely in verses

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Burgon, op. cit., pp. 173-74.

<sup>6</sup>B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament

10, 11, and 13 in the Longer Ending. It is never so used in the rest of the Gospel. *Πορευομαι* is used three times in a secondary tense in verses 10, 12, and 15. It is never so used in the rest of the Gospel in a secondary tense--it is used only one other time in the entire Gospel, Mark 9:30, and that in a primary tense. The phrase *το(ς) μετ'αυτου γενομενοις* used in verse 10 of the Longer Ending is not met with in the rest of the Gospel. That is, *γινομαι* though used frequently in the Gospel of Mark is never used in such a structural phrase. The word *θεαομαι* is used twice in the Longer Ending, verses 11 and 14, but it is not once used in chapters 1:1 to 16:8 of Mark. Mark instead uses the word *θεωρω* --in Mark 15:47 instead of *θεωρω* Codex Bezae has *θεαομαι*.<sup>7</sup> *Απιστεω* appears two times in 16:11 and 16:16 but nowhere else in the Gospel. The word *υστερον* in 16:4 does not appear at all from 1:1 to 16:8 of Mark. It is however, a word which is used by Matthew. *Μετα ταυτα* in verse 12 of the Longer Ending is a phrase peculiar to verses 9-20. The word *ετερος* appears also in the Longer Ending, verse 12, but nowhere else in the Gospel. The word *παρακολουθεω* appears in 16:12 but nowhere else in Mark. The words

---

in the Original Greek, Appendix (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), p. 48.

<sup>7</sup>James D. Yoder, Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961), p. 33.

Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 91.



ΣΥΝΕΡΓΟΥΝΤΕΣ, ΒΕΒΑΙΩ, and ΕΠΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΩ all in 16:20 appear nowhere else in the Gospel.<sup>8</sup> No one of these peculiarities alone would be of any evidence that verses 9-20 did not belong to the Gospel of Mark, for an author will use different words and phrases to express different ideas. But when so many words and phrases are peculiar to such a short passage, it can be an indication that the text is from another author.

In the matter of style the following points can be made to show that verses 9-20 represent a different style than that of the rest of the Gospel of Mark: the absence of *παλιν* and *εὐθὺς* in these verses, the use of which is so characteristic of Mark's style--*παλιν* appearing some thirty-nine times in the chapters 1:1-16:8 and *εὐθὺς* some forty-two times.<sup>9</sup> While the Gospel of Mark is rich in graphic details as it presents the historical narratives, verses 9-20 seem rather to be a summary of events than a detailed narrative of events. Stonehouse writes:

The simple, paratactic style which is found as far as Mk. 16:8 is absent from the long ending, where instead one finds a more complex sentence structure and distinctive connecting links. *καὶ* ('and') commonly serves to introduce sentences or clauses before Mk. 16:9,

---

<sup>8</sup>F. H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Fourth Edition, Vol. II (Cambridge: George Bell & Sons, 1894), p. 342, footnote.

W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A Concordance To The Greek Testament (Edinburg: T. and T. Clark, Third Edition, 1950), pp. 313, 314, 840, 164-65, 438, 87, 632, 392, 758, 921, 145, and 351.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 400 and 748.

appearing, for example, ten or more times in the thirteen verses of the preface and seven or more times in the eight undisputed verses of chapter 16, but it does not occur at all in the long ending.<sup>10</sup>

The phrase *αναστασις δε* is correctly used as a beginning of a narrative, but is out of place in verse 9 of the Longer Ending. For as a statement of antecedent fact not witnessed by human eyes, it is out of place in the midst of an account of the things actually seen and heard by the women.<sup>11</sup> *πρωτον* suits the beginning of a narrative rather than a continuation of verses 1 to 8.<sup>12</sup> And *πρωι πρωτη σαββατου* is without force as a slightly varied repetition from verse 2, though it is most necessary to an initial narrative of the Resurrection.<sup>13</sup> Again these peculiarities are too striking to pass over, and added together they lend weight to the evidence that these verses do not belong to the Gospel of Mark.

Far weightier perhaps than the grammatical construction and style in leading one to think that verses 9-20 are not a part of the Gospel of Mark is the difference in the content between verses 1-8 and 9-20 in chapter 16. Verses 9-20 do not logically or contextually follow verse 8. The strong impression which is left after a careful reading of the

<sup>10</sup> Stonehouse, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-91.

<sup>11</sup> Westcott-Hort, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-9.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

chapter is that verses 9-20 were tacked on to verse 8 and came from an entirely different source. That verses 9-20 come from some Resurrection account is evident, but that it fits after verse 8 is not in keeping with verses 1-8. Verse 9 begins a parallel narrative to that which begins in verse 1 as if it were in summary fashion beginning to relate the narrative again. In verses 1 to 8 the three women are the persons in the narrative, but beginning with verse 9 a shift singles out only Mary Magdalene. She enters the picture in verse 9 as if she had not been mentioned before.<sup>14</sup> The comment of the angel in verse 7 is not referred to in verses 9-20, quite unlike Matthew 28:7, 16.<sup>15</sup> And the material of the signs following the preaching of the Gospel seem almost apocryphal in tone to the somber yet majestic material in verses 1-8.<sup>16</sup> It is interesting to note that both Matthew and Luke keep in step with Mark up to verse 8 in their respective Resurrection accounts, in step also with each other, but after verse 8 Matthew and Luke diverge from both Mark and each other.<sup>17</sup>

An analysis of the Longer Ending shows that it is a patch-work affair containing mention of events from the

---

<sup>14</sup>H. P. Hamann, "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel - A Study in Textual Criticism," (St. Louis: An unpublished STM thesis presented to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, 1949), p. 55.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Austin Farrer, St. Matthew and St. Mark (London: Dacre

other three Gospels and from sources outside the other three Gospels. As it mentions each event it strings them all together without describing them in detail. Verses 9-11 mention the appearance of the risen Lord to Mary Magdalene, which is fully described in John 20:1-18. Verses 12-13 mention the appearance to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus described in detail in Luke 24:13-35. Verses 14-16 mention the appearance to the eleven disciples and the great commission, which is described in more detail in Luke 24:36-48, Matthew 28:16-20, and John 20:19-23, 26-29. Verses 17-18 mention the signs which would follow the preaching of the Gospel. This material is absent in the other three Gospels and its source is not traceable. Verse 19 mentions the Ascension, which is described in detail in Luke 24:50-53 and Acts 1:4-14. And verse 20 mentions the preaching of the Gospel everywhere, similar to Matthew 28:19, and is fully described throughout the book of Acts. This patch-work text where the events are only catalogued and not described in detail is contrary to the style of the Gospel of Mark. The contents also of verses 9-20 do not follow contextually or logically after verse 8.

The conclusion then derived from such a study of verses 9-20 in relationship to verses 1-8 and to the rest of the Gospel is that these verses are not a part of the Gospel of Mark, but part of another independent account of

the Resurrection. This together with the evidence from the manuscripts witnesses to the fact that Mark closes his Gospel at verse 8. But did Mark intend to end his Gospel at verse 8?

#### The Ending of Verse Eight and its Internal Relationship to the Gospel of Mark

That the Gospel should end at verse 8 is at first glance strange. As one again reads the last chapter, one expects the narration to continue after verse 8. It is almost unthinkable to be stopped suddenly at verse 8 with no more narration following. Westcott-Hort believe,

It is incredible that the evangelist deliberately concluded either a paragraph with *εφ' οβουρτο γαρ*, or the Gospel with a petty detail of a secondary event, leaving his narrative hanging in the air.<sup>18</sup>

Zahn maintained that though the Gospel as we now have it ends at verse 8, it is "an intolerable book-ending."<sup>19</sup> Harris strongly asserts that *εφ' οβουρτο γαρ* is neither a proper literary ending nor even a Christian or Greek ending. He thinks that the real ending is lost and gone.<sup>20</sup>

Professor Burkitt maintains that,

---

<sup>18</sup>Westcott-Hort, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>19</sup>Th. Zahn, Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888 and 1892), Zweiter Band, Zweite Hälfte, p. 929.

<sup>20</sup>J. R. Harris, Side-Lights on New Testament Research (London: The Kingsgate Press and James Clarke and Company, 1909), p. 87.

In no case could the Gospel have originally ended with  $\epsilon\phi\omicron\theta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron \gamma\alpha\rho$ . Ought we not, indeed, to print  $\epsilon\phi\omicron\theta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron \grave{\gamma}\alpha\rho$  . . . with a grave accent? It is very unusual to find clauses, much less paragraphs, which end with  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ .<sup>21</sup>

Streeter claims that

the author of the Gospel cannot have originally meant to end it without the account of the appearance to the Apostles in Galilee which is twice predicted in the text (Mk. xiv.28, xvi.7). Indeed the words  $\epsilon\phi\omicron\theta\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron \gamma\alpha\rho$  in Greek may not even be the end of a sentence; they lead us to expect a clause beginning with  $\mu\eta$ , 'They were afraid, lest they should be thought mad,' or something to that effect.<sup>22</sup>

The majority of scholars today concur with the above believing that while Mark as we have it ends at verse 8, the Gospel originally had a proper ending in keeping with verse 8, which ending is now lost.<sup>23</sup>

If Mark did not intend to end his Gospel with verse 8, what kind of ending would he have conceived? This opens all kinds of possibilities, and scholars are not wanting in try-

---

<sup>21</sup>F. C. Burkitt, The Old Latin and the Itala. Vol. IV, No. 3 of Texts and Studies. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: The University Press, 1904), p. 408.

<sup>22</sup>B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels - A Study of Origins, Ninth Impression (London and New York: MacMillan and Company, 1956), p. 337.

<sup>23</sup>Kirsopp Lake, The Historical Evidence For the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907), pp. 44-79.

Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, An Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Harpers, 1937), pp. 35-7.

Allan Menzies, The Earliest Gospel (London: MacMillan and Company, 1901), pp. 290-97.

E. J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937 and 1955), pp. 144-45.

ing to conjecture the answer. Some, like Farrer, favor a short rounding-off sentence rather than a lengthy narrative. Farrer reconstructs a rounding off sentence from the way Matthew used Mark and comes up with ". . . for they were afraid. But Jesus sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel among all nations."<sup>24</sup> He then concludes, "We advance the hypothesis we have expounded as a tolerable alternative to the difficult but still attractive supposition that the Gospel ended with the words 'For they were afraid.'"<sup>25</sup> Moule conjectures that ουδενι ουδεν may have been parenthetical. He then suggests as a possible ending to Mark the following:

και εξελθουσιν εφυγον απο του  
μνημειου (ειχεν γαρ αυτας τρομας  
και εκστασις. και ουδενι  
ουδεν ειπον. εφοβουντο γαρ).  
και ευθυσ λεγουσιν τοις  
μαθηταις περι παντων τουτων .<sup>26</sup>

Turner favors a more lengthy narrative with which to supply Mark with an ending. He suggests an ending which would include an appearance of Jesus to the women, the women then carrying the angel's message to the disciples, the appearance

---

<sup>24</sup>Farrer, op. cit., p. 157.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 159.

