

# humanitas

Vol. IX-X

IMPrensa DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA  
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS

FACULDADE DE LETRAS DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA  
INSTITUTO DE ESTUDOS CLÁSSICOS

---

# HYMANITAS

VOLS. VI E VII DA NOVA SÉRIE  
(VOLS. IX E X DA SÉRIE CONTÍNUA)



COIMBRA  
MCMLVII-VIII

## OBSERVATIONS ON MARK 16, 9-20 IN RELATION TO ST. MARK'S GOSPEL\*

Nearly all modern critics assume that Mark 16,9-20 is spurious. The reasons given are based on internal as well as on external evidence (1). The case for the external evidence seems in fact to be very strong. For the passage is missing in a number of the most important mss. (2). Moreover, the patristic evidence seems to be of some weight, since several of the Fathers do not show any acquaintance with the passage (3). Such an authority as Eusebius even observes that it is missing in the majority of the Greek mss. (4). The question

**This article is dedicated to my eldest brother Leendert, Johannes van der Valk.**

**My step-brother has shown me great kindness and sympathy especially since my father's death; it is in gratitude for this that I dedicate to him a study which would have interested our common parent.**

\* I am especially indebted to Prof. J. A. Davison of Leeds, who was so kind as to look through this paper and revise the English. I have made only a few references to the work of other scholars. This does not mean that I undervalue other man's contributions; but I think that what I have written must either stand or fall by its own merits.

(1) Cf. e.g. Kirsopp Lake, *Historical Evidence Resurrection* p. 121; B. H. Streeter, *The four Gospels* pp. 335 ff. ; Bacon, *Gospel of Mark* p. 86 «The original ending of Mark is lost forever».

(2) It is missing in the important mss. B<sub>k</sub>, in sy<sup>s</sup> (the oldest Syriac translation), in k (one of the representatives of the oldest Latin translations), in the Armenian text and in the oldest Egyptian versions. On the other hand, the passage is to be found in the Koine, in CD, in a great number of Latin versions and in sy<sup>C</sup>. Thus it is found in the Koine-text and in the majority of the representatives of the Western text, whereas it is missing in a number of the oldest translations and in the best representatives of the Egyptian text. Since the Egyptian text is considered by the majority of modern critics to be the best text and that which is closest to the original, the textual evidence testifying against the authenticity of Mark 16,9 ff. seems to be strong, cf. also below N 4.

(3) We observe that no trace of the passage can be found in Origen, Clement and Dionysius. Neither Cyprian nor Tertullian seem to show any acquaintance with the passage, cf. however, also below p. 53 n. 2.

(4) Cf. Euseb. *Quaest. 1 ad Marinum*; Hieron. *Ep. 120, 3*. The testimony of Euseb. about the Greek mss. of his time is important, especially if we connect it with the fact that Mark 16,9 ff. is not mentioned by Origen.

seems to be complicated further, because a number of mss. give an alternative text(1). On the other hand, Mark 16,9 ff. was known to Irenaeus (2) and probably to Justin.

As to the internal evidence, critics have observed that words occurring in this passage are not found elsewhere in Mark and are not in keeping with what we know of him. They have further observed that there is apparently a lack of continuity between Mark 16,8 and 9 ff. Moreover, the appearances of Christ which occur in Mark 16,9-13 seem to have been copied from Luke and John. Accordingly, they assume that the passage was interpolated in early times, probably in the first part of the second century A. D.

It is clear that there are two possibilities: *a)* Mark 16,9 ff. is spurious; *b)* It is genuine, but was omitted on purpose, because readers took special exception to it. If this is true, we may expect the removal to have taken place in early times, because later on the Gospels were canonical, and had too great an authority for readers or copyists to have had the audacity to remove a passage from them.

The reader will understand that in our opinion the question of the genuineness or interpolation of Mark 16,9 ff. must be approached from the side of the internal evidence. For if the passage has been removed, in fact, from the text in early times, we may expect our seemingly most trustworthy witnesses among the mss. as well as among the Fathers to have omitted it (3).

If we suppose for a moment that Mark 16,9 ff. is genuine the

(1) The alternative version, which is very concise, is offered by L (Paris, eighth century), by  $\Psi$  (Athos eighth century), by the minusc. ms. 579. These three mss. are considered as belonging to the Egyptian text. Further it occurs in k (Latin version) and in sy<sup>h</sup>mS. It may also be mentioned that W (Freerianus, fifth century) offers an expansion of the text after Mark 16, 14. This expansion is clearly an interpolation.

(2) The evidence is of great importance, because it shows that the passage must have been known already about the middle of the second century. For Irenaeus, cf. *Contra Haeres.* 3, 10, 6 and Irl<sup>at</sup>.

(3) The approach to the question by means of the mss. is, in my opinion, further complicated by the following fact. The question which branch of the tradition is the most trustworthy has not been settled as yet with absolute certainty. Though most critics are inclined to prefer the Egyptian text of the N.T., I think that there are reasons to be very cautious in this respect. For these reasons I hope that the reader will understand that in this article I wish to approach the question from the side of the internal evidence.

two following questions arise: *a)* Can it be said that assertions occur in this passage to which readers could take serious exception?

*b)* Can we point to other examples which show that in early times a tendency can sometimes be found to remove lines from the text, because they seemed to give offence?

*a)* Two points might give serious offence: *a)* The grave reproaches, directed by Christ at the apostles (v. 14), show a mentality quite different from the representation of the resurrection, as given in the other gospels. In Matthew 28 the disciples convey the message given by the women; in Luke 24,36 ff. at the appearance of Christ, the apostles already believe in the fact of the resurrection (cp. Luke 24,34) and are not reproached. One may observe that in fact in the Gospels major and minor discrepancies occur which have not, however, induced the copyists to excise a passage. One might even add that the accounts of the resurrection as given in Matthew and Luke do not correspond. However, one must take into consideration the fact that the discrepancy in Mark 16,9 ff. does not concern a minor event such as a cure\* etc., but deals with the important fact of the resurrection. Further we must bear in mind that not only the discrepancy with the other gospels but also the grave upbraiding of the apostles may have given rise to objections.

*β)* The promise about the taking up of serpents and the drinking of deadly poisons (Mark 16,17 f.) may have been offensive, too, because of the peculiar form of Christianity which it shows. For here supernatural powers are allotted to the disciples, whereas in none of the other Gospels are similar powers attributed to them. We can understand that the form of Christianity revealed in Mark 16,17 f. might give rise to objections and cause the removal of the passage from the text.

*b)* As for the point which concerns the removal from the text of lines which seemed to give offence, we may quote the following examples. Luke 22,43 f. is missing in a number of mss (1); it is highly possible that these verses were omitted in part of the tradition, because it seemed unbecoming to the divinity of Christ that an angel should strengthen Him in the agony in Gethsemane. Since the verse occurs in Luke only, it could easily be removed. In the same way Luke 23,34

(1) The verses are missing in B A and in representatives of the old Latin, Syriac and Egyptian text.

is missing in a number of mss. (1). The verse seems to have been omitted, because the fact that even Christ's tormentors were pardoned must have seemed, to a number of readers, an example of mercy pushed too far. Luke 24,51 which says of Christ *ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν* is likewise missing in a number of mss. (2), though at present critics are inclined to assume that the verse is genuine. In this case the verse may have been cancelled on purpose in order that the discrepancy between this passage and the beginning of Acts might be removed (3).

We may add two examples, were this principle can perhaps also be applied. In John 1,51 Christ says to Nathanael: *δυεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγῶτα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Most critics offer this text which is in accordance with a number of mss. The Koine and other mss., however, read: *απαρτι δυεσθε κτε*. One might think that *απαρτι* was omitted on purpose, too. One must take into consideration the two following points. 1 It might seem strange that angels should have continuously descended on Christ, before the moment of the resurrection, when He had entered into his divine glory. The narration of the gospels does not warrant this statement. If we omit *απαρτι*, the statement, offered in John 1,51, becomes more vague and general. For then Christ's words can be applied to the future moment of the resurrection, when in fact angels descended on earth. In my opinion, *απαρτι* is the crucial word of the sentence. For if we accept it, we must assume that according to John during Christ's lifetime this fact had indeed occurred often. The omission of the word makes the verse less offensive.

