

The Text and the Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel

Autor(en): **Elliott, James Keith**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Theologische Zeitschrift**

Band (Jahr): **27 (1971)**

Heft 4

PDF erstellt am: **21.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-878650>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

The Text and Language of the Endings to Mark's Gospel.

An article, recently published by Professor Kurt Aland, indicates that there are several major errors in the citation of the manuscript evidence for the longer and shorter endings to Mark's gospel in the apparatus criticus of currently available printed editions of the Greek New Testament¹.

1.

As the *text* for these verses is so often the subject for discussion and as textual variants in these verses are to be taken into account below in analysing the distinctiveness of the language and style, the full citation of the evidence for the verses occurring after Mark 16, 8 is presented here. Much of the information in the apparatus has been kindly provided for me by the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster. The evidence is as follows.

1) The *longer* ending (Mark 16, 9–20) is included in the following MSS.:

A C D E H K M S U W X Y Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ Ω 047 055 0211 f 13 28 33 274
(text) 565 700 892 1009 1010 1071 1079 1195 1230 1242 1253 1344 1365 1546
1646 2148 2174 etc.

Lect. 60 69 70 185 547 883.

Lat. (vt. aur c d^{supp}. ff² l n o q) (vg). Syr. (c p h pal) Cop. (sah boh fay) Gothic (MS. lacks 12–20) Arm.^{MSS.} Geo.^B Diat. (Arabic, Italian and Old Dutch).

Justin?, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Aphraates, Apostolic Constitutions, Didymus, Hippolytus, Marinus (as quoted by Eusebius), Epiphanius.

2) The *longer* ending is included in the following MSS. *marked* with asterisks, or obeli, or with a critical note added:

f¹ 137 138 1110 1210 1215 1216 1217 1221 1241 (vid) 1582.

3) The following MSS. add the *shorter* ending *before* the *longer* ending:

¹ K. Aland, Bemerkungen zum Schluß des Markusevangeliums: Neotestamentica et Semitica. Studies in honour of Matthew Black edited by E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (1969), pp. 157–180. Aland points out particularly errors in the editions of Merk, Bover, Nestle and the United Bible Society.

L Ψ 099 (incomplete up to συντόμως) 0112 (omits πάντα...μετὰ δὲ) 579 274 (mg).

Lect. 1602.

Syr. (h^{mg}·) Copt. (sah^{MSS}· boh^{MSS}·) Eth.^{MSS}·

4) Lat. (vt. k) reads *only* the *shorter* ending after Mark 16, 8:

Lat. [vt. a] may also have originally contained the shorter ending only.

5) The following MSS. of Mark *end* at 16, 8:

Ⲙ B (a large space follows 16, 8) 304 (2386 and 1420 have a page missing at this point).

Syr. (s) Arm.^{8 MSS}· Eth.^{3 MSS}· Geo.^{1, A}·

Clement, Origen, Eusebius, MSS. according to Eusebius, Jerome, MSS. according to Jerome².

2.

The other main problem concerning these endings which is often the subject of discussion is their *language* and style.

A recent discussion is found in an article by Eta Linnemann in which it is claimed that Mark 16, 15–20 is original to Mark and forms part of the actual ending to the gospel³. Linnemann maintains a) that the theology of these verses is consistent with the theology of canonical Mark⁴, and b) that both Matt. 28, 18–20 and Luke 24, 44–53 knew of Mark 16, 15–20. One section of the article devoted to the linguistic and stylistic characteristics of Mark 16, 15–20 concludes: «Aus dem sprachlich-stilistischen Befund läßt sich kein Einwand erheben gegen die These, daß Mk. 16, 15–20 den ursprünglichen Schluß des Evangeliums enthält.»⁵

Linnemann's discussion in this section of the article is however too facile based as it is on a refutation of Morgenthaler's arguments

² The Coptic evidence has been cited largely from P. Kahle, *The End of St. Mark's Gospel. The Witness of the Coptic Versions*: Journ. Theol. Stud. N. S. 2 (1951), p. 49–57. I am informed that Pater Quecke S. J. is now at work on the Coptic versions of Mark, and Professor Bruce Metzger on the Ethiopic MSS. of the longer ending of Mark.

³ Eta Linnemann, *Der wiedergefundene Markusschluß*: Zs. Theol. Ki. 66 (1969), pp. 255–287.

⁴ Linnemann (n. 3) strongly refutes V. Taylor's arguments for a late date for the ending found in his commentary *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (1952), pp. 610–614.