<sup>26</sup>C. F. D. Moule, "St. Mark 16:8 once more," New Testament Studies, 2/1 (1955-56), 58-9.

of Jesus to Peter, and lastly an appearance to all the eleven and possibly to the five hundred at once.<sup>27</sup> Haefner conjectures that after verse 8 Mark continued with Acts 1:13-14 and then in turn with Acts chapters 3 and 4. Moffatt had already noted that Briggs and Blass had found the early chapters of Acts due to Mark.<sup>28</sup>

To maintain that Mark did not intend to end his Gospel at verse 8, however, imposes upon the conjecturer a hazardous undertaking. It operates in complete silence of any objective evidence. It begs the question, and it can end in the wildest sort of suggestions. Even Farrer is conscious of this when he says:

It is immoral to invoke accident, whether physical accident, such as the damaging of the unique original before even St. Matthew saw a copy; or personal accident such as St. Mark's death or arrest in the middle of a sentence, when he had a couple more paragraphs only to write. Such accidents could happen, but they are not at all likely; and history would become a field for uncontrolled fantasy, if historians allowed themselves the free use of such suppositions.<sup>29</sup>

Such suppositions leave many questions that one would have to answer. Was Mark prevented from completing his Gospel? Did he complete it, but was the end by intention or accident lost? Is there any evidence from any other famous writing

---

<sup>27</sup>J. M. Creed, "The Conclusion of the Gospel according to St. Mark," Journal Of Theological Studies, XXXI (1930), 177.

<sup>28</sup>A. E. Haefner, "The Bridge between Mark and Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII/I (1958), 67-71.

<sup>29</sup>Farrer, op. cit., p. 144.



thus suffering such a loss without any trace of it? Can we maintain that a part of Holy Scripture could have been lost? The accident theory, that Mark finished his Gospel but that the end of it was lost by accident, seems the most plausible. Kenyon at first maintained that the last chapter of Mark could not have been mutilated so that it became lost, because the manuscript at first was a roll and not a codex and there would have been no last leaf to be torn off. The end of the roll being on the inside would not be exposed to the danger of such mutilation. Though Kenyon still holds to the first argument--even though codices were in the second century being used, the scroll was still used in the first--he is no longer so sure of the second. He now believes that usually a reader being human when he had finished reading a roll, he did not rewind it but left the end on the outside, leaving it for the next person who wanted to read it to rewind it. Kenyon maintains that this is confirmed by the habit of placing the title at the end of the roll and not at the beginning.<sup>30</sup> With this conclusion Roberts does not agree. He says that there is no evidence of this habit among the wealth of references in Latin literature. The practice of placing the title at the end of the scroll does not necessarily support Kenyon's view. Roberts says, "The accepted view has been that it was placed

---

<sup>30</sup>F. G. Kenyon, "Papyrus Rolls and the Ending of Mark," Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1939), 56-7.

at the end because that was the securest place for it, and this view is confirmed by the evidence of the papyri." While a number of papyri rolls preserve their endings, it is rare to discover the initial section of a roll having been mutilated. "The inference is surely that that was the part likely to become detached and lost." It was usually at the beginning of a roll not at the end that a blank sheet of papyrus was attached for protection.<sup>31</sup> Roberts is also not so sure as Kenyon that the codex was not used even in the first century instead of the scroll.<sup>32</sup> Into the other questions, which the suppositions that the original ending of Mark is lost, propose, scholars have not ventured.

An objection to the Gospel ending with verse 8 is the ending of *γας*. Richardson argues that it is fruitless, however, to argue whether *γας* can or cannot end a sentence or a paragraph, for it can do either. But what decides the question is can "the Gospel . . . end with the thought expressed in the sentence of verse 8?"<sup>33</sup> That a sentence can end with *γας* and in so doing be grammatically correct can be seen from examples. A sentence in Homer (*Od.*, iv, 612) reads *τοίγας εγω τοι ταυτα μετασθηω θυραμας γας*. From Aeschylus (*Agam.*

---

<sup>31</sup>C. H. Roberts, "The Ancient Book and the Endings of Mark," Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1939), 253-54.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 256.

<sup>33</sup>L. J. D. Richardson, "St. Mark xvi, 8," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIX (1949), 145.

1564) the sentence *μιμει δε . . . παθειν τον ερξαντα θεσμικον γαρ*.<sup>34</sup> In the Septuagint Genesis 18:15 reads *ηρησατο δε Σαρρα λεγουσα ουκ εγελασα· εφοβηθη γαρ*, Genesis 45:3 *και ουκ εδυναντο οι αδελφοι αποκριθηναι αυτω· εταραχθησαν γαρ*, and Isaiah 29:11 *ου δυναμαι αναγνωνας, εσφραγισται γαρ*.<sup>35</sup>

Could a Greek sentence end with *εφοβουντο γαρ*? While some scholars believe not, the above quotations show that while it is not common, a Greek sentence can thus end. Ottley maintains:

It is hard to say exactly what constitutes a paragraph; but enough sentences ending with *γαρ* can be found to shew that there is nothing in itself suspicious about this. The necessary condition is simply that as *γαρ* regularly stands second, the rest of the clause must consist of a single word, either a verb, or implying a verb; and this clause must end a sentence, giving the reason or justification for what proceeds. . . . It seems, then, that neither Homer, nor the tragedians, nor the translators of the Old Testament into Greek, saw any objection to ending a sentence with *γαρ* if they had occasion to do so.<sup>36</sup>

It is not the *γαρ* that really leads one to expect something to follow, but rather the fact that *εφοβουντο* is the imperfect tense. Ending a sentence in an imperfect

---

<sup>34</sup>R. R. Ottley, "εφοβουντο γαρ Mark xvi 8," Journal Of Theological Studies, XXVII (1926), 407-409.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 409.

tense, or even a paragraph is usually indicative that the narrative is still to go on. The aorist would have been more effective in bringing the narrative to a conclusive end.<sup>37</sup> However, in Aramaic it is not uncommon to end a paragraph or narrative with the imperfect tense. This would also make the conjunctive stand last.

When the writer was putting into Greek oral narratives or the written accounts of his sources he had two alternatives. He could use a participle or adjective with the verb 'to be', or he could use the imperfect tense so characteristic of him (Mark). He chose the latter, and of necessity the conjunctive fell into the last place.<sup>38</sup>

A characteristic of Mark's Gospel is the use of the imperfect, for it is the tense that is used to narrate descriptive history. And whether or not there is an Aramaic influence behind his use here in *εφωσθουρτο*, it is not out of character either in good Greek narration or in his Gospel.<sup>39</sup>

Mark's use of *γαρ* and *εφωσθουρτο* does not then necessitate a continuation of narrative. There is of course no where else in Mark such a grammatical combination as found in 16:8, but it should be noted that Mark often uses similar short clauses introduced by the postpositive *γαρ* in order to explain declarative statements. Such examples are

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> W. C. Allen, "St. Mark xvi, 8. 'They were afraid.' Why?" Journal Of Theological Studies, XLVII (1946), 48.

<sup>39</sup> A. T. Robertson, A Grammar Of The Greek New Testament In The Light Of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), pp. 837-40, 883-84.

to be found in Mark 9:6, 1:16, 3:31, 10:22, and 16:4. On five different occasions Mark uses  $\phi\theta\beta\epsilon\omega$  absolutely, [Mark 5:15, 33, 36, 6:50, and 10:32.<sup>40</sup> Grammatically then Mark could well have intended to end his Gospel at verse 8. It is in keeping with his style and with the context of his account of the Resurrection. Mark alone of the four Gospels mentions that the women  $\text{οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν εἶπεν}$ . But in verse 10 of the Longer Ending the writer has Mary Magdalene telling the news to the disciples. If the Longer Ending is retained we then have a discrepancy between verses 7, 8, and 10. If the Gospel is left to end at verse 8, then the incoherence between verse 7 and 8 does not matter. The incoherence comes out only if there is a further ending after verse 8 which contains the events of the women telling the news to the disciples.<sup>41</sup> If one insists that a conclusion must be added to verse 8, then any number of conceivable conclusions could be produced as a conjectured ending. But "any conceivable conclusion is faced with the alternatives either of leaving the angel's message hanging in the air, or else of introducing at some point a cumbersome explanation as to why the message was not delivered."<sup>42</sup> Neither of these two alternatives is satisfactory. If verses 9-20 are not the ending of Mark,

---

<sup>40</sup> Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 102.

<sup>41</sup> Creed, op. cit., pp. 176-78.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 179.

then no other more recent attempted conjectured ending is going to fit after verse 8. Attempts in the past were made to round off Mark's abrupt ending at verse 8, such as the alternative ending of the manuscripts, the Shorter Ending, verse 8<sup>b</sup>. It is also the contention of this study that not only were verses 9-20 an attempt to give an ending to Mark, but that also any modern attempt to furnish Mark with an ending is just as unsatisfactory, and that it is not in keeping with the Gospel of Mark to say that he could not have ended his Gospel with *εφοβουκτο ναρ*. For Mark ends his Gospel with the story of the burial of Jesus and the empty tomb and the ringing news that "He is risen,"<sup>43</sup> and he does so because of the intent and purpose of his Gospel.

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 178-80.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE ENDING OF MARK CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF THE THEOLOGICAL CONTENT OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK

#### Theological Implications of Ending Mark at 16:8

If Mark by intention ended his Gospel at 16:8, what would be the meaning and implication of verses 1-8 of chapter 16? What would be the dominant note in his account of the Resurrection if it ends with verse 8? What would this imply for the entire Gospel of Mark?