2 If we investigate John's mentality, we see that among the writers of the gospels John especially stresses Christ's divinity and tries to show that Christ has revealed his glory in all its splendour from the beginning of his career. We may point to the Prologue, John 1,1 ff. ; we further point to the first of Jesus' miracles to be described by John

**(1) It is missing in BD, in other mss. and in representatives of the oldest Egyptian, Syriac and Latin versions.**

**(2) It is missing in AD, sy<sup>s</sup> and in the greater number of the old Latin witnesses.**

**(3) When asserting this we are aware of the fact that Luke and Acts were written by the same author. However, it is probable that Luke when he completed his gospel, had not as yet in mind the account which he was to give in Acts Ch.,**

**1 and 2.**

when Jesus altered the water into wine (John 2,1-11). At the end of the passage John significantly says: *καί ἐφανερώσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ* (John 2,11). We further call special attention to the description of the passion by John. For the other writers of the gospels the passion is the moment of Christ's life at which He has to suffer and be humiliated. To John even the passion is a revelation of Christ's glory, cf. e.g. John 13, 31: *οτε οὖν ἐξήλθεν λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς : νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.*

Especially important in this respect is John 12,28 ff. In this passage, just before the passion begins and at the moment when Christ predicts his passion (John 12, 20 ff), we have the episode of the voice of God from heaven which glorifies Christ *ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω.* The voice from heaven also occurs in the other gospels, but there it is mentioned at the beginning of Christ's career on the occasion of his baptism (Marc 1,11; Matth. 3,17; Luke 3,22). When John places the episode of the voice from heaven at the beginning of the passion, he does so, I think, with a special purpose. He wishes to show that in the passion Christ is not humiliated, but that it is a moment of glorification, to which glorification God himself expressly testifies.

If we take these facts into account I believe that we can see how John is especially interested in proving that Christ reveals his glory and splendour during his whole life from the beginning of his career. Therefore, we can expect that of all the Evangelists it is John who on one of the first occasions of Christ's meeting with the disciples, will be inclined to emphasize that Christ from the beginning onwards is glorified by angels and revealed in his divine splendour. Now it will be admitted that this idea is especially accentuated by the word *απαρτι*. Therefore, I think that the word is genuine and that it has been removed from the text on purpose by persons who did not understand the special mentality of John.

I may also point to Mark 15,39, where most critics read with a number of mss. *Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντηρίων ... διὰ ὄντως ἐξέπνευσεν.* The Koine, however, offers *διὰ ὄντω κράζας ἐξέπνευσεν.* In order to appreciate this reading, we must bear in mind that Mark, the oldest gospel, gives a particular representation of Christ which at times verges on the magical. I refer, for example, to the passage about the fig-tree, Mark 11, 12 ff., which serves to reveal Christ's divine character. It is well-known that the passage lacks ethical character and only tends

to underline Christ's supernatural powers. Thus it is rather magical than ethical. Now if in Mark 15,39 we read *cm ὀντως ἐξέπνευσεν*, the word *ὀντως* must refer to the darkness i.e to the signs given by God on this occasion. If we read *οντω κράζας ἐξέπνευσεν* the words refer to Christ and tend to show his supernatural character which reveals itself in his death-cry. I think that the latter reading better reveals the mentality of Mark.

These examples might justify us in making the following observation. It seems as if sometimes verses were omitted in part of the tradition, because they seemed offensive to the reader. This offence might be given either because the statements in question seem to go too far, (Luke 32,34) or because they did not seem to be in accordance with the representation of facts or of the Christology as given in the four gospels taken together.

I am aware that we are touching here upon a particularly vexed point, for we know that several other discrepancies occur in the gospels which have not been removed from the text. In this connection, however, we must bear in mind that several discrepancies could not be removed unless complete passages were removed from the text. In the points which we discussed above the removal of the offense was relatively easy, because the cancelling of a verse or even of a few words sufficed.

Nevertheless one might argue that the thesis which asserts that the verses discussed above were added later on, is equally defensible. Concerning Mark 16,9 ff. one might even go farther and say that in Mark 16,9-20 the removal of v. 16,14 *καὶ ὠνείδισεν — οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν* and of vv. 17 and 18 would have been sufficient, if these lines were offensive to ancient readers. In this case the remaining part of the passage might have been preserved, if it was genuine.

In view of these facts I think that we must make the following statement. When the authenticity of a passage is doubted, we must enquire whether the mentality of the passage which is called into doubt is in accordance with the mentality of the author in whose work it occurs. Such an enquiry is often made impossible or at best seriously hampered by the scantiness of the evidence which is at our disposal. In the case of Mark 16,9-20 we are in a better position, because we possess a relatively long passage. Therefore, we can pursue this investigation with some hope of success.

In my opinion, this is the crucial point and the only way by which the question of the authenticity or interpolation of Mark 16,9-20 can



be solved. For the external evidence is, in my opinion, inconclusive and may be used both ways (to explain either the authenticity or the interpolation), as we observed above. The same holds good for the question of the alternative version of the end of Mark.

One might argue that originally the gospel ended with 16,8, whereas two different interpolated versions originated in different circles in order to extend the concluding part of Mark. One might, however, equally argue in the following way. Mark 16,9 ff., though genuine, was removed from the text, because it was thought to be offensive. In the greater part of the tradition it was thought sufficient merely to cancel the passage; in some parts, however, the attempt was made to substitute an alternative version for the passage which had been removed. This alternative version was not offensive and gave to the gospel a conclusion which was satisfactory to the authors of the version.

One might also argue, as we observed above, that the critics should have confined themselves to the removal of vv.14,17 and 18. However, we cannot prescribe which course the ancient readers ought to have followed in their *atheteses* of lines or passages. In the end such a course will always be subjective; therefore, it cannot be judged from our side by standards which must be also subjective. In this case, we might pay attention to the fact that Mark 16,9 ff. contained not one but two serious difficulties (vv. 14 and 17 f.). This may have made ancient readers suspicious of the genuineness of the whole passage and, therefore, they may have rejected it entirely. In offering this suggestion, we may also point to the fact that the remaining part (Mark 16,1-8) contained an undoubted statement about the resurrection (v. 6 *ἡγέρθη, οὐκ ἐστὶν ὡδε*). Therefore, the ancient readers could be content, because this important fact was communicated to them in the chapter.

If we suppose Mark 16,9 ff. to be spurious, we have to admit that three explanations are possible. I The Gospel really ends with 16,8.

II Mark was prevented from finishing his gospel. III The genuine end of Mark is lost and has been replaced by the spurious Mark 16,9 ff.

I I think that this view must be discounted altogether, for the fact of the resurrection is one of the most salient features in Mark. In my opinion, a correct appreciation of this feature is fundamental for the understanding of Mark's mentality. The importance of the resurrection and the close connection between the passion and the resurrection is a characteristic which is common both to St. Paul and

to Mark. As we shall see later on, there are other important points of contact between St. Paul and Mark. With regard to the resurrection we observe that in Mark the passion and the resurrection are solemnly predicted by Christ on three occasions (8,27 ff.; 9,30 ff.; 10,32 ff.). One might observe that in Matthew and Luke, too, the same facts are predicted. However, Mark is the first to narrate them and accordingly the structure and the composition of the facts in Mark are original. More important is the fact that in Mark the three predictions are closely connected and are placed in a corresponding sequence. In my opinion, they have in Mark a paradigmatic significance; they tend to show the divinity of Christ and thus to settle the question of the Christology. In Luke this connection is disrupted. For the first two predictions are given in Luke 9,18 ff., whereas the third prediction is only given in Luke 18,31 ff. Matthew, it is true, more closely follows Mark in this respect, for he offers the three predictions in Matth. 18,12-20,28. In Matthew, however, the question of the Christology has already been settled in Ch. 11 (cf. especially vv. 25-30). Accordingly, the chapters on the three predictions have not the same paradigmatical value with respect to the question of the Christology, as in Mark.

As to Mark, we may also point to the passage of the transfiguration (Mark 9, 2-13). This passage, which is given after the first prediction of the passion and resurrection, is also paradigmatical. It tends to prepare for the resurrection and to create a belief in the fact when it occurs. One cannot but state that the fact of the resurrection is stressed by Mark in a very significant way (1). This makes it impossible to assume that Mark should have omitted, of all things, the story of the resurrection.

II This hypothesis is a subterfuge, which hardly deserves serious consideration. It is highly improbable that the author should have been prevented by external circumstances from adding a passage of only twenty lines.