⁵ Linnemann (n. 3), p. 264.

in his "Statistik".⁶ For instance, to disprove Markan authorship of 9–20 Morgenthaler argues that the number of examples of *καί* (especially *καί* consecutive) in the longer ending is lower than the average for canonical Mark whereas the total number of occurrences of *δέ* is greater than in Mark. Arguments of this type based on averages and percentages can all too easily be questioned as in fact Linnemann does successfully. Similarly, Morgenthaler argues that the longer ending is non-Markan because of the absence of foreign words. This too is an easy point for Linnemann to destroy. In choosing Morgenthaler's evidence, Linnemann has selected a simple target because the evidence in the "Statistik" for the secondary nature of the longer ending is by no means exhaustive. If Linnemann had tried to argue against the full evidence it would have proved impossible to maintain that part of the longer ending belonged to the original gospel.

Surprisingly though a thorough discussion of the language and style is not readily accessible.

Commentaries on Mark usually give detailed exegesis of the contents of the longer and shorter endings to the gospel, but the problems connected with the language and style are often dismissed with a statement such as Cranfield's, "In style and vocabulary they (the verses of the longer ending) are obviously non-Markan".⁷ This is typical. Taylor, for instance, also sees it "unnecessary to examine in detail the almost universally held conclusion that 16, 9–20 is not an original part of Mk", because according to him this detail can be found in discussions by Hort, Swete and Lagrange⁸. But these older works do not present a full discussion of the language of the verses. Consequently, there is to my knowledge no thoroughgoing analysis of the language and style of these endings compared with New Testament language in general or with Mark's gospel in particular. Similarly, although there are numerous discussions published on the documentary evidence for the verses after Mark 16, 8, the variants in MSS. containing the longer and shorter endings are not usually taken into account when considering the language and style.

⁶ R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (1958), § 10, *Wortstatistik und Echtheitsfragen*, pp. 58–60, Beispiel 1: Mk. 16, 9–20.

⁷ C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (1959), p. 472.

⁸ Taylor (n. 4), p. 610.

3.

The discussion below attempts to remedy these deficiencies.

The Distinctive Features of the Longer Ending, Mark 16, 9–20.

In these notes the name of Mark refers to the author of Mark 1, 1–16, 8 only.

V. 9

ἐφάνη. – This is the only occurrence in the New Testament of this verb with reference to the Resurrection appearances although it is used of Elijah re-appearing in Luke 9, 8 (cf. Num. 23, 4 LXX where it is used of God). According to Legg's apparatus, the Greek uncial D avoids this verb and reads ἐφανέρωσεν but this is clearly a misreading by D due possibly to assimilation to 12 or 14 where φανερώω occurs.

παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει. – This is likely to be the original reading and is a combination not found elsewhere in the Greek New Testament. Several MSS. read ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει but this variant is secondary. ἀπο has been introduced to the text by assimilation to Luke 8, 2 ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει although it is also possible that some scribes avoided παρά because like the International Critical Commentary they too found this preposition "strange".¹⁰

V. 10

ἐκείνη. – ἐκεῖνος as a pronoun is common in the Johannine writings (e.g. John 1, 8. 18. 33). It is however not characteristic of Markan style although it is a feature of this ending (see v. 11, 13, 20). κακεῖνοι in v. 11 for instance is not used of the disciples in Mark.¹¹

πορευθεῖσα. – The verb πορεύομαι found in Matt., Luke, John and Acts is not a Markan word. It is however found three times in this longer ending, v. 10, 12, and 15¹¹. Mark does not use the simple form of this verb. At Mark 9, 30 the variant reading representing the simple verb is secondary, for scribes tended to remove the prefixed prepositions of compound verbs¹², and παρεπορεύοντο should therefore be read at Mark 9, 30. Another significant

⁹ S. C. E. Legg, *Novum Testamentum Graece. Evangelium secundum Marcum* (1935), *ad loc.*

¹⁰ E. P. Gould, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark* (1896), *ad loc.*

¹¹ This unity of language in Mark 16, 9–20 makes it difficult to uphold Linnemann's (n. 3) arguments that 15–20 can be treated separately when refuting Morgenthaler's linguistic points. The textual arguments brought forward by Linnemann are successfully dismissed in another article by K. Aland, *Der wiedergefundene Markusschluß?: Zs. Theol. Ki.* 67 (1970), pp. 3–13.

¹² C. H. Turner, *Markan Usage, 9: Journ. Theol. Stud.* 29 (1928), 275–289, p. 288.

difference from Markan usage is that Mark tends to reserve the compounds of πορεύεσθαι for the present tense, and uses ἐλθεῖν for the aorist. Here, however, πορεύεσθαι appears in the aorist (cf. also the firm example of the aorist in v. 15).¹³ The v. l. ἀπελθοῦσα here read by K Π 42 131 229 253 481 517 579 892 etc. is to be rejected as secondary. As we have seen, πορεύομαι belongs to Pseudo-Mark's vocabulary and it is firmly established in all MSS. at v. 15. The v. l. has probably been introduced into the text through assimilation to 13 where ἀπαγγέλλω follows as here.

τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις is also an unusual way of referring to the disciples and is not found elsewhere in the New Testament (cf. κἀκεῖνοι above).

πενθοῦσι. – The verb πενθέω is non-Markan.

V. 11

ἐθεάθη. – θεάομαι is a non-Markan verb also. It occurs again in 14 in the middle voice.

ἠπίστησαν. – ἀπιστέω is also non-Markan. Once more the unity of the language of this ending is demonstrated because the verb also occurs in v. 16. At both 16 and here variants are found (D reads καὶ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ at 11 and 115 reads μὴ πιστεύσας at 16) but these are plainly secondary readings intended to avoid the less usual verb ἀπιστέω.

V. 12

μετὰ ταῦτα is found in Luke and John but not in Mark.

ἐφανερῶθη. – φανερῶ is not used by Mark of Jesus' resurrection appearances although it occurs again in the same context in this section at 14. The v.l. ἐφάνη read by Θ at v. 12 is to be rejected. Θ is notoriously inaccurate when deviating in this section. See the errors of this MS. in reading πορευθέντες in 13, αὐτοῖς in 11 and λαλήσωσι in 17.

ἐτέρῳ. – There is no firm example of ἕτερος in Mark¹⁴.

μορφή. – μορφή does not occur elsewhere in the gospels.

V. 14

ὑστερον does not occur in Mark. It is not part of his vocabulary as can clearly be demonstrated at Mark 12, 6 which contains ἔσχατον whereas the parallel in Matt. 21, 37 reads ὑστερον.

ἐνδεκα. – This is the only reference to the eleven disciples in Mark 1, 1–16, 20.

ὠνείδισεν. – This is the only example in the New Testament of ὠνείδίζω used of Jesus rebuking the disciples.

¹³ See further G. D. Kilpatrick, πορεύεσθαι and its compounds: *ibid.* 48 (1947), pp. 61–63.

¹⁴ See J. K. Elliott, The use of ἕτερος in the New Testament: *Zs. ntl. Wiss.* 60 (1969), p. 140f.

ἀπιστίαν . . . καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν. – This is the only place in the New Testament where these faults are levelled at the disciples.

The so-called Freer logion found after 14 in the Greek uncial W and part of which is found in Greek MSS. known to Jerome has no claim to being original either to Mark's Gospel or to the longer ending. The vocabulary differs sharply from both: ὄρος and προσλέγω are hapaxes in the Greek New Testament; ἄφθαρτος, δείνα, ὑποστρέφω, ἁμαρτάνω, ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀπολογέομαι do not occur in Mark 1, 1–16, 8 or in 16, 9–20; ὁ Χριστός is not the designation of Jesus by the author of the longer ending.

V. 15

ἅπαντα. – There is no firm example of the form ἅπας in Mark although it occurs as a variant in Mark 1, 27; 8, 25; 11, 32.

κτίσει. – This is the only occurrence in the Gospels of κτίσις used in the sense of the sum of what is created rather than the creative act¹⁵. κτίσις in the latter sense is found at Mark 10, 6; 13, 19.

V. 16

κατακριθήσεται. – The passive forms of κατακρίνω are not found in Mark.

V. 17

σημεῖα. – The plural of σημεῖον is not found in Mark in the sense of miracles or wonders regarded as a sign of the divine act although it is frequently plural in John with this meaning (e.g. John 2, 11. 23, 3, 2; 6, 2. 14). See also the same usage in v. 20.

The separation of ταῦτα and σημεῖα is not characteristic of normal New Testament word order. Similarly, the use of ταῦτα with anarthrous σημεῖα differs from the usual usage in the gospels although N. Turner points to examples of the omission of the article after οὗτος in Acts 1, 5; 24, 21¹⁶. Of this example he says ταῦτα here may be construed as the object of the participle as in fact certain scribes (C³ RW 565 etc.) possibly indicate by placing ταῦτα next to τοῖς πιστεύσασιν.

παρακολουθήσει. – παρακολουθέω in the sense "to result" differs from the meaning in the rest of the New Testament (e.g. Luke 1, 3; I. Thess. 4, 6; II. Tim. 3, 10). This reading is however to be preferred to ἀκολουθήσει (read by C* L Ψ 892 and others) because ἀκολουθέω occurs as a compound verb in 20. The variant reading the simple verb is explicable on stylistic grounds. It can be demonstrated in many other places in the apparatus to the Greek New Testament that scribes tended to avoid compound forms.