If the Gospel of Mark ends with verse 8, the dominant thought would be, "He is risen!" The two supporting notes would be the empty tomb and the fear of the women. There would be no account of the appearance of the risen Christ. There would be no commission and no mention of the Ascension. This seems strange to us because we are conditioned to expect these events. We are so conditioned because of our knowledge of the other Gospels.<sup>1</sup> To the twelve disciples and the other followers of Jesus during His ministry the absence of an account of the appearances of the risen Christ and of the Ascension would not have been strange. For the first dominant thing that they heard was the news, "He is risen!" In the first days after the Resurrection,

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), p. 83.

and perhaps also in the earliest kerygma,<sup>2</sup> there was first and dominant the news of the Resurrection. The news, "He is risen!" was supported first by the empty tomb. Peter and the other disciple, according to John 20:1-10, upon hearing the message from Mary Magdalene ran to the tomb and saw that it was empty, and on the strength of the empty tomb the other disciple believed. Then gradually as the first Easter day wore on reports of the appearances of the risen Lord began to come in. This factor of the news of the Lord's resurrection being first, the empty tomb being second as a support to the message, and then finally reports of the appearances of the Lord was prevalent during the days immediately after the Resurrection. Especially during the first week was this true even after Christ's appearance to the disciples on the evening of the first Easter day. For the message of His resurrection was still the dominant element of the kerygma as evidenced by Thomas's reaction and the Lord's rebuke of him, "Blessed are those who do not see and yet believe." (John 21:24-29) In such a situation it would not have been strange to hear Mark's account of the Resurrection having only verse 1 to 8 of chapter 16. It is the contention of this study that Mark intended to end his Gospel at verse 8 because he meant to capture the impact that the news of the Lord's resurrection

---

<sup>2</sup>Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1958), pp. 358-64.



made on the first hearers. The message, "He is risen!" was first. Later came the appearances of the resurrected Lord. But even when Jesus made His appearances, the message was still the important element. For there would be many later who would never see the resurrected Lord and yet believe. (John 20:29-31) They would believe first because of the message. This message, "He is risen!" so it seems, Mark wanted to emphasize in his Gospel.<sup>3</sup>

Mark begins his Gospel with the message of John the Baptist in the wilderness. The "Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" is this message of John in Mark's Gospel. He has no account of nor does he even mention the preincarnate Christ and the angelic message of His nativity. Rather, Mark begins his account of Christ with His baptism. Such a beginning ought also to seem strange as we again are conditioned by John to expect mention of the preincarnate Christ or to hear of the birth of Christ as related in Matthew and Luke. The *ApXn* for Mark, however, is not the birth of Christ but the ministry of John the Baptist and the subsequent baptism of Jesus. With only Mark's beginning in mind we ought to be alerted and not think it strange if also his ending is different and not in keeping with what we would expect in comparison to Matthew and Luke or to John. Such an abrupt ending as Mark 16:8 is in keeping with Mark's

---

<sup>3</sup>Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 80-97.  
cf. Lohmeyer, op. cit., pp. 358-64.

abrupt beginning. So then it is not so much the abrupt beginning and ending of his Gospel that ought evoke our attention, but the message which Mark is endeavoring to convey through his Gospel which has such a beginning and such an ending.<sup>4</sup>

Mark's picture of the Christ is one that is human and earthy.<sup>5</sup> He presents Christ in such a way that one readily accepts Him as a fellow human being. When Mark then describes a miracle of Jesus, the miracle catches one off balance and by surprise. One does not expect a miracle from Jesus, from such a human person as described by Mark, and when Jesus is pictured as displaying through the miracle His divine power, the account of it puts fear and dismay into the hearts of the hearers. Mark casually paints his picture of Christ, but then all of a sudden he puts into his description a note on Christ's amazing power which shatters one's prior conception of Jesus as pictured by Mark. This picture of the human Christ and his shattering power creates in the minds of the hearers and readers amazement and fear. However, it is a godly fear which prepares the hearer for the gracious influence of the Kingdom of God through the ministry of Jesus. Mark's intent with his Gospel is first to present Christ in such a human and under-

---

<sup>4</sup>N. B. Stonehouse, The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Guardian, 1944), p. 117.

<sup>5</sup>Lightfoot, op. cit., pp. 89-92.

standable way that his hearers will quite readily warm up to Him and accept Him as a human friend who is interested in them. Then when he has their attention fastened on Christ, Mark introduces some aspect of Christ's divine person and mission. Mark does this in the same down-to-earth manner and with words that he has been using before in describing Christ as a human person. Because of this unpretentious and simple way of presenting Christ, the divine manifestation of Christ's person and mission comes upon one and is gone again almost before one realizes what has happened. When it does dawn on one what had just taken place, it leaves the reader breathless and full of fear and awe. This fear and awe then shocks one into thinking that his prior knowledge and ability to understand Christ by one's own image of Him is not enough. For the Kingdom of God according to Mark is not merely seeing Christ with the physical eyes and the ability to understand Him only as a fellow human being, but it is a fear and amazement over God's action through this human Christ.<sup>6</sup> This fear and amazement then turns into belief and trust in Christ's ability to serve and to save. The Kingdom of God in Mark approaches the hearer and catches the attention of the hearer through the picture of the human Christ, but then the preaching of the Kingdom of God carries the hearer to a fear and awe of the mighty power of God through Christ's person and mission, a fear and an awe that then

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 87-92.

turns into belief in the salvation of the Kingdom of God.  
(Mark 1:14-15, Mark 5:25-34)

Lightfoot says that the Gospel of Mark is made-up of sections, each a self-contained unit.<sup>7</sup> Each section or episode introduces the human figure of Christ which immediately draws the reader to Him. Mark then introduces into the episode some aspect of Christ's divine mission, either a miracle or a teaching. He introduces this divine manifestation in such a manner that it moves the hearer or reader to fear, to follow Christ, or to praise God. (Mark 4:35-41, 2:1-12). Each episode conveys a message or picture of some aspect of the divine mission of Christ, and each episode contains all that is necessary for the understanding of the particular aspect of the mission of Christ. Each episode is also related to all the others in that they all together move forward to the passion account. The episodes are presented in order to introduce some aspect of the Kingdom of God in the mission of Christ and then to move the hearer to follow Christ to the cross, to follow with fear and trust. (Mark 8:27-9:1) The Passion then becomes for Mark the goal for his hearers. Each episode is used by Mark to encourage the hearer to follow Christ to the Passion. Each episode is used to point to the Passion and to interpret it. For Mark the Kingdom of God, the message of the Kingdom of God, is the suffering and death of Christ.

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Each episode is an interpretation of the Passion as to how it comes and effects and serves each individual hearer. (Mark 10:35-45, 8:27-33, 2:1-12, 10:32-34) The last of these episodes is the account of the Resurrection which serves as the seal of the reality and the validity of the Passion of Christ. (Mark 14:26-28, 16:6-7, 9:30-32) The episode of the Resurrection, however, not only serves as the seal of the Passion but also of the whole Gospel of Mark and of each individual episode in the Gospel. Because the episode of the Resurrection is the seal of the Passion, it is also the seal of every other episode making-up the Gospel of Mark. (Mark 9:9, 14:57-58, 15:29-32, 12:24-27) It is the seal of the *APXN* of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is the seal of the truth of the divine mission of Christ.<sup>8</sup>

As this seal to the whole Gospel of Mark and to each individual episode by way of the Passion, the episode of the Resurrection does not of itself add anything significantly new to the picture of Christ or of His divine mission. Rather, it makes real and sustains the whole picture of Christ that Mark has been endeavoring to create through his episodes and through the Passion. Mark's account of the Resurrection best serves this purpose by permitting the message, "He is risen!" to be the dominant element together with the empty tomb and the resulting fear

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

and awe of the women. In the opinion of this present study for Mark there then was no need for the appearances of the risen Christ but only the shattering message.<sup>9</sup>

#### The Silence and Fear Referred to by Mark 16:8

Would Mark have ended his Gospel on a note of fear even if he desired no account of the physical appearances of the risen Christ? There is a psychological objection to the Gospel thus ending with this note of fear which caused the women to say nothing to anyone. The *εφοβουντο* desires an answer. Of what were the women afraid, or why were they afraid? Ending the Gospel at 16:8 leaves the question unanswered and leaves the disobedience to the angel's command in 16:7 apparent. To end the Gospel on a note of fear means to end on a note not of joy and victory, a note not in keeping with the good news of the victory of Christ. This is however, not the first instance in Mark's Gospel where he leaves unanswered the question why there was a certain fear. In 10:32 Mark tells of those who were following Jesus to Jerusalem as being afraid, but he doesn't say why they were afraid. In 9:15 Mark pictures the crowd running to meet Jesus as being amazed but doesn't answer why they were amazed. Mark has a definite reason for stating that the women were afraid and that they said nothing to anyone in view of the amazing message of the angel that

---

<sup>9</sup>Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 105.

Christ was risen. For the fear was a fear and awe of God, of the divine manifestation of Christ through the message that, "He is risen!"<sup>10</sup> It was a fear born out of the knowledge that they were in the very presence of God as they stood before the empty tomb hearing the message, "He is risen!" It was a fear caused by a revelation of God, a revelation telling them that Christ was risen. This note of fear caused by some manifestation of the divine mission of Christ is a minor theme throughout the Gospel of Mark. In Mark 4:35-41 the disciples were afraid when they had witnessed Christ stilling the tempest. In Mark 5:15 the people were afraid when they saw the Gadarene demoniac healed and in his right mind. In Mark 5:33 the woman with the issue of blood came to Christ after she had been healed, trembling and afraid. In Mark 6:50 the disciples were afraid when they saw Christ walking on the water. Also in Mark 9:32 the disciples were afraid to speak to Jesus in view of the prediction of His passion. In Mark 11:18 the chief priests and scribes were afraid of Jesus. In more than one of these instances the answer is not given why they were afraid, but it is clear from the context that in each instance they were afraid because of a manifestation of the divine power and mission of Christ. The fear was caused by the knowledge that they had witnessed an action of God, and that they were standing in the very presence of this divine power as they

---

<sup>10</sup>Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 89.

stood before Christ. Such a fear was instilled into the women as they stood before the empty tomb hearing the message, "He is risen!" It was this fear that moved the women not to say anything to anyone.<sup>11</sup>

The silence of the women not saying anything to anyone ought not to surprise the reader. For there are several instances in the Bible where men were moved to remain silent in the presence of God or in the presence of some mighty act or word of God. Ezekiel was made to be dumb and silent in the presence of a revelation from God, Ezekiel 3:24-27, 24:27. Zacharias was made to be dumb after he had seen the angel and heard the revelation from the angel, Luke 1:20. Paul in II Corinthians 12:4 writes that he was unable to speak of the revelations given to him.<sup>12</sup> In Mark 9:34 the disciples remained silent when Jesus asked them what they had been speaking about. This silence was brought about from a shame of what they were in the presence of Christ; a silence generated from a fear of knowing what they were like in comparison to Christ. Their silence also was an apparent disobedience to Christ's question.

Lightfoot maintains that Mark's treatment of the Resurrection is in keeping with his treatment of the crucifixion. That is, the reserve with which he treats the Resurrection is in keeping with his account of the crucifixion.

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.



And just as nothing can exceed the unspeakable tragedy and darkness of the Passion, as recorded by St. Mark, so nothing, I suggest can exceed, in his view, the ineffable wonder and mystery of its parallel or counterpart, the resurrection. The one unique event is answered by the other; and it is therefore possible that in 16:1-8 an emphasis, unsurpassed elsewhere, even in this gospel, is laid upon the devastating results, for the women, of the first intimations of the greatest and final manifestation of the divine activity recorded in this book.<sup>13</sup>

And this manifestation of divine activity of God through the person and ministry of Christ moved those who stood before it to awe and fear. A fear and awe of God in the presence of Christ. Not a fear, however, of what they had seen, but of what they had heard. They had seen the empty tomb, and they had seen the angel; but it was rather the word they heard that put fear into their hearts and silence upon their lips, the word, "He is risen!" This fear in the presence of the mightiest act of God certainly is in keeping with Mark's view of the fear of God throughout his Gospel.<sup>14</sup>

The result of the last episode in the Gospel of Mark is fear. There are other episodes in the Gospel of Mark which result and end in fear, Mark 4:35-41, 1:21-28, 5: 1-20, 2:1-12, and 5:21-43. Lightfoot suggests that two points must be made about this resulting fear. First, the fear invoked by such revelations of God in the presence of Christ was not the desired outcome. Men feared because of their lack of understanding, because of their lack of faith.

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. , p. 97.