III The best way to discard this view is to show that Mark 16,9-20 shows exactly the characteristics which are peculiar to Mark and that it does not contain words which can be considered alien to that author.

First of all we draw attention to the last point. We must emphasize

**(1) At the last supper (Mark 14, 38) the passion and resurrection are also closely connected and predicted by Christ. Mark 14,58, too, seems to refer to, the resurrection (cf. Mark 15,29).**

that the argument that a passage must be spurious, because words occur in it which are not found in the same meaning elsewhere in the author, can be used only with great caution. If a passage seems suspect, it is relatively easy to detect in it words which seem to be used in a specific sense. I may mention 2 Cor. 6,2-7, a passage which used to be suspected of being interpolated.

Scholars were not loth to detect in it words which seemed to be used in a sense deviating from that of the remaining part of the epistle. It has, however, rightly been pointed out that it is incorrect to make use of this argument here (1).

I may further point to the word *πνεύμα* in Mark 14,38, a word which is not found in this sense in any other part of Mark. I am sure that if the passage had been suspected, scholars would have been ready to point to the singular use of *πνευμα* as a proof of the inauthenticity of the passage.

Bousset (*Kyrios Christos* pp. 95-7) has observed that in Mark 16,9 ff. *kyrios* is twice used with respect to Jesus (vv. 19 and 20), whereas it only seldom occurs in this sense elsewhere in Mark.

The fact has accordingly been adduced as one of the reasons for the inauthenticity of Mark 16,9 ff. In this connection we may observe that Mark, the first disciple to write a gospel, is cautious in his use of Messianic or divine designations for Christ. Thus, whereas Luke and John freely use *kyrios*, Mark only seldom uses it. It is interesting to note that before the last stage in Christ's career (Mark Ch. 11, etc.) *kyrios* is only twice used in a sense in which it can be applied to Jesus. It is significant that in both places the meaning is doubtful. In Mark 5,19 Jesus says to a person who has been cured *ναγαε... ἀπάγγελον αυτοῖς δσα δ κύριός σοι πεποίηκεν και ήλέησέν σε.*

The meaning of the word remains doubtful here, for though it may refer to God it may just as well refer to Christ himself. In Mark 7,28 it is used by the Syrophenician woman, who says *ναι, κύριε.* This time, it directly refers to Jesus, but it can easily be explained as a polite form of address. Therefore, I stress the fact that critics who maintain that *kyrios* is not used in a Messianic sense with reference to Christ in either case, cannot be refuted. However, I wish to draw attention to the following fact. We shall see later on that Mark is very cautious in introducing significant terms or ideas. Now in the

(1) Cf. Plummer, *Commentary on the epistle.*

above-named passages we see that on both occasions (Mark 5 and Mark 7) Christ addresses a non-Jewish person. We know that Mark deliberately makes Jesus go to a non-Jewish region, when He reveals himself for the first time as Christ and predicts his passion and resurrection (Mark 8,27 ff.). This way of representation seemed to him more cautious. In the same way the first two instances of the word *kyrios* in the gospel occur in interviews with non-Jewish persons and, moreover, it is used on both occasions in an ambiguous way. I think that here we can detect Mark's typically cautious manner and that in both cases the author hopes or intends that the reader will understand the term in its Messianic sense.

The meaning of the term is not dubious in Mark 11,3. We must not forget, however, that here we have reached a definite stage in Christ's career, for we hear of Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, which undoubtedly has a Messianic purpose. In this connection we may point to the passage immediately preceding, Mark 10,46-52, in which Jesus is acknowledged as the Messianic son of David, while in Mark 11 and 12 also Christ is triumphant over all his adversaries. In Mark 11,8-10 Christ is acknowledged as the son of David by the bystanders and in Mark 12,35-37 it is stated that the son of David (Jesus) must necessarily be the *kyrios*. If we take these facts into consideration, we cannot but state that in Mark 11,3 the term has been used deliberately and emphasizes Christ's divine character, when He enters Jerusalem. Thus we see that during the first stages of Christ's career, Mark twice uses the word *kyrios* but both times in an ambiguous and covert way. After Christ's entry into Jerusalem he uses the word more freely and openly applies it to Jesus in a definitely Messianic sense.

I think that now the use of *kyrios* in Mark 16,9 ff. becomes understandable, for it is clear that it is especially in the resurrection that Christ reveals his divine character. After the resurrection He belongs entirely to the divine world. Especially in the earliest Christian times, as can be learnt from the Pauline epistles (1) the resurrection is of the greatest importance. I believe that in the Christology of the early Church of the Diaspora Christ was thought to be especially entitled to be called *kyrios* after the resurrection, when He had decisively shown his divine character. Therefore, after the

(1) Rom. 8,34; 1 Cor. 15, 14.

resurrection Mark is not sparing in the use of the word *kyrios* (Mark 16, 19 and 20) and thus he shows that Christ has revealed himself definitely as the divine *kyrios*. With respect to the word we can thus observe a climax in the gospel of Mark and we may say that its use in Mark 16,9 ff. is in keeping with the tendencies revealed in the Gospel of Mark.

When discussing the further relation between Mark 16,9 ff. and the Gospel of Mark, we wish to point to the following features. I The three appearances of Christ and their sequence (Mark 16,9-14). II The relation of Christ to his disciples (Mark 16,14). III The supernatural powers allotted to the disciples (Mark 16,17 f.).

I As scholars have observed, the appearances to Mary Magdalene and to the two travellers (Mark 16,9-12) seem to have been copied from Luke and John, where the appearance on the road to Emmaus and that to Mary Magdalene respectively occur. In this connection, however, attention may be drawn to the following points. In Mark Christ appears to the two disciples *εν ετέρα μορφῃ*, whereas in Luke Christ has an ordinary human form; the two disciples are only prevented by divine agency from recognizing him (Luke 24,16). In my opinion, the representation of Mark 16,12 is in keeping with the gospel of Mark and is also characteristic of the earliest Christian times. We may refer to Mark 9,3, the account of the transfiguration, which, as we observed, is important in connection with the resurrection. Here Christ *μετεμορφώθη*, a representation similar to that of Mark 16,12 (*ετέρα μορφή*). In Luke and John emphasis is laid on the bodily character of the risen Christ (cp. Luke 24, 39-44), a feature which is characteristic of the writers of the later Gospels.

In the epistles of St. Paul, however, which are the earliest documents of Christianity, emphasis is laid again and again on the pneuma, the gifts of the pneuma and the pneuma in the resurrection (1). In my opinion, the statement in Mark 16,12 about the *ετέρα μορφή* of Christ, is in keeping with this representation, whereas Luke in the story of the

(1) For the latter fact we refer to 1 Tim. 3, 16: *ἐφανερώθη εν σαρκί, εδικαιώθη εν πνεύματι*. However, one must take into consideration that 1 Tim. is considered not to be authentic, and according to nearly all modern critics cannot be ascribed to St. Paul. It would be presumptuous to call this opinion into doubt here. Nevertheless, the epistle must, at least have originated in circles which stood in close relation to St. Paul. The statement offered in 3, 16 is, in my opinion, very important.

appearance on the road to Emmaus, evades these characteristics and represents Christ in an ordinary human appearance.

Nevertheless, another serious objection has been raised against the appearances described in Mark 16,9 ff. They differ notably from the account in 1 Cor. 15 ff., the oldest account of the resurrection (1). In this connection, we observe that 1 Cor. 15 and Mark 16,9 ff. approach the fact of the resurrection from a different angle and according to different principles. In 1 Cor. 15 it is St. Paul's aim to establish the fact of the resurrection by invoking the testimony of persons whose authority carried the greatest weight in the Church. The witnesses are mentioned here in two series. The first series is headed by the chief of the apostles, Peter, one of the pillars of the Church (Gal. 2,9). After him, first the Twelve and then 500 members of the Church are mentioned. The second series opens with St. James, also one of the pillars of the Church (cp. Gal. 2,9); then follow the apostles and finally comes Paul himself. It must be admitted that in both series authoritative witnesses are mentioned and that they are mentioned according to the principle of the descending scale.