¹⁵ This is the interpretation of A. Plummer, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (1914), *ad loc.*

¹⁶ N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* by J. H. Moulton, 3. Syntax (1963), p. 259.

V. 18

ὄφεις. – ὄφεις does not occur in Mark.

κἄν in the sense “and if” is not found in canonical Mark. At Mark 5, 28; 6, 56 it is merely an intensification of simple καί (in the sense “even”, “at least”).

θανάσιμον. – θανάσιμος occurs only here in the whole of Biblical Greek, although it is found in the apocryphal Acts of John. Biblical Greek prefers the poetic θανατηφόρος (which occurs five times in the LXX and in James 3, 8).

βλάψη. – βλάπτω is not found in Mark.

ἐπιθήσουσιν. – This is the only occurrence of ἐπιτίθημι, ἐπί + Accusative, in Mark. In Mark 5, 23 the verb is followed by the dative direct, despite the parallel in Matt. 9, 18 which reads ἐπί + Accusative.

καλῶς ἔξουσιν. – This classical phrase is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

V. 19

μέν οὖν. – This combination is not found in Mark. οὖν itself is rare in Mark there being only two firm examples according to C. H. Turner¹⁷.

ὁ... Κύριος as a Christological title is not found in Mark¹⁸ although it occurs again in 20. The v. ll. adding either Ἰησοῦς alone after Κύριος (in C*LKΔ fam. I, 565 etc.) or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός after Κύριος (in W Lat. [vt. o] Copt [boh.^{Mss}]) are secondary. The expansion of divine titles is a characteristic of scribal activity¹⁹.

ἀνελήμφθη. – ἀναλαμβάνω is not found in Mark. The verb is used of the ascension only in Acts 1, 2. 11. 22; I. Tim. 3, 2. Elsewhere in the New Testament this meaning is conveyed by ἐπαρθῆναι (Acts 1, 9), ἀναβῆναι (John 6, 62; 20, 17), πορευθῆναι εἰς οὐρανόν (I. Pet. 3, 22), or διεληλυθῆναι τοὺς οὐρανοὺς (Heb. 4, 14).

V. 20

ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ. – This expression is not found elsewhere in the gospels.

τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργούντος... σημείων. – The extended genitive absolute found here is a rare New Testament usage. συνεργέω is not found elsewhere in the gospels and is found nowhere else in the New Testament with Jesus as

¹⁷ C. H. Turner, *Markan Usage*, 7: *Journ. Theol. Stud.* 28 (1927), 9–22, p. 20f.

¹⁸ *Pace* Linnemann (n. 3), p. 281, who wishes to take Mark 11, 3 as a parallel to the usage of ὁ Κύριος here. Mark 11, 3 however is clearly not an example of Κύριος as a Christological title. This interpretation is enforced if χρείαν ἔχω at 11, 3 is used absolutely as at Mark 2, 25 and if αὐτοῦ is seen as a postpositional possessive, i.e. “its master has need”.

¹⁹ J. K. Elliott, *The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus*, = *Studies and Documents* 36 (1968), especially p. 204f.

subject (if ὁ θεός is read at Rom. 8, 28). It is a Pauline word. So too are βεβαιῶ and ἐπακολουθέω neither of which is found elsewhere in the gospels²⁰.

The Distinctive Features of the Shorter Ending, after Mark 16, 8.

In this section the following *words* do not occur in canonical Mark:

συντόμως, ἐξαγγέλλω, σωτηρία, ἀνατολή²¹, ἄρχι (or μέχρι, if the reading of Ψ is accepted as original), and ἄφθαρτος (which occurs in the Freer logion).

The following *phrases* are peculiar to this ending:

οἱ περὶ τὸν Πέτρον, ἐξαποστέλλω τὸ κήρυγμα, ἡ αἰώνιος σωτηρία.

δύσις is a New Testament hapax. The perfect participle of παραγγέλλω is found nowhere else in the New Testament. The adjective ἱερός is found elsewhere only at II Tim. 3, 15. μετὰ ταῦτα is not found in canonical Mark although it occurs at 16, 12 (see above).

James Keith Elliott, Leeds

²⁰ It will be seen from the above that the statement in The International Critical Commentary (n. 10), p. 303, that in the longer ending 19 words and 2 phrases are not found in canonical Mark represents an undercount. Morgenthaler's figure (n. 6), p. 59, that 16 of the 92 different words in the longer ending are not found in canonical Mark is also low.

²¹ Note that ἀνατολή occurs in the plural at Matt. 24, 27; Luke 13, 29 where δυσμή is also plural. The v.l. ἀνατολῶν here in 274 mg. is plainly secondary as the singular parallels the singular δύσεως.