(Mark 4:35-41) And secondly, in the first half of Mark the fear is a result of misunderstanding and unbelief in the face of Christ's Messianic acts. But after Caesarea Philippi and Peter's confession, the fear in the disciples is not now so much caused by the Messianic acts of Christ, but rather by the teaching of their own involvement in suffering and ruling with Christ. It was a fear of not understanding Christ's teaching about their living, dying, and reigning with Him. It was a fear of not understanding Christ's work of salvation, of His cross and their part in it.<sup>15</sup> Could not this fear of the women in 16:8 be a gathering up of the fear caused by Christ's divine person and mission throughout the whole Gospel of Mark--a fear caused at first by Christ's Messianic acts, acts through which He showed His divine person and mission by which they in turn came to fear God; and secondly a fear caused by the meaning of His teaching of these acts as far as their own personal lives were concerned. The fear then of the women before the empty tomb at the message of the angel, "He is risen!" is the climactic fear of the entire Gospel of Mark and in full accord with his Gospel.<sup>16</sup> This fear, however, was not the final desired outcome, but it was nevertheless a very necessary fear by which they saw their own unworthiness and need, by which they could then be led to faith and trust in

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 87-92.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

the divine person and mission of Christ. Faith and trust was the final desired outcome, but first fear had to possess them. Later, by the work of the Holy Spirit as pictured in the Gospel of John, would come complete understanding and faith. (John 16:5ff.) While the emphasis in the Gospel of John is this faith, John 20:30-31, the emphasis in Mark's Gospel is this God-given fear. It is the judgment of this present study that the ending of Mark's Gospel on a note of fear is in keeping with his emphasis on fear throughout the whole of his Gospel.

The objection to Mark ending at 16:8 because of the promise made in 14:28 and again in 16:7 does not militate against ending his Gospel at verse 8.<sup>17</sup> The purpose of Mark's Gospel was fully realized with the message, "He is risen!" and the effect of it upon the women. Any further narration would have detracted from the desired effect that Mark wished his readers to have. For it was his desire that the message, "He is risen!" remain ringing in their ears; that his picture of Christ and His divine mission be seen in the light of the message of His resurrection. (Mark 9:2-9) Mark wanted no further narration to detract from this desired outcome. There are other promises made in the Gospel of Mark which remained unfulfilled. The promise in Mark 9:1 is seemingly nowhere answered in the Gospel. The prediction that the sons of Zebedee would

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 96-97.

drink the cup of Christ and be baptized with His baptism is nowhere fulfilled in the Gospel of Mark, 10:39. In chapter 13 of Mark the eschatological predictions are left unfulfilled as far as the Gospel of Mark is concerned.<sup>18</sup>

Though Mark ends his Gospel on a note of fear, it is not a fear of sadness but rather a fear full of awe and triumph. It is a fear that throws into sharp relief the supremacy and greatness of the Lord's victory and love. "Throughout this book, and to the end, we find human failure and want of understanding; but the divine foundation stands firm, and in this book has its final seal in the fact of the resurrection of the Lord."<sup>19</sup> It is because of our own lack of understanding today in our modern twentieth century no less than in the early centuries of the Christian era that this emphasis of fear in Mark's Gospel and this note of fear at the end of his Gospel is so strange to our ears. But as Lightfoot suggests, it is a very necessary understanding for us to come by.

I desire to suggest, in conclusion, that it may be exceptionally difficult for the present generation to sympathize with St. Mark's insistence on fear and amazement as the first and inevitable and, up to a point, right result of revelation. One of the most obvious and disturbing phenomena in the religious life of Christendom during the last seventy or eighty years has been the disappearance of the awe or dread or holy fear of God . . . . It is not a marked feature of religious life today that we work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, Phil. 2:12, or that we offer

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. p. 97.

service well-pleasing to God with godly fear and awe, Hebrews 12:28, or that we order our lives, whilst we live here, in fear, I Peter 1:17; and I doubt whether to most Europeans to-day the words of Joseph to his brethren, "This do and live; for I fear God," would at once give the natural and obvious reason for his forbearance towards them.<sup>20</sup>

As Lightfoot also points out, the Christian doctrine of eternal life with its intimate connection with the Lord's resurrection is a tremendous and a terrible truth:

. . . if we do not know this for ourselves that this is so, we are far astray. And if the belief should ever come to be widely held that St. Mark may have ended his book deliberately at 16:8, I should like to think that such a recognition might have its part to play in recalling men and women to the Truth that the dread as well as the love of God is an essential note of our religion, which sounds loudly in the New Testament as well as in the Old, and in no book of the New Testament more strongly than in the Gospel according to St. Mark.<sup>21</sup>

Does Mark's account of the Resurrection with only verses 1-8 without any appearances of the risen Christ give any weight to the denial of Christ's physical resurrection? While Mark's ending of 16:8 has been used to support the view that Mark did not believe in the physical resurrection of Christ,<sup>22</sup> this view is not supported by most scholars who have dwelt with the problem of the ending of Mark. Lohmeyer argues that not only the appearances of Christ support the truth of the Resurrection. The straight forth-

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> A. J. Edmunds, "The Text of the Resurrection in Mark, and its Testimony to the Apparitional Theory," Monist, XXVII (1917), 175-78.

right narrative of the empty grave with or without the appearances of the angels was regarded as valid for the early Christian belief for a longer time than the seemingly more valid evidence of the appearances of the risen Christ.<sup>23</sup>

The validity of what really happened at the tomb depends not only upon the witness to the appearances of the risen Christ, but also and above all upon the message, "He is risen!" and the empty tomb.

Therefore it is quite possible that the oldest Gospel cited only the evidence of the empty tomb and did not report of having heard of the appearances in the apostolic account, notwithstanding also that he would have known about them.<sup>24</sup>

Mark's Gospel is thus complete with the ending of 16:8.

The ending of 16:8 is in keeping with the purposes of the Gospel. That purpose was to direct the reader's attention to the serving and suffering Christ with the word, "He is risen!" and to evoke from the reader the response of fear and awe before the presence of God who is calling the reader into the Kingdom and to service in the Kingdom. In this writer's opinion any further ending would have weakened Mark's emphasis and would have belittled the reader's response to the work and message of the risen Christ.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Lohmeyer, op. cit., p. 359.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., pp. 359-60.

cf. Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 105-117.

C. E. B. Cranfield, "St Mark 16, 1-8," The Scottish Journal of Theology, V (1952), 399-406.

W. C. Allen, "St. Mark xvi, 8. 'They were afraid.' Why?" Journal of Theological Studies, XLVII (1946), pp. 46-49.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

How did Mark end his Gospel? Did he end his Gospel with the Longer Ending, verses 9-20, as some manuscripts of the Greek New Testament suggest? Did he end his Gospel with the Shorter Ending, verse 8<sup>b</sup>, as a few manuscripts suggest? Or did Mark end his Gospel at verse 8, as some other manuscripts suggest? As the evidence of the manuscripts and of the internal structure and purpose of the Gospel is weighed, verse 8<sup>b</sup> is immediately ruled out. It is also the opinion of this study that verses 9-20 are not the ending of Mark. While there is much more evidence to commend for consideration, verses 9-20 than verse 8<sup>b</sup>, we believe that when all the evidence is carefully weighed, the Longer Ending is also to be rejected as the ending of Mark, and that Mark's Gospel ends at verse 8.

Did Mark intend to end his Gospel at verse 8? Or was the original ending of his Gospel lost so that today we do not know how he ended his Gospel beyond verse 8? It is also the contention of this study that the ending of the Gospel of Mark was not lost and that the ending at verse 8 is Mark's intentional ending. The ending of verse 8 best fits the evidence of the manuscripts. It is also in keeping with the internal grammatical structure of the Gospel. Again, the ending of verse 8 is in line with the emphasis

and purpose of Mark's Gospel.

The two alternative endings which the manuscripts suggest to the Gospel of Mark, verses 9-20 and verse 8<sup>b</sup>, are best explained as attempts to supply an ending to Mark.<sup>1</sup>

Very early some parts of the Church must have felt that Mark's ending at verse 8 was defective and supplied verses 9-20 as an ending that was complete. Verse 8<sup>b</sup> was never seriously considered as an ending of Mark by the early Church as witnessed by the lack of evidence supporting it.

The Longer Ending was received by the early Church as a genuine part of the Gospel of Mark. It must have been generally accepted by the middle of the second century, if not indeed earlier. It is significant to note that as knowledgeable a writer as Irenaeus gives no indication that he entertained any doubt as to the genuineness of verses 9-20.<sup>2</sup> Swete thinks that, "While the shorter ending was evidently composed with the view of completing St. Mark's work, the last twelve verses of the common text (verses 9-20) are as clearly part of an independent composition."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1951), pp. 359-60.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to Mark, Reprint of reprinted Third Edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), pp. cix-cx.

cf. Kirsopp Lake, The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907), p. 45.

<sup>3</sup>Swete, op. cit., p. cx.



The mystery as to how verses 9-20 were attached to the Gospel of Mark remains and can not at present be solved.<sup>4</sup> It does seem, however, that Western Europe may have been the source of the Longer Ending since it is supported as a "Western" rather than an "Alexandrian" or an "Eastern" text in origin. The Longer Ending was a part of the early Latin text in Europe though absent in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (k) which has the Shorter Ending.<sup>5</sup> As an answer to the mystery Hamann suggests that Mark intended to have a fuller ending in detail after verse 8, but he was interrupted and so to hastily complete his Gospel he gives a summary in verses 9-20 of a longer detailed account which he would have given if permitted.<sup>6</sup> Hamann accepts verses 9-20 as a genuine part of Mark, but to support his suggestion there is no evidence. His view however, of the origin of verses 9-20 really supports verse 8 as the genuine ending, for it recognizes that verses 9-20 are not in keeping with the style and purpose of the Gospel. It is also difficult to imagine apart from conjecture that Mark was hindered

---

<sup>4</sup>cf. Sherman E. Johnson, A Commentary On The Gospel According To St. Mark (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), pp. 261-62.

<sup>5</sup>F. C. Burkitt, The Old Latin and the Itala. Vol. IV, No. 3 of Texts and Studies. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: The University Press, 1904), pp. 49-50.

<sup>6</sup>H. P. Hamann, "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel - A Study in Textual Criticism" (St. Louis: An unpublished thesis presented to the faculty of Concordia Seminary, 1949), pp. 95-6. <sup>STM</sup>

from completing a fuller ending while having the opportunity to complete a shorter one like verses 9-20.

The possibility that a "lost ending" is an answer to the abruptness of ending the Gospel of Mark at verse 8 cannot seriously be entertained. There is no evidence upon which to base such a suggestion, and it leaves the scholar only a hypothetical field in which to work. Such subjective conjecture poses a difficulty which must first be answered if a "lost ending" is to be seriously received in contention. The early Church knew of no such possibility, and throughout the history of the transmission of the sacred texts of the Greek New Testament there is no hint of such a possibility. Also in view of all evidence available to us today, the early Church never permitted any transmitted text of the apostolic scriptures to become lost. Quite the contrary she was very careful to preserve it.<sup>7</sup> This would be the first such instance. It is difficult to conceive that the ending of Mark was lost unless the original manuscript, the autograph of Mark's Gospel, lost its ending before it was even once copied.<sup>8</sup>

The Freer Logion while not a determinative factor<sup>9</sup> in evaluating the ending of Mark is nevertheless of interest

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 65.