In Mark 16,9 ff., on the other hand, the appearances are given according to the principle of the ascending scale. The author first of all mentions as a witness a woman who is called by name (Mary of Magdala). We must bear in mind that in those times the testimony of a woman carried no weight and that, even if her name was mentioned, it was inferior in value to that of a man. In this connection, we observe that among the witnesses, mentioned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15 there are no women. The second appearance occurs to two men who remain anonymous. Critics believe these men to have been taken over from Luke 24. However, in Luke at least one of them is mentioned by name (Luke 24,18). The interpolator of Mark 16,9 ff. might have mentioned his name, too. Moreover, we would expect that an interpolator, when inserting a passage would enhance its importance and thus we would have expected persons enjoying special authority to have been mentioned in Mark 16,9 ff. The fact can be explained, if we pay attention to the principle mentioned above. A man's

**(1) In this connection I observe that some scholars (Bacon, *Story of Jesus* p. 83) have even thought that in the lost original of Mark 16 an appearance to Peter may have occurred.**

testimony has greater authority than a woman's. Thus the appearance to the two men is more important than that to the single woman. The testimony is somewhat weakened, however, by the fact that the men remain anonymous.

We may argue as follows. The author of Mark 16,9 ff. tries to establish the fact of the resurrection, but proceeds in a very cautious way. He first mentions a woman, then two men who remain anonymous and only in the third place the appearance to the Eleven which is definitive and authoritative. We must not forget that the fact of the resurrection, especially in the earliest times of the Church, is of crucial importance. One may invoke authoritative persons as witnesses, as is done by St. Paul. One may also proceed gradually and tentatively, as is done by Mark 16,9 ff. It will be admitted that the cautious method is especially likely to be used by the earliest authors who have to narrate the fact.

I may strengthen these observations by pointing to the fact that caution is a special characteristic of the author of the Gospel of Mark, as we have already seen in the above discussion of the term *kyrios*. I may further point to Mark 2,18-3,6, where the questions of fasting and of the sabbath are discussed. Mark first treats of fasting (2,18-22). Christ ends by speaking about new wine which cannot be poured into old wine-skins (vv. 21 f.). It is clear that Mark wishes to show that Christ's new doctrine cannot be compressed into the old schemes and observances of the Jews. It is somewhat curious that this observation should be connected with the discussion of fasting. Fasting was not uncommon in the early Christian Church (1) and in the passage itself it is said (2,20) that after the passion Christ's disciples will fast.

I think that the fact becomes understandable, if we connect it with the passage dealing with the sabbath which follows immediately afterwards, 2,23-3,6. Here the question of the sabbath is treated at length.

It will be admitted that in the early Church of the Diaspora the question of the obligation to observe the O. T. Law, the sabbath, etc. and Jewish customs was of primary importance (cf. e.g. Gal. 2), whereas the question of fasting was only a point of secondary importance.

**(1) Cf. e.g. Mark 9,29 and 1 Cor. 7,5. It is to be admitted that in both passages the observation about fasting is not found in a number of mss.**

On the other hand, it will also be admitted that it was difficult to attack the doctrine of the sabbath in a straightforward way. In my opinion, Mark has acted with caution and skill. He begins by seemingly directing his attack at the less important point of fasting, which was not enforced by the O. T. Law. He can, without danger draw the conclusion that fasting is not obligatory and that the new doctrine of Christ has here superseded the old doctrines of the Jews. Then Mark proceeds to discuss the sabbath. He does not positively say that the sabbath has been superseded. However, for the observant reader the authority of the Jewish obligations and consequently of the sabbath as well has been impaired by the observations on fasting.

I think that in Mark 7,1 ff. the same method can be detected and that here, too, Mark drives his attack home by a detour. Here, Mark seemingly discusses an excessive precept of the Pharisees viz. the washing of hands. This precept will in fact appear very excessive to the reader and he will readily admit that it is obsolete and not obligatory. However, at the end of the interview (Mark 7, 14 f.) Christ expressly again convokes the multitude and says by way of conclusion: *οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν ὃ δύναται κοινώσαι αὐτόν*. We must not neglect this important statement, for we know that in the earliest Church of the Diaspora the ritual cleanness of victuals, which was enforced by the Jews, was one of the most important questions. Therefore, when Christ says that nothing which enters man can pollute him, I cannot but think that Mark wishes to allude to this question. Here, too, I think that Mark first prepares the reader's assent on a point of minor importance (washing the hands) in order to bring home afterwards his main attack viz. the question of the cleanness of dishes. Here, too, Mark is cautious, for he does not positively say that all kinds of dishes are permissible. Christ only says that no dish can pollute man which comes to the same thing.

I also point to Mark 10,1-22, where the question of divorce (10,1-12), the necessity for the disciple to become like a child (10,13-16) and the question of possessions (10,17-22) are discussed. The passages on divorce and possessions concern man's relations to the O. T. Law and tend to show that the O. T. Law and its precepts are insufficient for the disciple and follower of Christ. In this connection, we must pay attention to Mark 10,13-16 where it is said that the disciple must



become like a child. This passage should be compared with Mark 2,21 f. which intimates that Jesus brings a completely new teaching which cannot agree with the old Jewish customs. In the same way, Mark 10,13-16 tends to show that the disciple must become a completely new man and cannot go on adhering to the old Jewish customs. This view, which is stated positively in Mark 10,13-16, is exposed negatively in the two other passages of this chapter (Mark 10,1-12 and 17-22), where Mark emphasizes the insufficiency of the O. T. Law.

This time, too, Mark begins (vv. 1 ff.) by attacking the Law on a subordinate point (Deut. 24-1); he even proves the incorrectness of the precept given here by referring to another passage of the O. T. (Gen. 1,27). Thus in 10,1-12 the attack on the Law is still seemingly harmless. However, in the second passage, Mark 10, 17-22, the author hints that the person who has fulfilled the Decalogue in its entirety, has not done enough to become a follower of Christ (cp. v. 21 *εν σε υστερεί*). If we pay attention to the fact that already at the beginning of the chapter (10,1 ff.) the O. T. was attacked, it seems highly probable that at the end (vv. 17-22) the most important point of the O. T. viz. the Decalogue is attacked and that its insufficiency is exposed. If we accept this explanation of the facts, we see that here, too, Mark proceeds in the same cautious way.

I think that we find the same cautious method in Mark 16. For in Mark 16,1 ff. the words of the angel about the resurrection (v. 6 *ήγγεθη, ούκ εστιν ώδε*) and the fact of the empty tomb are not revealed by the women (v. 8 *καί ονδενί ονδεν είπαν, εφοβοντο γάρ*). In the same way in Mark 16,9 ff. the narration of the first two appearances is not believed. I think that this attitude of the author may also account for the curious fact that Mark 16,1 ff. does not begin with the story of the resurrection, but with the story of the empty tomb and the indirect message of the angel about Christ's resurrection. One would expect the writer of the Gospel to have opened chapter 16 with an account of the resurrection. Here, too, I think we meet with the cautious method characteristic of the author. He does not directly offer the main point (resurrection), but approaches the problem from the side of a minor point (the empty tomb, the message of the angel). Only then he does proceed to the main point (Mark 16,9 ff.).

This may also account for the vexed question of the lack of continuity between Mark 16,8 and 16,9 ff. Because Mark for the above reason narrates the event of the resurrection in two stages, he is

forced to make a fresh start in v. 9, the more so, since now the actual fact of the resurrection is narrated (1).

II As to Christ's attitude to the disciples in Mark 16,14 scholars have observed that nowhere in Mark have the words *ονειδίζειν*, *σκληροκαρδία*, *απιστία* been used with respect to the disciples (2). In my opinion, this argument is especially deceptive and shows how cautious our attitude should be in the case of words which occur only in a particular passage. First of all Mark 8,17 offers *πεπωρομένην εχετε την καρδίαν*, an expression which has nearly the same weight. In the second place we must bear in mind that the resurrection is the most important fact and that Christ's reproaches will be proportionally heavier here than in the case, when the disciples do not understand a less important fact such as a cure. The principal argument, however, is that Christ's attitude in Mark 16,14 is in close agreement with the representation offered elsewhere in Mark's Gospel. When comparing Mark with Matthew and Luke on this point, we learn from a number of passages that Mark tends to show that there is a peculiar difference between Christ and other men or rather between the pneumatic-divine sphere of Christ and the carnal sphere of the disciples. We may refer to Mark 8,33 *ναγε όπίσω μου, σατανά*, where the contrast between the two spheres of Christ and of Peter, the disciple, appears very markedly. We can see that Christ's attitude towards Peter is no less sharp and vehement here than in Mark 16,14. It is true that the passage has been taken over by Matthew; but we must bear in mind that Mark is the original and that, accordingly, the representation is characteristic of him.

Moreover, we see that Luke already took exception to the passage and omitted it (cf. Luke 9,18-23). The same difference between the pneumatic sphere of Christ and the carnal sphere of men appears in Mark 9,19, a passage of special importance, coming as it does after the transfiguration, where Christ appeared in pneumatic glory. Christ here says *ώ γενεά άπιστος... εως ποτε ανεξομαι υμών*. We see that the motif of *απιστία* (cf. Mark 16,14) occurs here (3). We may further

(1) Matthew and Luke, moreover, had the advantage that they were writing after Mark and thus could make the report more fluent and could connect the facts more closely.

(2) Cf. Klostermann, *Kommentar ad loc.*; Lagrange, *Comment*, p. 419: «Swete remarque que nulle part les disciples sont traités avec autant de rigueur, etc.».

(3) The passage has been taken over by Matthew (17) and Luke (9). However, it must be borne in mind that Mark is the original. Moreover, Matthew

refer to Mark 9,6, where Mark says of Peter's attitude at the moment of the transfiguration *ου γάρ ήδει τί λαλήσει* (v.l. *άποκριθή*). It is significant that in the corresponding passages of Matthew and Luke this notice does not occur.

We may also compare Mark 9,32, the attitude of the disciples after Christ's second prediction of the passion and resurrection: *ΟΙ δε ήγγούουν το ρήμα καί εφοβοντο αυτόν επερωτήσαι*. We observe that the statement is omitted in Matth. 17,23 who only says *καί ελυπήθυσαν σφόδρα* and altered in Luke 9,45 (1). In the passage of Mark, however, the difference between the carnal understanding of the disciples and the divine sphere of Christ is stressed.

We may further refer to Mark 8,17 (miracle of the loaves), where Christ says to the disciples *οὔπω νοείτε ουδε συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην εχετε τήν καρδίαν υμών*; It is significant that in Matth. 16,8 (in Luke the passage does not occur) the sharp words have not been taken over; instead, the disciples are designated by the less offensive *ολιγόπιστοι*. We also mention Mark 4,40 (stilling of the tempest): *τί δειλοί εστε ούτως; πώς ουκ εχετε πίστιν*; Matth. 8,26 *τί δειλοί εστε ολιγόπιστοι*; Luke 8,25 *που ή πίστις υμών*. It is obvious that in Mark the difference between Christ and the disciples is greatest. In Matthew and Luke the faith of the disciples is not entirely equal to the situation; in Mark Christ is surprised that they have no faith and cannot master the situation.

In this connection, we observe that *ολιγόπιστος* often occurs in Matthew (6,30; 8,26; 16,8), whereas it is never found in Mark (2). The fact is characteristic. Matthew shows degrees of faith; a disciple who is not equal to a situation, has less faith. In Mark no degrees of faith are found but a complete break between the divine sphere and the carnal sphere in which men usually move. A disciple who does not understand

(17,17) and Luke (9,41) say: *ώ γενεά άπιστος καί διεστραμμένη*. Here the words contain a general statement about the deplorable moral condition of the world, (*διεστραμμένη*, cf. Mark 8,38 *εν τη γενεά ταντη τη μοιχαλίδι και άμαρτωλφ*). In Mark, however, we have to deal with a lack of faith; the disciples do not understand the pneumatic and supernatural power of Christ.

(1) Luke 9,45 says: *καί ήν παρακεκαλυμμένον άπ αυτών ίνα μη αϊσθωνται αυτό*. The statement is similar to that of Luke 24,16 f., where it is said of the two travellers that divine interference prevented them from recognizing Christ.

(2) In this connection, we also refer to Mark 9,24 *πιστεύω βοήθει μου τη άπιστία* (not *τη όλιγοπιστία*, as we would have expected).

a miracle or prediction has no faith; he still belongs to the carnal sphere. On the other hand, when faith is present in the disciple, its powers are irresistible, cf. Mark 9,23 *πάντα δυνάτῃ τῷ πιστεύοντι* and Mark 11,22-25 (1). Then the disciple belongs to the pneumatic sphere.

Thus we see that in Mark the disciple who does not understand the pneumatic facts is sharply rebuked, whereas the disciple who has real faith receives extraordinary powers. The very same facts can be found in Mark 16,14 (rebuke of the disciples) and in Mark 16,17 f. (extraordinary powers of the disciple). Just as in Mark 6,52 and in 8,17-21 the carnal disciples do not understand Christ's divine miracles, so in Mark 16,14 they do not understand the divine miracle of the resurrection.

For this we may also point to Mark's representation of Christ, for, in my opinion, Mark especially emphasizes the supernatural and almost magical character of Christ and the difference between Christ and other men (2). We may refer to Christ's walking over the sea, a passage which, I believe, is especially characteristic of Mark (Mark 6,45 ff.). We see that Luke entirely omits this passage, while Matthew, though he includes it (Matth. 14,22 ff.), omits Mark's significant statement about Christ *καὶ ἠθέλην παρελθεῖν αὐτούς* (Mark 6,48) and also omits the statement about the disciples *καὶ ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη* (Mark 6,52). Further we see that Matthew shows that as the result of Christ's performance he is acknowledged by the disciples as the son of God (Matth. 14,33). In Mark, however, the result of Christ's appearance is that the disciples are nonplussed because of his supernatural power (cf. Mark 6,51)(3). Here, too, we see how Mark

(1) We see that Matthew has taken over the statements of Mark, whereas Luke 17,6 only says: *ὁὶ εἰχετε πίστιν.....ελέγετε ἂν κτε*. Luke unlike Mark does not emphasize the extraordinary power of the disciple's faith.

(2) We must not forget that in Mark, too, Christ has compassion on the multitude or on the disciples, cf. Mark 6,31 and 34. Of course Mark does not omit these characteristics which form the basis of Christ's career. However, Mark also wishes to show the difference between the divine Christ and carnal men.

(3) Mark says: *καὶ λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθαυμάζον*. *ὄν γὰρ συνήκαν..... ἀλλ\* ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη*. The words *καὶ ἐθαυμάζον* are omitted by a number of mss.; they are given by the Koine. In my opinion, they are genuine, because they very aptly underline the surprise of the disciples, a feature which, as we saw, seems to be characteristic of Mark.

shows the sharply-marked difference between the carnal sphere of the disciples and the divine sphere of Christ.

We further refer to Mark 11,12 ff., the passage of the barren fig-tree. This passage, which lacks ethical character and has, therefore, given offence to critics, is, in my opinion, characteristic of Mark, because it tends to reveal Christ's divine and supernatural powers (1) which extend also over the realm of inanimate nature (cf. Christ's walking over the sea, Mark 6,45 ff.).

We may also point to Mark 15,37 *ἀφεις φωνήν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν* and to Mark 15,39 *ὄντω κράζας ἐτελενησεν* and we may mention also Mark 4,12. Christ says that He speaks in parables lest the multitude should understand his words. It is significant that in Matth. 13,35 the sharp expression is toned down and that it is omitted altogether in Luke. All these examples tend to show that in Mark it is especially the difference between Christ and ordinary men that is stressed. So in Mark, Christ, by the stress laid on his pneumatic qualities, has a somewhat magical character (2).

Thus the marked difference between Christ and the disciples in Mark 16,14 need not surprise us, but is, in our opinion, characteristic of Mark. It is also understandable that Matthew and Luke should have omitted or altered this representation, offered in Mark 16,14, because the character of their gospels is different. We can see, however, that Luke has retained some traces, for he narrates that the message of the women was not believed. He also mentions that Christ made reproaches (Luke 24,25). These reproaches, however, were not directed to the Eleven, but to two less important disciples. Thus we see that in Luke the original features of Mark 16,9 ff. have been somewhat toned down.

III We further wish to discuss *a*: Christ's order to preach and

(1) We must not forget that the scene takes place shortly after Christ's triumphant and Messianic entry into Jerusalem. It shows how, at that important moment, Christ can claim the obedience of nature. It is significant that the passage of the fig-tree has been transformed by Luke into the parable of Luke 13,6 ff.