<sup>8</sup> George Salmon, An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament, Tenth Edition (London: John Murray, 1913), p. 149.

<sup>9</sup> See Appendix IV.

to the problem. The only sources available for the Freer Logion are the Washington manuscript of the Gospels (W) and the quotation from Jerome.<sup>10</sup> Helzle believes that the Freer Logion is old, middle of the second century to the beginning of the third.<sup>11</sup> He believes that the theology of the Freer Logion is similar to that of the oldest Christology as represented by Isaiah 53:12. He finds that the final sentence of the Freer Logion is good Pauline theology, especially agreeing with I Corinthians 15:35-58, and that possibly the last sentence in the Freer Logion may even be a resume of I Corinthians 15:35-58. Helzle also finds a connection between Pauline theology and the Freer Logion in the forensic idea of *δικαιοσύνη*, and a connection between John's use of *ἀληθεία* and the Freer Logion. He suggests the idea that there seems to be a relationship between verses 9-20 and the Freer Logion in that the Freer Logion may be an exegesis of verses 9-20, especially an exegesis of the disciples' unbelief.

Are we today closer to giving an answer to the problem of the ending of Mark? While a definite answer cannot be

---

<sup>10</sup>A. T. Robertson, "Some Interesting Readings in the Washington Codex of the Gospels," Expositor, Series IX, 3 (1925), 198.

<sup>11</sup>E. Helzle, "Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums (Mk. 16,9-20) und das Freer-Logion (Mk. 16:14 W), ihre Tendenzen und ihr gegenseitiges Verhältnis. Eine wort-exegetische Untersuchung! (Tübingen: An unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1959), from a review in Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXV (1960), 470-72.

given which will dispel all doubts and alternatives, it is the contention of this study that we can give an answer which will meet the requirements put forth by the problem and which will help us to be more certain as to the ending of Mark. Mysteries still surround the problem, but through all the mysteries and the evidence there emerges the strong contention that Mark intended to end his Gospel at verse 8.

## APPENDIX I

### NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO

A. The evidence of both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus has been questioned. The scribe of Codex Vaticanus in Mark left one and a fourth columns blank after 16:8 before beginning Luke. It is contended that this is enough space for the codex to contain the Longer Ending, verses 9-20. The question is asked, "Why did the scribe leave not only the remainder of the column blank in which he finished the Gospel with verse eight, but also another whole column in addition blank before beginning the Gospel of Luke?" Throughout the New Testament Codex Vaticanus leaves blank the remainder of the column in which the gospel or epistle is ended, never an additional column. But contrary to this custom the scribe does at the end of Mark leave an additional column blank. Two answers have been suggested to this problem: (1) the scribe when copying the last chapter of Mark ended it at verse 8, but he knew of copies which contained the Longer Ending, (2) in the original copy of the codex, Mark did contain verses 9-20, but the head of the scriptorium ordered it to be stricken out. So they took out the folio containing the last chapter of Mark and rewrote it on a new folio leaving then the extra space blank before beginning Luke.

Salmon<sup>1</sup> discusses this problem at length bringing into the discussion Codex Sinaiticus. He begins his discussion with the conclusion of Tischendorf that the scribe who wrote the New Testament of Codex Vaticanus is the identical scribe who wrote the last chapter of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus. On the strength of this Salmon maintains that though for most of the text of the Gospel of Mark Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are independent witnesses, they are not such for the ending of Mark. They here represent only one witness that Mark ended at verse 8. Salmon then demonstrates that in Codex Sinaiticus Mark ends in such a way that it also indicates that the present ending at verse 8 is not the original ending but a substitute for the Longer Ending. Having in mind the fact that a different scribe wrote the last leaf of Mark and the first leaf of Luke than the original scribe for the New Testament in Codex Sinaiticus (scribe 'A' wrote the New Testament of Codex Sinaiticus while the corrector 'D' wrote the last leaf of Mark and the first leaf of Luke--Tischendorf and Salmon identify the scribe of Codex Vaticanus as being the same person who corrected these leaves of Codex Sinaiticus, corrector 'D'), Salmon bases his conjecture on two further reasons: (1) the spreading out of the letters to take up more space, (2) the Gospel as it now stands in Codex Sinaiticus ends in the middle of

---

<sup>1</sup>George Salmon, An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament, Tenth Edition (London: John Murray, 1913), pp. 146-48.

a line and the rest of the line is taken up by an over long ornamentation.

This filling up of the last line occurs nowhere else in the Sinaiticus, nor in the Vaticanus New Testament. . . . We see that the scribe who recopied the leaf betrays that he had his mind full of the thought that the Gospel must be made to end with *εφοθουτο γαρ*, and took pains that no one should add more. I do not think those two phenomena can be reasonably explained in any other way than that the leaf, as originally copied, had contained the disputed verses; and that the corrector, regarding these as not a genuine part of the Gospel, cancelled the leaf, recopying it in such a way as to cover the gap left by the erasure. It follows that the archetype of the Sinaitic Ms. had contained the disputed verses.<sup>2</sup>

Salmon also agrees that the same thing must have happened with Codex Vaticanus. Only this time the original scribe corrected his own work in addition to correcting Codex Sinaiticus. Thus Salmon concludes that both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus do not witness against verses 9-20, for there is reason to believe that here they do not represent their exemplars but were edited by a corrector. He ends his discussion with the interesting conjecture that this correction of both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus could possibly have been done under the direction of Eusebius.

The answer of Salmon to the problem of the blank column in Codex Vaticanus and to the different scribe of the last leaf of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus seems reasonable until some checking is done. Skeats and Milne<sup>3</sup> point out that

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 147.

<sup>3</sup>H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeats, Scribes and Correc-

while it is proven that a different scribe wrote the last leaf of Mark and the first leaf of Luke than the scribe who wrote the rest of the New Testament in Codex Sinaiticus (scribe 'D' for the two leaves, scribe 'A' for the rest of the New Testament), it also can be demonstrated that scribe 'D', the corrector of Codex Sinaiticus, is not the identical scribe of the New Testament in Codex Vaticanus. They maintain that Tischendorf's famous proposal gains no support from a careful study of the two scribes. Though corrector 'D' of Codex Sinaiticus and scribe 'B' of Codex Vaticanus have similar characteristics "it would be hazardous to argue identity of the two hands (for one thing D's use of the long-pronged omega in corrections seems an obstacle), but the identity of the scribal tradition stands beyond dispute." Taking up the problem only in Codex Sinaiticus as to why the last leaf of Mark and the first leaf of Luke had to be replaced Skeats and Milne maintain that this was done because of an original error in the beginning of Luke. The end of Mark and the beginning of Luke were on the same bifolium, and when the beginning of Luke had to be replaced by the corrector 'D' because of an error by the scribe 'A', the end of Mark also had to be replaced. (Skeats says that the error was an error of duplication, a long passage in the first part of Luke being erroneously repeated. However, he does not demonstrate this.) To make up for the

---

tors of the Codex Sinaiticus (Oxford: University Press for the British Museum, 1938), pp. 9-11 and 89-90.



extra space, corrector 'D' stretched out his letters and made an extra long ornamentation at the end of Mark. Could this extra space originally have contained verses 9-20 as Salmon conjectures? Skeats and Milne say no. For the space does not allow enough room to do so. Upon checking both the facsimiles of Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus it was found that the scribe of the New Testament in Codex Vaticanus and the corrector of the last leaf of Codex Sinaiticus do not seem to be identical though they have close affinities. Also the blank column in Codex Sinaiticus could not contain verses 9-20. In verses 9-20 there are some 970 letters. There is space left at the end of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus to contain only about two-thirds of this number.

The problem however, of the one and a fourth columns blank in Codex Vaticanus at the end of Mark still remains. (Skeats and Milne do not go into this problem, their study covering only Codex Sinaiticus.) For the space in the blank columns in Mark of Codex Vaticanus is large enough to contain verses 9-20. Counting carefully it was found that the blank space at the end of Mark would take around 900 of the 970 letters. This would not quite take all of the letters in verses 9-20. It must be remembered, however, that the scribe would only allow approximately the space needed since he had no intention of adding verses 9-20. But why then did he leave one whole extra column blank? From all the evidence available no answer is given. The evidence presents the problem but does not offer an answer.

While this does throw some doubt on the witness of Codex Vaticanus, the conclusion is still definite that the scription of both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus did not want verses 9-20 in their codices. For the above discussion compare Burgon, op. cit., pp. 86-9; Westcott-Hort, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

B. The last leaf of Codex Vercellensis in Mark is missing. The present leaf making-up this loss is of the Vulgate text and was added in the ninth century. Codex Vercellensis most likely ended at 16:8 and thus is a witness to the end of Mark at verse 8. However, since the last leaf of Mark is missing, and although it may be accurately measured to maintain that the missing leaf would not have had enough space to contain verses 9-20, there is some doubt. The codex as written by the original scribe ends at Mark 15:15 with the words Pilatus autem. The next words following are galileam ibi eum videbitis sicut dixit which begin the section of Mark 16:7-20. This whole latter section follows the text of the Vulgate and is of the ninth century from a different hand.<sup>4</sup>

C. Colwell examined 220 Armenian manuscripts of which

---

<sup>4</sup>A. Gasquet, Codex Vercellensis, Vol. III, two parts, of Collectanea Biblica Latina (Rome: Fridericus Pustet, 1914), p. xii.

C. H. Turner, "Did Codex Vercellensis (a) Contain the last Twelve Verses of St. Mark," Journal of Theological Studies, XXIX (1927-28), 16-18.

eighty-eight include Mark 16:9-20, ninety-nine end the Gospel at 16:8, while the remaining thirty-three contain verses 9-20 "but present them in such a way as to indicate an earlier omission." Colwell concludes his article by suggesting that the original Armenian version did not include verses 9-20, and that these verses were a later insertion from another source.<sup>5</sup> One early Armenian manuscript dated 989 contains verses 9-20 but separates them from the Gospel of Mark with a note "Of the presbyter Ariston." This is the famous Edschmiazin Manuscript of the Gospel found by Mr. F. C. Conybeare in the Patriarchal Library of Edschmiazin. Swete says, "Mr. Conybeare with much probability suggests that the person intended is the Aristion who is mentioned by Papias as one of the disciples of the Lord." Papias is quoted as saying by Eusebius (H. E. iii. 39):

ΕΙ ΔΕ ΠΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΗΚΟΛΟΥΘΗΚΩΣ ΤΙΣ  
 ΤΟΙΣ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙΣ ΕΛΘΟΙ, ΤΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ  
 ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΝ ΑΝΕΚΡΙΝΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΥΣ...  
 Α ΤΕ ΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ  
 ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ ΟΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ  
 ΛΕΓΟΥΣΙΝ.

Eusebius himself then adds:

ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΑΣ ΔΕ ΤΗ ΙΔΙΑ ΓΡΑΦΗ ΠΡΟΑΡΙΘΜΩΣΙΝ

---

<sup>5</sup>E. C. Colwell, "Mark 16:9-20 in the Armenian Version," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 369-86.