(2) We also point to the fact that in Mark 9,38 f. the magical power of Christ's name appears: *εἰδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια*. It is significant to compare with this Matthew 7,21-23. Matthew here expressly lays stress on the ethical conduct of the disciple: *ὁ ποίων τὸ βέλη μα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* and emphasizes that the use of Christ's name will not be effective.

baptize (Mark 16,15) and *b*: The supernatural powers attributed by Christ to the disciples (Mark 16,16-18).

*a)* The order to preach the gospel in the whole world (Mark 16,15) is in keeping with other passages in Mark. We may refer to Mark 13,10: *και εις πάντα τα εθνη πρώτον δει κηρυχθηναι το εναγγέλιον* and 14,19. Mark 13,10 is of special importance, since it occurs in Christ's apocalyptic speech. We see that in the corresponding passage of Luke (Luke 21) this point has not been taken over, while in Matthew (24,14) it has been given a rather different meaning in accordance with the Jewish-Christian mentality of the Gospel of Matthew. Matthew says that it will be preached *εις μαρτύρων πασιν τοις εθνεσιν* and thus he alters and weakens the meaning of Mark 13,10. According to Matthew the Gentiles will have no excuse for being unacquainted with the gospel, whereas according to Mark the gospel will be preached in the whole world i.e. many Gentiles will accept it.

We must also bear in mind that, if Mark 16,9 ff. is spurious, Matthew 28 is the oldest record of the commands given by Christ on the occasion of the resurrection and especially of that concerning baptism. If this is true, the utterance of Mark 28,19 *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τα εθνη βαπτίζοντες αυτούς* is somewhat surprising. For though it is possible that Matthew or his source contained an indication that the gospel was to be preached in the world, we know that, as a rule, Matthew is inclined to restrict the preaching of the gospel to the Jews (cf. Matth. 10,5 and 6 and Matth. 24,14). Therefore, it seems strange to me that Matthew should have been the first to emphasize on the occasion of the resurrection, the preaching of the gospel to the whole world. The difficulties disappear, if we assume that Mark 16,9 ff. is genuine. For then Matthew only followed the text of Mark and adapted it to his special Jewish-Christian views, just as in Ch. 24,14 he had adapted Mark 13,10 to his Jewish-Christian surroundings.

Mark 16,15 had only enforced the obligation of preaching and baptizing. We have already observed that the author of Mark's gospel had no interest in the O. T. Law and did not think that it was strictly obligatory. Therefore, it is understandable that no mention should be made of that Law in Mark 16,15.

To Matthew, however, the O. T. is obligatory (cf. Matth. 5, 17-19) and the primacy of Israel is important also (cf. Matth. 20,1 ff. and 22,1 ff.). Therefore, he observes that the apostles must make the

Gentiles their disciples and emphasizes the obligation to observe both the O. T. and N. T. Law (cf. for the N. T. Law Matth. Ch. 5-Ch. 7).

If, on the other hand, we assume that Mark 16,9 ff. is spurious, we have to assume that the interpolator knew and made use of Matth. 28. Then it is strange that he should have omitted to mention the words on baptism in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost (Matth. 28,19). I think that it will be admitted that the later author (Matthew) is likely to have the more amplified version.

We may also draw attention to the fact that it is only in Mark 16,9 and in Matth. 28 that a command to baptize is given on the occasion of the resurrection.

This feature is, in my opinion, characteristic of early Christian mentality. We have already had an opportunity to observe that the resurrection is one of the most important facts in Mark, and we learn from the epistles of St. Paul that this was also true of the early Christian communities of the Diaspora. This was the moment at which Christ entered on the divine life. As we supposed in our discussion of the term *kyrios*, Christ's authority is enhanced by the resurrection; his character as *kyrios* then clearly becomes supreme. Thus we can understand that at this important moment, when his authority is greatest and when He has entered upon the divine life of *kyrios*, Christ gives important commands.

In this connection we may make a comparison with John. In the gospel of John (cf. 3,22 and 4,1 and 2) baptism was already practised during Christ's lifetime, and this is understandable, since John most strongly emphasizes from the beginning Christ's divine and pre-existing character, and whereas Mark offers only unambiguous examples of the term *kyrios* with reference to Jesus after the triumphant entry into Jerusalem (Mark 11), John freely uses the term from the beginning. In Mark the facts of the passion and resurrection, as we saw in our discussion of the three predictions of the passion and resurrection, are paradigmatic and are meant to emphasize Christ's divine character. In John this tendency is completely missing. We do not find a gradual climax in John's Christology as we do in Mark's. Therefore, we can understand that it is especially in Mark that the command to baptize is given after the resurrection, when Christ has his greatest authority and is about to take his place at the right hand of God.

This view can be strengthened by the following observation. Mark is the only author in whose gospel the disciples receive important

commands only after the resurrection. Both in Matthew and Luke the disciples receive commands during Christ's lifetime (cf. Matth. Ch. 10 and Luke Ch. 9,1-10 and 10,1-25). I think it is characteristic of Mark that the disciples receive special powers at an important moment of Christ's career i.e. at the moment, when He himself has shown his divine character particularly clearly (Mark 16,9 ff.).

For this view we may compare Mark 9,2-29, where the disciples receive instructions for exorcizing particularly dangerous demons. It is significant that this instruction is given directly after the scene of the transfiguration (Mark 9,2-13). For in the part of Christ's career which comes before the passion and resurrection this is the passage in Mark which most clearly reveals Christ's supernatural and pneumatic character. In the transfiguration Christ has shown his divine character in a significant way and is thus entitled to transmit specific and extraordinary powers to the disciples.

We also point to Mark 11,22-25, where the irresistible power of the disciple's faith is emphasized. Again this passage occurs after the passage of the fig-tree (Mark 11,12-14 and 22), where Christ has shown his extraordinary powers over nature after his Messianic entry into Jerusalem. In accordance with Christ's power, the power of the disciple's faith has no limits.

b) The powers attributed to the disciple in Mark 16,17 f. (the taking up of serpents and the drinking of deadly poisons) seem to be very peculiar; in none of the other gospels are they associated with the disciples (1). Nevertheless, the powers mentioned here seem to be understandable in early Christian times, at least in communities such as those which we know from the epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians (cf. e.g. 1 Cor. 12 and 14). We see that in the Christian community of Corinth pneumatic and supernatural powers were greatly appreciated and nearly all attention was focused on them. We can say that in Corinth more value was attached to pneumatic-supernatural than to ordinary human qualities. We may compare the treatment of the brother who has sinned in Matth. 18,15 ff. and in 1 Cor. 5,3-5. In Matthew the offender is judged before the community in the presence of witnesses after the customs of the Jews. In 1 Cor. the offender is condemned in an assembly, where the *pneuma* of Paul and the *δύναμις*

(1) For the faint resemblance which can be found between Mark 16,17 and Luke 10,19, cf. below Excursus II.



of Christ are thought to be present. We see that in these surroundings pneumatic and supernatural qualities are of special value. The same holds good for Mark 16,17 f. It must be admitted that in the Corinthian epistles characteristics such as are found in Mark 16,17 f. are not attributed to the disciples. However, we must take into account that Mark was, in all probability, a Christian of a narrower outlook than St. Paul. Thus Mark may well have been more inclined to the more popular forms of Christianity, and may be found to elaborate the lower forms of pneumatic-supernatural life such as we find them in Mark 16,17 f., whereas St. Paul, notwithstanding his pneumatic mentality, is likely to prefer ultimately a form of Christianity such as we find in 1 Cor. 13.

We further point to Mark 16,17 *γλώσσαις λαλήσουσι καιναῖς*. If Mark 16,9 ff. is spurious, we may suppose this to be an imitation of the miracle of the tongues in Acts 2. However, the two situations are markedly different, for in Acts 2 the disciples spoke in languages which already existed and which, accordingly, were understood by the bystanders (Acts 2,11), whereas in Mark it is promised that they will speak in new languages which, accordingly, do not exist.

Now we may draw attention to the fact that the idea of *καινός* is often found in the gospel of Mark and is always of special importance there. Thus in Mark 1,27 Christ's teaching is called a *διδασχὴ καινή κατ' ἐξουσίαν* (1), a feature which is not taken over either by Matthew (2) or by Luke. In Mark the idea is taken up again in 2,21, where in the parable of the new wine and the old wine-skins Christ's teaching is called *καινός* (3). Mark emphasizes the fact that the teaching of Christ originates from God and is pneumatic; accordingly, it has authority, whereas the doctrines of the scribes etc. are only based on human knowledge. We further see that just as Christ's teaching

(1) Cf. also Mark 1,22 of Christ: *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς*.

(2) To Matthew Christianity is not something new but the fulfilment and crowning of the O. T. teachings.

(3) Though the parable has been taken over by Matthew (9,16 f.) and by Luke (5,36-39), the original meaning which it had in Mark has been lost. Luke by adding v.38 about the superiority of old wine, changes the original meaning of the parable. Matthew takes over the parable without any change. In Mark, however, the parable immediately precedes the passage about the sabbath and thus stresses the new character of Christianity; in Matthew the passage on the sabbath only occurs in Ch. 12,1 ff.

is new, so the disciple in Mark must become a new man, Mark 10,13-16. As we observed above the image of the disciple becoming like a child (1) has the meaning that the disciple of Christ must start afresh and become a new man (2).

Here again we may refer to the views of St. Paul who also compares the disciples to new-born children (1 Cor. 3,1, cf. also 1 Peter 2,2). It is significant that Matth. 19,13-15, when taking over the above-named passage of Mark omits Mark 10,15 about the disciple becoming like a child (3). I believe that Mark and St. Paul are related in this respect, for according to them Christ has brought a new divine and pneumatic doctrine which supersedes the obligations of the O.T.

We further point to Mark 14,25, where, at the last supper, Christ says that He will only drink the *οἶνος καινός* of the Kingdom. I think that this passage is instructive for the understanding of Mark 16,17. Just as Christ will only drink the new wine of the new Kingdom, so the disciple will speak *γλώσσαι καιναι* viz. the new languages of the new Kingdom. In Acts 2 the disciples keep within the forms of the old system, for they speak languages which are already known. In Mark 16,17 they are to speak the pneumatic languages of the Kingdom. We have the same situation, as we observed above, in Mark 16,12 when compared with Luke 24. In Mark 16,12 Christ had a pneumatic appearance, in Luke Christ retained the ordinary human appearance. Therefore, I believe that Mark 16,9 ff. represents an older form of Christianity than Acts 2 and Luke 24.

If, in fact, in Mark 16,17 f. the disciple receives attributes which are of a supernatural character and which may be called pneumatic, we cannot fail to associate them with Christ's pneumatic life after the resurrection. Just as Christ shows his nature as *kyrios* and his divine

**(1) In Mark 9,33 ff. the image of the child also occurs. Here the meaning is that even the least important disciple, who is as insignificant as a child, must be treated with respect and love by his fellow-disciples.**

**(2) Gould, Comment, p. 189 wrongly interprets the passage as meaning that the disciple must be obedient as a child is to his parents. As we observed above, Mark in this chapter stresses the fact that the O. T. Law is no longer obligatory for the disciple of Christ. The disciple must follow a new doctrine..**

**(3) In Ch. 18,3 where Matthew takes over the sentence, he gives it another meaning: The disciple must humiliate himself like a child.**

character at the resurrection (1 ), so the disciple receives supernatural qualities on that occasion. Thus we see in Mark 16,9 ff. a very intimate connection between Christ and the disciple and between the important stages in Christ's life (resurrection) and the life of the disciple. We may go further and make the two following statements. I This intimate connection between Christ and the disciple is also found in St. Paul. II It is likewise found elsewhere in Mark, whereas it is not found in the other gospels.

For the intimate connection between Christ and the disciple, especially with regard to the great moments in Christ's life (the passion and the resurrection), we may refer to 2 Cor. 4,11: *Εἰς Θάνατον παραδίδόμεθα δια Ἰησονν Ἰνα και ἡ ζωή τον Ἰησον φανερωθη εν τη θνητή σαρκί νμών*, to 2 Cor. 1,5 and 7 and to Rom. 6,5: *σύμφωντοι γεγονάμεν τω όμοιώματι τον Θανάτον αυτων*. The assimilation goes so far that the disciple even shares the passion and resurrection of Christ and thus in Col. 1, 24 St. Paul can even say: *άνταναπληρώ τά νοτερή ματ α τών Θλίψεων τον Χρίστον*. If we pay attention to this fact, we can understand how to St. Paul the disciple, just like Christ, can become an example and model for the other disciples. In this Connection, we may point to 1 Thess. 1,6 *νμείς μιμηταί ημών εγενήθητε και τον κυρίον* and to 2 Tim. 2,10 *πάντα νπομένω δια τονς εκλεκτούς*.

From these examples it appears that to St. Paul the connection between Christ and the disciple is very close indeed, and that the difference between them is not insurmountable. On the strength of the evidence of the above passages from the epistles of St. Paul, we may expect that in the oldest forms of Christianity in the communities of the Diaspora, an intimate connection between Christ and the disciple will be revealed. Since Mark wrote his gospel in one of the

**(1) We draw attention to the fact that it is not our intention to assert that according to Mark Christ should not have been pre-existing or divine before the resurrection. — For this we may point to Mark 1,1: *Ἰησοῦ Χρίστον υἱοῦ του Θεοῦ* (I think that the words *υἱοῦ του θεοῦ* which are offered by the Koine and by BD and other mss. cannot be omitted) and to Mark 1,39 *εἰς τούτο γάρ ἐξήλθον* — We only wish to say that Christ's pre-existence does not appear in the same way in Mark as it does for instance in John. As we have already observed, in Mark Christ's divine character shows and reveals itself by degrees. Accordingly, in his gospel the resurrection is of great importance as the crowning point in this development and revelation.**

communities of the Diaspora, we may seek for these characteristics in his gospel.

First of all we may call attention to a seeming contradiction with the above statement. We observed above that it was especially in Mark that there appeared to be a difference between Christ and the disciple and that in Mark the disciples were often sharply rebuked. However, this fact only holds good for those disciples who are carnally-minded and who do not pay attention to the pneumatic sphere. As soon as the disciple is pneumatically-minded the difference disappears (1).

As for the close connection between Christ and the disciple in Mark we may refer to the three predictions about the passion and the resurrection, given by Christ in Mark 8,27-10,45. We have already observed above that though the same predictions occur in Matthew and Luke, they are not so closely connected as in Mark and do not have such a significant meaning as in that gospel. In Matthew the predictions are given in the same order as in Mark (Matth. 18,12-20,28). However, it can easily be seen that in Matthew the connection between Christ and the disciple is not so significant as it is in the predictions given by Mark.

We must bear in mind that Matthew has already given an exposition of the situation and the obligations of the disciple in Ch. 10. Then he offers his Christology in Ch. 11 and 12 and does not give the predictions about the passion and resurrection until Ch. 16,13 ff. We see that in Matthew the Christology, the predictions about the passion and resurrection and the position of the disciple, are described in different parts of the gospel. We even see that in Matthew the exposition of the situation and the obligations of the disciple (Matth. 10) precede the exposition of the Christology, etc. (Matth. 11 and 12 and Matth. 16 ff.). Thus we may suppose that in Matthew the connection between the disciple and Christ and the relation of the disciple to the important facts of Christ's life (passion, etc.) is not intimate.

In Mark, however, the fate of the disciple is intimately bound up with that of Christ. We can learn this from the fact that in Mark 8,34-9,1 the situation of the disciple is discussed immediately after

**(1) We may recall the fact that the difference between the pneumatic — supernatural and carnal — human is also especially emphasized by St. Paul.**

the first prediction of the passion and resurrection of Christ. (Mark 8,27-34). Just like Christ the disciple will have to suffer, but the faithful disciple will share in Christ's resurrection.

Whereas after Christ's first prediction the disciple's position was sketched only summarily and in broad outline, the second prediction (Mark 9,30-32) is followed by an extensive exposition of the situation of the disciple and the events and obligations which will confront him (Mark 9,33-10,31). One must not omit to pay attention to the fact that in the space between the second (Mark 9,30-32) and the third (Mark 10,32-34) prediction, Mark continuously discusses the situation of the disciple.

In this section Mark considers the disciple's attitude towards the principal practical questions of life. Thus his attitude towards sexual relations and matrimony (Mark 10,1-12), towards worldly possessions (Mark 10,17-31) and towards his fellow-disciples (Mark 9,33-50) are discussed.