Αριστωκος του προσθεν δεδηλωμενου  
των του κυριου λογων διηγησεις .<sup>6</sup>

With this identification of the Aristion of Papias and the author of verses 9-20 made by Conybeare also Harris<sup>7</sup> and Gregory<sup>8</sup> concur. Gregory says that this evidence is not to be taken lightly. He himself puts much weight on it accepting it unless proven otherwise. Gregory further maintains that these verses are not a part of the original Gospel of Mark, but that they should however remain with Mark as equal authority to the rest of the Gospel. Streeter<sup>9</sup> does not accept this identification but calls it a "brilliant conjecture." The evidence being so slight for this identification, since it is found in only one source late in origin, it does seem to be too easy a way out in seeking to answer the problem about the last chapter of Mark. At least it is not critically sound to base evidence on such a one lone witness.

---

<sup>6</sup>H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to Mark, Reprint of reprinted Third Edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), pp. cxi-cxii.

<sup>7</sup>J. R. Harris, Side-Lights on New Testament Research (London: The Kingsgate Press and James Clarke and Company, 1909), pp. 92-3.

<sup>8</sup>C. R. Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament (Edinburg: T. and T. Clarke, 1907), p. 509.

<sup>9</sup>B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels - A Study of Origins, Ninth Impression (London and New York: MacMillan and Company, 1956), pp. 344-47.

D. In the oldest Georgian version, dated 897, the Gospel of Mark ends at 16:8. But the Longer Ending is added as an appendix to the Four Gospels at the end of John, possibly being copied from another manuscript. Streeter adds the note, "The Adysh Gospels, Phototypic edition, Moscow, 1916. I owe this information to my friend R. P. Blake."<sup>10</sup>

E. Minuscules 137 and 138 have verses 9-20 marked off with asterisks accompanied by a note from the commentary of Victor of Antioch. (see note L, Appendix I)<sup>11</sup> When a microfilm of Codex 137 in the St. Louis University Library was examined it was found that the manuscript actually had verses 16:9-18 marked off with the asterisks instead of verses 9-20. After verse 18 and the asterisk verses 19 and 20 are then given.

F. Codex 24, a codex of the eleventh century, is wholly void of the lectionary apparatus sometimes found in manuscripts of this date. But still we find a  $\tau \tau \epsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma \tau$  right in the body of the text at the end of verse 8 and again at the end of verse 20. Codices 36 and 22 have exactly the same  $\tau \tau \epsilon \lambda \omicron \varsigma \tau$  at verse 8 in the body of the text and again at the end of verse 20. The note ac-

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 335.

<sup>11</sup> S. C. E. Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum - Evangelium Secundum Marcum (Oxford: University Press, 1935), pp. covering notes and criticus apparatus for Mark 16:8-20.

companying the *τελος* after verse 8 according to minuscules 15 and 22 reads *εν τισι των αντιγραφων εως ωδε πληρουται ο ευαγγελιστης εν πολλοις δε και ταυτα φερεται* and then add verses 9-20.<sup>12</sup>

Concerning Codex 199 Scrivener says, "Cod. 199 has *τελος* after *εφοβουντο γαρ* and before *Αναστας δε*, and in the same hand as *τελος* we read *εν τισι των αντιγραφων ου κειται ταυτα, αλλ'ενταυθα καταπαινει.*"

He then adds in a footnote, "Of course no notice is to be taken of *τελος* after *εφοβουντο γαρ*, as the end of the ecclesiastical lesson is all that is intimated."<sup>13</sup>

G. Minuscules 1, 205, 206, 209, and 1582 have the note

*εν τισι μεν των αντιγραφων εως ωδε πληρουται ο ευαγγελιστης εως ου και Ευσεβιος ο Παμφιλου εκανονισεν· εν πολλοις δε και ταυτα φερεται.*

Then they add verses 9-20.<sup>14</sup> Minuscules 20, 215, and 300

have the note *εντευθεν εως του τελους εν τισι των αντιγραφων ου κειται.*

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

J. W. Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark (Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1871), pp. 228-30.

<sup>13</sup> F. H. A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, Fourth Edition, Vol. II (Cambridge: George Bell & Sons, 1894), p. 399.

<sup>14</sup> Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

εν δε τοις αρχαιοις παντα απαραλειπτα  
 κειται and then add verses 9-20.<sup>15</sup>

H. Minuscules 237, 239, and 259 have a note at John 21:12 enumerating the resurrection appearances of our Lord from Matthew, Luke and John, but none from Mark.

ως εκ τουτου περισταθαι ἵ ειναι τας  
 εις τους μαθοντας μετα την αναστασιν  
 γεγονυιας οπτασιας του σωτηρος ημων  
 Ιησου Χριστου· μιαν μεν παρα τω  
 ματθαιω· τρεις δε παρα τω Ιωαννη,  
 και τρεις παρα τω λουκα ομοιως.

The codices give verses 9-20 in Mark 16 without any indication that they were considered suspect by any sources.<sup>16</sup>

I. Codex 282 has a τέλος in the body of the text at the end of verse 8. Codex 268, a codex never adopted for liturgical use has a τέλος written in gold ink in the body of the text at the end of verse 8.<sup>17</sup> When Codex 161 was examined on a micro-film at the St. Louis University Library it was also found to have a τέλος after verse 8.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Appendix (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882), p. 30.

<sup>16</sup> Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

<sup>17</sup> Burgon, op. cit., p. 231, footnote.

This may be a liturgical note. However, there were only three other instances of the *τελος* in the entire Gospel of Mark.

J. All of these codices give a shortened form of the extract from Victor of Antioch's commentary on St. Mark.

Four of these minuscules were checked on micro-film in the St. Louis University Library, codices 137, 129, 143, and 374. They all give with some minor variations the same extract. The extract below is taken from Codex 129.

παρὰ πλείστοις ἀντιγραφοῖς οὐκ εἶν  
(ὡν) τὰ ταῦτα (ταῦτα τὰ) ἐπιφερόμενα  
ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ. ὡς  
νοῦθα νομισάντες αὐτὰ τίνες εἶναι.  
ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξ ἀκριβῶν ἀντιγραφῶν ὡς  
ἐν πλείστοις εὑρόντες αὐτὰ. κατὰ  
τὸ παλαιστίναιον εὐαγγέλιον Μάρκου,  
ὡς ἔχει ἡ ἀλήθεια συντεθεικάμεν,  
καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιφερομένην  
δεδωτικὴν ἀναστάσιν ἐδηλώσαμεν  
μετὰ τὸ εἰσθῆναι γὰρ.

of the four codices 129 was the only one to give the inserted word *ἐδηλώσαμεν* in the last line, which is also absent from the whole extract as found in Victor's commentary (see Appendix, note L).<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> cf. Legg, *op. cit.*, pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes



This may be a liturgical note. However, there were only three other instances of the *τελος* in the entire Gospel of Mark.

J. All of these codices give a shortened form of the extract from Victor of Antioch's commentary on St. Mark.

Four of these minuscules were checked on micro-film in the St. Louis University Library, codices 137, 129, 143, and 374. They all give with some minor variations the same extract. The extract below is taken from Codex 129.

παρά πλείστοις αντιγραφοῖς οὐκ εἰν  
(ἦν) τὰ ταῦτα (ταῦτα τὰ) ἐπιφερόμενα  
ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ. ὡς  
νοθα νομισάντες αὐτὰ τινες εἶναι.  
ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξ ἀκριβῶν ἀντιγραφῶν ὡς  
ἐν πλείστοις εὑρόντες αὐτὰ. κατὰ  
τὸ παλαιστίναιον εὐαγγέλιον Μάρκου,  
ὡς ἔχει ἡ ἀλήθεια συντεθεικάμεν,  
καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιφερόμενῃ  
δεδωτικὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐδηλώσαμεν  
μετὰ τὸ εὐφραθῆναι γὰρ.

of the four codices 129 was the only one to give the inserted word *ἐδηλώσαμεν* in the last line, which is also absent from the whole extract as found in Victor's commentary (see Appendix, note L).<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> cf. Legg, *op. cit.*, pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes

K. "In L verse 8 comes to an end in the middle of the last line but one of a column, and a termination of the Gospel in some sense at this point is implied by the ornamental marks which make up the last line of the column." In the next column comes the note *ΦΕΡΕΤΕ ΠΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ*. The note surrounded by ornamental lines introduces the Shorter Ending, verse 8<sup>b</sup>. Then another short note *ΕΣΤΗΝ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΑ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟ ΕΦΟΒΟΥΝΤΟ ΓΑΡ*, also decorated by ornamental lines. This second note then introduces the Longer Ending, verses 9-20. Last of all comes the colophon.<sup>19</sup>

L. The quotation of Eusebius in answer to a question by one Marinus. The question of Marinus:

*ΠΩΣ ΠΑΡΑ ΜΕΝ ΤΩ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΩ ΟΥΕ  
 ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΕΓΗΓΕΡΜΕΝΟΣ Ο  
 ΣΩΤΗΡ, ΠΑΡΑ ΔΕ ΤΩ ΜΑΡΚΩ  
 ΠΡΩΣ ΤΗ ΜΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ ;*

Eusebius answers:

*ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΔΙΤΤΗ ΑΝ ΕΙΗ Η ΛΥΣΙΣ· Ο ΜΕΝ  
 ΓΑΡ ΤΟ ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ ΑΥΤΟ ΤΗΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ  
 ΦΑΣΚΟΥΣΑΝ ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΗΝ ΑΒΕΤΩΝ, ΕΙΠΟΙ  
 ΑΝ ΜΗ ΕΝ ΑΠΑΣΙΝ ΑΥΤΗΝ ΦΕΡΕΣΘΑΙ*

---

and criticus apparatus.

<sup>19</sup> Westcott-Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 30.  
 Swete, *op. cit.* pp. cv-cviii.

τοις αντιγραφοις του κατα μαρκον  
 ευαγγελιου· τα γουν ακριβη των  
 αντιγραφων το τελος περιγραφει  
 της κατα τον μαρκον ιωφραις εν  
 τοις λογοις του οφθεντος νεανισκου  
 ταις γυναιξι και ερηκοτος αυταις  
 μη φοβεισθε Ιησουν ζητετε τον  
 Ναζαρηνον· και τοις εξησ οις  
 επιλεγει· και ακουσασαι εφυγον και  
 ουδεις ουδεν ειπον εφθουοντο γαρ· εν  
 τούτω γαρ σχεδον εν πασι τοις  
 αντιγραφοις του κατα μαρκον ευαγγελιου  
 περιγεγραπται το τελος· τα δε εξη  
 σπαιως εν τισι αλλ' ουκ εν πασι  
 φερομενα περιττα αν ειη και μαλιστα  
 εσπερο εχοιεν αντιλογισαν τη των  
 λοιπων ευαγγελιστων μαρτυρια·  
 ταυτα μεν ουκ ειποι αν τις  
 παραστουμενος και παρτη αναιρων  
 περιττον ερωτημα· αλλος δε τις  
 ουδ' οτι ουκ πολλων αθετειν των  
 οπως ουκ εν τη των ευαγγελιων  
 γραφη φερομενων διπλην ειναί φησι  
 την αναγκωσιν ως και εν ετεφοις  
 πολλοις εκατεραν τε παραδεκτεαν  
 υπαρχειν τω μη μαλλον ταυτην  
 εκεινης η εκεινη ταυτης παρα τοις

πιστοῖς καὶ εὐλαβεσὶν ἐγκρίνεσθαι. καὶ δὴ  
 τοῦδε τοῦ μέρους συγχωρούμενου εἶναι  
 ἀληθούς, προσήκει τὸν νοῦν διερμηνεύειν  
 τοῦ ἀναγκωσματος· εἰ γοῦν διελόμεν τὴν  
 τοῦ λόγου διακοσίαν, οὐκ ἂν εὐροίμεν αὐτὴν  
 ἐναντίαν τοῖς παρα τοῦ Ματθαίου οὐχ  
 σαββάτων ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὸν Σωτῆρα  
 λελεγμένους· τὸ γὰρ ἀνάστας δε  
 πρῶς τὴν μίαν τοῦ σαββάτου κατὰ τὸν  
 Μάρκον, μετὰ διαστολῆς ἀναγκωσομεθα·  
 καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἀνάστας δε, ὑποστίζομεν  
 καὶ τὴν διακοσίαν ἀφορίζομεν  
 τῶν ἐξῆς ἐπιλεγόμενων .<sup>20</sup>

An English translation as found in Westcott-Hort:

The solution will be twofold. For one man, rejecting the passage by itself, the passage which makes this statement, will say that it is not current in all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark. That is, the accurate copies determine the end of the narrative according to Mark at the words of the young man who appeared to the women and said to them, "Fear not! . . ." And they, on hearing this, fled and said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid. At this point the end of the Gospel according to Mark is determined in nearly all the copies of the Gospel according to Mark; whereas what follows, being but scantily current, in some but not in all (copies), will be redundant (i.e. such as should be discarded), and especially if it should contain a contradiction to the testimony of the other evangelists. This is what will be said by one who declines and entirely gets rid of (what seems to him) a superfluous question. While, another, not dar-

<sup>20</sup> Burgon, *op. cit.*, pp. 265-66, 45-6, 41-51.

Westcott-Hort, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-33.

Legg, *op. cit.*, pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

ing to reject anything whatever that is in any way current in the Scripture of the Gospels, will say that the reading is double, as in many other cases, and that (reading) must be received, on the ground that this (reading) finds no more acceptance than that, nor that than this, with faithful and discreet persons.<sup>21</sup>

The quotations from Jerome:

Epistulae cxx at Hedibiam 3:

After a question concerning the cause of the differences in the resurrection accounts between Matthew and Mark, Jerome answers:

-aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium quod in raris fertur evangelis omnibus Graeciae libris paene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, praesertim cum diversa atque contraria evangelistis certis narrare videratur, aut hoc respondendum quod uterque verum dixerit.

Jerome contra Pelagian:

In quibusdam exemplaribus et maxime in Graecis codicibus iuxta Marcum in fine eius Evangelii scribitur: Postea quum accubuissent undecim apparvit eius Iesus et exprobat incredulitatem et duritiam cordis eorum quia<sup>22</sup> his qui viderant eum resurgentem non crediderunt.

The extract from Victor's commentary on Mark:

ΕΠΕΙΔΗ ΕΝ ΤΙΣΙ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΩΝ  
ΠΡΟΣΚΕΙΤΑΙ ΤΩ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΩ  
ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣ ΔΕ ΤΗ ΜΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΥ  
ΠΡΩΙ ΕΦΑΝΗ ΜΑΡΙΑ ΤΗ ΜΑΓΔΑΛΗΝΗ  
ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΕΨΗΣ, ΔΟΚΕΙ ΔΕ ΤΟΥΤΟ

---

<sup>21</sup>Westcott-Hort, op. cit., p. 33.

<sup>22</sup>Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

Burton, op. cit., pp. 51-57.

Διαφωνεί τω ὑπο του ματθαιου  
 εισημενω ερουμεν ως δυνατον ην  
 ειπειν, οτι κενοθευται το παρα  
 μαρκω τελευταιον εν τισι φερομενον.  
 πλην ινα μη δοξωμεν επι το ετοιμον  
 καταφευγειν ουτως αναγκωσομεθα.  
 αναστας δε και υποστιζαντες  
 επαγομεν πρωι τη μια του σαββατου  
 εφανη τη μαγδαληνη... παρα  
 πλειστοις αντιγραφοις ουκ ην δε ταυτα  
 τα επιφερομενα εν τω κατα μαρκον  
 ευαγγελιω. ως νοθα γαρ ενομισαν  
 αυτα τινες ειναι. ημεις δε εξ  
 ακριβων αντιγραφων ως εν πλειστοις  
 ευροτες αυτα κατα το παλαιστιναιου  
 ευαγγελιον μαρκου ως εχει η  
 αληθεια συντεθεικαμεν και την  
 εν αυτω επιφερομενην δεσποτικην  
 αναστασιν μετα το εφοβουκτο γαρ.  
 τουτεστιν απο του αναστας δε  
 πρωι πρωτη σαββατου, και  
 καθ'εξης μεχρι του δια των  
 επακολουθουτων σημειων. Αμην.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>23</sup>Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

Burton, op. cit., pp. 50-66, 289.

M. Streeter believes that the ending of Mark is lost:

. . . the author of the Gospel cannot have originally meant to end it without the account of the Appearances to the Apostles in Galilee which is twice prophesied in the text (Mk. xiv. 28, xvi. 7). Indeed, the words *εφοβουντο γαρ* in Greek may not even be the end of a sentence; they lead us to expect a clause beginning with *μη*, "They were afraid, lest they should be thought mad," or something to that effect. . . . We conclude, then, either Mark did not live to finish his Gospel--at Rome in Nero's reign this might easily happen--or that the end of the Gospel was already lost when it was used by Matthew and Luke.<sup>24</sup>

N. In the light of the evidence as seen distributed both chronologically and geographically it is difficult to understand how Streeter can say, "The distribution of the Mss. and versions, taken in connection with the statement of Eusebius, compels us to assume that the Gospel ended here (at verse eight) in the first copies that reached Africa, Alexandria, Caesarea, and Antioch." Streeter does say further on that the Longer Ending as well as the ending at verse 8 was of great antiquity when "B" and "S" were copied and that the scribes must have known both endings.<sup>25</sup> Swete gives a balanced and safe conclusion when he says:

The documentary testimony for the longer ending is, as we have seen, overwhelming. Nevertheless, there are points at which the chain of evidence is not merely weak but broken. Besides the fact that in the fourth century, if not in the third, the "accurate copies" of the Gospel were known to end with xvi. 8, and that in the two great fourth century Bibles which have come down to us the Gospel actually ends at this point, those who maintain the genuine-

---

<sup>24</sup> Streeter, op. cit., pp. 337, 343.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., pp. 336-37.

ness of the last twelve verses have to account for the early circulation of an alternative ending, and for the ominous silence of the Ante-Nicene fathers between Irenaeus and Eusebius in reference to a passage which was of so much importance both on historical and theological grounds.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Swete, op. cit., pp. cxii-cxiii.



APPENDIX II

CHRONOLOGICAL APPEARANCE OF MARK 16

<u>Century</u>	<u>Verses 9-20</u>	<u>Verse 8</u>	<u>Verse 8<sup>b</sup></u>	<u>Freer Logion</u>
I	Papias Hermas			
II	Justin Martyr Irenaeus Tatian			
III	Hippolytus Vincentius Cyprian	Clement Al.? Origen ?		
IV	Iacobus Nis. Ambrose  (a)	Eusebius Hesychius B N a		W
	W Const. Apos. Coptic (Severus)	Severus		
V	Syr <sup>cur</sup> Augustine A C Victor Ant. Z	Syr <sup>sin</sup> Jerome  (Victor Ant.)	k	(Jerome)
VI	Eugip. Rome (D) Syr <sup>Pes</sup> N			
VII	Vulgate Syr Harc <sup>mg</sup> 0112	(Syr Harc <sup>mg</sup> ) (0112)	Syr Harc <sup>mg</sup> 0112	
VIII	099 E L O	(099)  (L)	099  L	

<u>Century</u>	<u>Verses 9-20</u>	<u>Verse 8</u>	<u>Verse 8<sup>b</sup></u>	<u>Freer Locion</u>
IX	Ψ Ω F V K X M Y (Armenian) Π Georgian	(Ψ)       Armenian	Ψ	
X	Γ G H U Minuscules Δ S 274	(Minuscules)		
XI	579 Minuscules	(579)       (Minuscules)	274       579	

---

The witnesses enclosed in ( ) means that it gives a secondary witness while the same witness not enclosed gives its primary witness. Codex D is enclosed in ( ) because the filio covering the last chapter of Mark is by a later hand than the rest of the manuscript.

APPENDIX III

GEOGRAPHICAL APPEARANCE OF MARK 16

<u>Century</u>	<u>Alexandria</u>	<u>West</u> (Rome)	<u>East</u> (Byzantine)	<u>East</u> (Pales.)	<u>West</u> (Africa)
I					
II		9-20		9-20	
III	8 ?	9-20			
IV		9-20	9-20		
	8 9-20 Freer Logion			8	8 ?
V	8 9-20	8 <sup>b</sup>		8 9-20 Freer Logion	9-20
VI		9-20	9-20	9-20	
VII	9-20 8 <sup>b</sup> 8	9-20		9-20	
VIII	9-20 8 <sup>b</sup> 8	9-20	9-20	9-20	
IX	9-20 8 <sup>b</sup> 8	9-20	9-20	9-20 8	9-20
X	9-20 8	9-20 8 8 <sup>b</sup>	9-20 8	9-20	
XI			9-20 8	9-20 8 8 <sup>b</sup>	

---



## APPENDIX IV

### FREER LOGION

#### Freer Logion

Washington Manuscript of the Gospels, Codex W, dated the Fourth Century. The Logion comes between verse 14 and 15 of Mark chapter 16. The text is given according to that found in Legg<sup>1</sup> and Taylor,<sup>2</sup> carefully comparing it with the facsimile of the original (Facsimile Of The Washington Manuscript Of The Four Gospels In The Freer Collection, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1912).

κακεικοι απελογουντο λεγοντες οτι ο αιων  
ουτος της ανομιας και της απιστιας  
υπο τον σαταναν εστιν, ο με εων τα  
υπο των πνευματων ακαθαρτα την  
αληθειαν του θεου καταλαβεσθαι  
δυναμιν· δια τουτο αποκαλυφον σου  
την δικαιοσυνην ηδη, εκεικοι ελεγον  
τω Χριστω. και ο Χριστος εκεικοις  
προσελεγεν οτι πεπληρωται ο ορος  
των ετων της εξουσιας του σατανα,

---

<sup>1</sup>S. C. E. Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum - Evangelium Secundum Marcum (Oxford: University Press, 1935), pp. covering notes and criticus apparatus for Mark 16:8-20.

<sup>2</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, Reprint of First Edition (London and New York: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1959), p. 614.

αλλα εγκριζει αλλα δεικα (δεικα).  
 και υπερ ων εγω αμαρτησαντων  
 παρεδοθην εις θανατον, ινα υποστρεψωσιν  
 εις την αληθειαν και μηκετι  
 αμαρτησωσιν ινα την εν τω ουρανω  
 πνευματικην και αφθαρτον της  
 δικαιοσυνης δοξαν κληρονομησωσιν.

The following translation is taken from Taylor:

And they replied saying, This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who by means of evil spirits does not permit the true power of God to be apprehended; therefore reveal thy 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 may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven.<sup>3</sup>

Jerome's Allusion to the Freer Logion

Taken from Hier. contra Pelagian ii. 15:

Et illi satisfaciebant dicentes saeculum istud iniquitatis et incredulitatis substantia (Vat. 1 Ms. = sub satana) est quae non sinit per immundon spiritus veram Dei apprehendi virtutem ideireo iam nunc revela iustitiam tuam.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 614-15.

<sup>4</sup>Legg, op. cit., pp. covering Mark 16:8-20, notes and criticus apparatus.

APPENDIX V

THE SHORTER ENDING VERSE 8<sup>b</sup>

The Shorter Ending, verse 8<sup>b</sup>, according to Codex L as quoted in Swete:

παντα δε παρηγγελμενα τοις περὶ  
τον Πέτρον συντομως ἐξηγγιλαν  
(ἐξηγγειλαν)· μετὰ δε ταυτα και  
αυτος ο Ιησους [ <sup>+</sup>εφανη ψ; <sup>+</sup>εφανη  
αυτοις <sup>099</sup> ] απο ανατολης και αχρι  
δυσεως ἐξαπεστειλεν (ἐξαπεστειλεν)  
δι' αυτων το ιερον και αφθαρτον  
κηρυγμα της αιωνιου σωτηριας.<sup>1</sup>

The following translation is taken from Taylor:

And all that had been commanded them they made known briefly to those about Peter. And afterwards Jesus Himself appeared to them, (and) from the East as far as the West sent forth through them the sacred and incorruptible proclamation of eternal salvation.<sup>2</sup>

The Shorter Ending according to Codex Bobiensis "k" as quoted in Legg:

Omnia autem quaecumque praecepta erant et qui cum puero (sic, sed videtur = petro) erant breviter exposuerunt post haec et ipse Iesus adparvit it ab oriente (sic) usque usque in orientem (sic, sed

---

<sup>1</sup> H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to Mark, Reprint of reprinted Third Edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. cv.

<sup>2</sup> Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, Reprint of First Edition (London and New York: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1959), p. 615.

videtur errore pro occidentem) misit per illos sanctam  
 et incorruptam (suppl. praedicationem) salutis  
 aeternae. Amen.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>S. C. E. Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece Secundum  
 Textum Westcotto-Hortianum - Evangelium Secundum Marcum  
 (Oxford: University Press, 1935), pp. covering notes and  
 criticus apparatus for Mark 16:8-20.



APPENDIX VI

CODEX BOBIENSIS 'k' MARK 15:47-16:8<sup>b</sup>

Maria autem Magdalene et Maria Iosetis viderunt ubi positus est. Et sabbato exacto abierunt et adtulerunt aromata ut eum unguerent. Et venerunt prima sabbati mane dicentes quis nobis revolvat lapidem ab osteo? Subito autem ad horam tertiam tenebrae diei factae sunt per totum orbem terrae, et descenderunt de caelis angeli et surgent in claritate vivi Dei simul ascenderunt cum eo, et continuo lux facta est. Tunc illae accesserunt ad monumentum et vident revolutum lapidem fuit enim magnus nimis et cum intro intro issent viderunt iuvenem in dextra sedentem in duto stolam albam et hebetes factae sunt. <sup>16:6</sup> Ille autem didit ad illas: Quid (Quid) stupetis? Iesum illum crucifixum illum Nazoraeum quaeritis; surrexit, ecce locus illius ubi fuit positus. Sed ite, et dicite discipulis et Petro praecedo vos in Galileam; illic me videbitis, sicut vobis dixi. <sup>16:8</sup> Illae autem cum exirent a monumento, fugerunt; tenebat enim illas tremor et pavor propter <sup>16:8<sup>b</sup></sup> timorem. Omnia autem quaecumque praecepta erant et qui cum puero erant breviter exposuerunt posthaec et ipse Iesus adparuit et ab orientem usque usque in orientem misit per illos sanctam et incorruptam salutis aeternae. Amen.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Codice Evangelico K In Facsimile (Torino, 1913).

---

cf. Adolf Jülicher, Itala, Das Neue Testament In Alt-  
lateinischer Überlieferung, II Marcusevangelium (Berlin:  
Walter De Gruyter and Company, 1940), pp. 156-58.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W. C. "St. Mark xvi,8. 'They were afraid.' Why?" Journal of Theological Studies, XLVII (1946), 46-49.
- Arndt, Wm. "Some Notes on New Testament Textual Criticism," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXIII (April 1952), 280-83.
- Burgon, J. W. The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to St. Mark. Oxford: James Parker and Company, 1871.
- Burgon, J. W. and Edward Miller. The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.
- Burkill, T. A. "The Injunctions to Silence in St. Mark's Gospel," Theologische Zeitschrift, XII (1956), 585-604.
- Burkitt, F. C. The Old Latin and the Itala. Vol. IV, No. 3 of Texts and Studies. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1896.
- Carrington, Philip. According to Mark. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.
- Cheek, John L. "The Historicity of the Markan Resurrection Narrative," The Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVII (1959), 191-200.
- Cole, R. A. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.
- Colwell, E. C. "Mark 16:9-20 in the Armenian Version," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 369-86.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "St. Mark 16, 1-8," The Scottish Journal of Theology, V (1952), 282-98, 398-414.
- Creed, J. M. "The Conclusion of the Gospel According to St. Mark," Journal of Theological Studies (1930), pp. 175-80.
- Edmunds, A. J. "The Text of the Resurrection in Mark, and its Testimony to the Apparitional Theory," Monist, XXVII (1917), 161-78.
- "The Washington Ms. and the Resurrection in Mark," Monist, XXVIII (1918), 528-29.

- . "The Six Endings of Mark in Later Mss. and Catholic and Protestant Imprints of the Old Armenian Version," Monist, XXIX (1919), 520-25.
- . "The End of Mark in the Curetonian Syriac and the Futility of Using it to Support the Appendix," Monist, XXX (1920), 443-45.
- Farrer, Austin. St. Matthew and St. Mark. London: Dacre Press, A. and C. Black Ltd., 1954.
- Gasquet, A. Codex Vercellensis. Vol. III, two parts, of Collectanea Biblica Latina. Rome: Fredericus Pustet, 1914.
- Goodspeed, E. J. An Introduction to the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- Gould, Ezra P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark. Edinburg: T. and T. Clarke, 1897.
- Grant, F. S. "Studies in the Text of Mark," Anglican Theological Review, XX (1938), 103-119.
- Gregory, C. R. Canon and Text of the New Testament. Edinburg: T. and T. Clarke, 1907.
- . Einleitung in das Neue Testamentes. Leipzig: J. Hinrichs, 1909.
- . Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes. Leipzig: J. Hinrichs, 1902.
- Haefner, A. E. "The Bridge between Mark and Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 67-71.
- Hamann, H. P. "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel - A Study in Textual Criticism." Unpublished STM Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1949.
- Harris, J. R. Side-Lights on New Testament Research. London: The Kingsgate Press and James Clarke and Company, 1909.
- Hebert, Gabriel. "The Resurrection Narrative in St. Mark's Gospel," Australian Biblical Review, VII (1959), 58-65.
- Helzle, E. "Der Schluss des Markusevangeliums (Mk. 16,9-20) und das Freer-Logion (Mk. 16:14 W), ihre Tendenzen und ihr gegenseitiges Verhältnis. Eine wortexegetische Untersuchung." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Tübingen, 1959. Reviewed in Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXV (1960), 470-72.

- Johnson, S. E. A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Kahle, P. E. "The End of Mark's Gospel - The Witness of the Coptic Versions," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, II (1951), 49-57.
- Kenyon, F. G. "Papyrus Rolls and the Ending of Mark," Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1939), 56-7.
- Kleist, J. A. The Gospel of Saint Mark. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1936.
- Knox, W. L. "The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel," Harvard Theological Review, XXXV (1942), 13-23.
- Lake, Kirsopp. The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.
- Lake, Kirsopp and Silva Lake. An Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Harpers, 1937.
- Legg, S. C. E. Novum Testamentum Graece Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum - Evangelium Secundum Marcum. Oxford: University Press, 1935.
- Lightfoot, R. H. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Markus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1951.
- Galiläa und Jerusalem. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1936.
- Menzies, Allan. The Earliest Gospel. London: MacMillan and Company, 1901.
- Milne, H. J. M. and T. C. Skeats. Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. Oxford: University Press for the British Museum, 1938.
- Moule, C. F. D. "St Mark 16:8 once more," New Testament Studies, II (1955-56), 58-9.
- Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Reprinted from the third edition (1926). Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- Ottley, R. R. "εφοβουτο γαρ Mark xvi 8," Journal of Theological Studies, XXVII (1926), 407-09.

- Richardson, L. J. D. "St. Mark xvi,8," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIX (1948), 144-45.
- Roberts, C. H. "The Ancient Book and the Endings of St. — Mark," Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1939), 253-57.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- "Some Interesting Readings in the Washington Codex of the Gospels," Expositor, IX (1925), 192-98.
- Rutz, Karl Wm. "A Search for the Archetype of the Greek Gospel Lectionary." Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1961.
- Salmon, George. An Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament. Tenth edition. London: John Murray, 1913.
- Scrivener, F. H. A. A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. Fourth edition, Vols. I and II. Cambridge: George Bell & Sons, 1894.
- Stonehouse, N. B. The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Guardian, 1944.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels - A Study of Origins. Ninth impression. London and New York: MacMillan & Company, 1956.
- Swete, H. B. The Gospel According to Mark. Reprint of reprinted third edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. Reprint of first edition. London and New York: MacMillan & Company, 1959.
- Tischendorf, C. Novum Testamentum Graece. Edition octava critica maior. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1869.
- Turner, C. H. "Did Codex Vercellensis (a) Contain the last Twelve Verses of St. Mark," Journal of Theological Studies, XXIX (1927-28), 16-18.
- Westcott, B. F. and F. J. A. Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Introduction and Appendix. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882.

Wordsworth, J. and H. J. White. Novum Testamentum Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi. Oxford: University Press, 1889ff.

Williams, G. C. "Tatian and the text of Mark and Matthew," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIII (1942), 37-42.

Yoder, James D. Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961.

Zahn, T. Einleitung In Das Neue Testament. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche, 1924.

----- . Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Zweiter Band, Zweite Hälfte. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1892.

----- . Introduction to the New Testament. Translated from the 3rd German edition by John Moore Trout, et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke, 1909.