Especially in the last passage (Mark 9,33-50) we can observe the close connection between Christ and the disciple. Mark 9,37 observes that even the most insignificant disciple stands for Christ himself. Further we may compare Mark 9, 42 which says that for anyone who offends a disciple it will be better to be drowned with a mill-stone round his neck. We may compare Mark 14,21 where Christ says of the traitor Judas that it would have been better for him, if he had not been born. Thus Mark treats the fate of the traitor to Christ and that of the tormentor of the disciple in similar terms. When Mark says that it would have been better for Judas, if he had not been born, he obviously alludes to the fact that he will be condemned to hell-fire.

In this connection the vv. Mark 9,43-48 are especially interesting. Christ says that it is better for a person to lose a part of his body than to be condemned to hell-fire. One might be inclined to think that Mark here alludes in general to the dangers of hell-fire against which the disciples are warned.

However, I believe that in vv. 43-48 Mark has in mind a definite sin viz. the ill-treatment of the fellow disciple (1). Already at the beginning the example of the child (Mark 9,36 f.) tends to illustrate

**(1) I shall return at the end of this section to the meaning which Mark 9,49 f has in this connection.**

this fact (1) and to show that even the most insignificant disciple (the child) is on an equal footing with the other disciples and represents Christ (Mark 9,37). It is clear that also in v. 42: *και δε αν σκανδαλιστη ενα των μικρων τουτοιον των πιστενοντων κτε.* Mark is still treating the same topic and refers to the treatment of the fellow-disciple. Also at the end of the pericope (v. 50) the same subject is still under discussion, for Christ ends his words by saying to the disciples (Mark 9,50): *ειρηνευετε εν αλληλοις.* By these words Christ clearly refers to the attitude of the disciples towards one another.

If we bear these facts in mind, I cannot but think that the remaining part of the pericope, Mark 9,43-48, must be referred to the same fact viz. the treatment of the fellow-disciple. This time the punishment which is applied to the person who harms his fellow-disciple is mentioned. He will be exposed to hell-fire just as the traitor to Christ apparently will be exposed to it. If this statement is true, we see how important the person of the disciple is in the gospel of Mark. For to lose a limb and thus to suffer carnal loss is preferable to harming a fellow-disciple- and thus being condemned to hell-fire.

I think that the above explanation of the passage agrees with Mark's mentality and that it also shows how skilfully in the passages about the first two predictions Mark has divided the exposition of the fate of Christ and that of the disciple. The pericope dealing with the first prediction, Mark 8,27-9,29, focuses our main attention on Christ and on his passion and resurrection. After Christ's predictions the passage of the transfiguration (Mark 9,2-13) follows in order to reveal Christ's divine life and thus to illustrate the certainty of his resurrection. Thereupon 9,14-28 shows Christ's triumph over the most powerful demons. As we have already observed above, the disciple's position is here treated only concisely (Mark 8,34-9,2). All this is completely understandable, since we expect that on the occasion of the first prediction the person of Christ will claim all attention.

In the pericope of the second prediction (Mark 9,30-10,31) the situation is reversed. We may expect that after Christ's position has been settled and made plain, the disciple will now have his turn. This makes it clear to us why in the second pericope first of all the position of the disciple, the attitude of the disciples towards one another and

(1) For the meaning which the image of the child has here, cf. above p. 75, n. 1.

the privileges which every disciple, even the most insignificant, can claim are described (Mark 9,33-50). This must be settled first and foremost. Thereupon, after the disciple's position has been defined, his attitude towards the practical questions of life can be traced (Mark 10,1-31). I think that these observations will show how intimately, in Mark, Christ and the disciple are connected with one another, because first of all Christ's future is made plain and after that, in the passage of the second prediction, the disciple's position is defined.

I think that if we bear this point in mind, we are better able to consider the pericope of the third prediction (Mark 10,32-45). This prediction (Mark 10, 32-34) is followed by the passage containing the demand of the two sons of Zebedee (Mark 10,35-45). This demand concerns the assignment of the principal places in heaven to Christ's faithful followers. The sons of Zebedee admit that they are prepared and able to share Christ's chalice and baptism. Nevertheless, Christ says that He does not assign places in heaven. We see how in Mark the principal topics which interested the Christians are successively treated. The pericope of the second prediction served to expose the situation of the disciple during his life on earth. We can understand that the Christian readers, after this point had been settled, were anxious for some information about their future position in heaven. I think that Mark 10,35-45 also shows the intimate connection between Christ and the disciple.

One would be inclined, together with most critics (1), to refer the words about the chalice and the baptism to Christ's passion and to the readiness of the disciples to suffer too. It is obvious that the drinking of the chalice (Mark 10,38) points to the passion, as appears for instance from a comparison with Mark 14,36. As regards baptism, we see that Luke 12,50 interprets it too as referring to Christ's passion. We must, however, consider the possibility of Luke having given a wrong interpretation of the passage in Mark. For this we may point to Mark 9,2 ff., the passage of the transfiguration, which in Mark undoubtedly refers to the resurrection. In Luke 9,31, however, it is connected with the passion.

When discussing this point, we have to admit that a critic who refers both chalice and baptism to the passion, cannot be refuted..

**(1) We may refer to the commentaries on the passage.**

I wish, however, to draw attention to the following points. Baptism has a well-known negative meaning, since it denotes the washing away of sins, a topic which need not be discussed here. However, it can also be interpreted in a positive sense, since baptism may be considered as an initiation into a new sphere of life and a receiving of new qualities. When we investigate the material we see that the Christian fathers do not fail to allude to the positive qualities of baptism (1).

In this connection I think that we can cite interesting examples from the N. T. itself. Thus in Mark 1,9 f. the positive side of baptism appears, too, for Christ here receives the Holy Ghost at baptism. The above interpretation becomes strengthened, if we pay attention to Tit. 3,5 : *εσωσεν ημάς διά λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καί ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου.*

The text does not only speak of the «baptism of regeneration» but connects it closely with renovation (*ἀνακαίνωσις πνεύμ. ἁγ.*) Therefore, though baptism often denotes the washing away of sins and the purification of man (thus e.g. Ef. 5,26), the testimonies show that it can also indicate the renovation of man and his entering on a new sphere of life.

If we apply this meaning here Christ says that the disciple must share his chalice and his baptism i.e. the passion and the resurrection (2). Critics may be inclined to think that the statement made by the disciple that he will be able to share the resurrection may seem bold. However, we must not forget that St. Paul in Col. 1,24 also made a statement which seems very bold from the standpoint of the disciple. In the early Christian communities of the Diaspora, as we learn from St. Paul

(1) I draw attention to Tertullian, *De Baptismo*. In Ch. 4 he says: *Ne mirum sit in baptismo, si aquae animare noverunt.* Cf. also Ch. 4 *ad baptismi figuram, dei spiritum... intinctos reformaturum.* Ch. 5 of the kinds of baptism applied by the Heathens: *idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem periuriorum suorum agere praesumunt.* I observe that in Ch. 6 Tertullian says: *non quod in aquis spiritum sanctum consequamur.* However, we must not forget that in this tract Tertullian wishes to restrict and to combat heretical notions. Therefore, I believe, he wishes to stress in Ch. 6 that the Christian does not receive his salvation by baptism alone.

(2) In this connection, I also draw attention to the fact that in Mark 10,38 Christ says: *ὄνασθε πιεῖν το ποτήριον κτε.*; If Mark had the intention only to show in this passage that the disciple had to suffer, we would have expected him to say: *θέλετε πιεῖν κτε.*;



and from Mark, the connection between Christ and the disciple was most intimate; the difference between them was not so great as it was later on.

This view is clearly proved by the following observation. According to Mark 10,40 the assignment of the principal seats in heaven is withheld from the disciple only because Christ has no disposal of them either. A completely similar motivation is given in Mark 13,32. In Mark 13 Christ gives an elaborate prophecy of the future of the world and of the future glory of the disciples on his return. All coming events are exactly communicated here by Christ to the disciples; only the moment of Christ's return is not communicated to them. Mark 13,32 motivates this fact by saying that Christ himself is not acquainted with the exact moment of his return. We see that in Mark only the things of which Christ himself has no disposal are out of the reach of the faithful disciple (1). Thus we see that the connection between Christ and the disciple is most intimate in Mark.

Therefore, we may expect the events of Christ's life to be shared by the disciple. The central facts of Christ's life are the passion and resurrection. We must not forget either that in Mark the passion and the resurrection are most closely connected, as we can learn for instance from the three predictions. We also know that on the occasion of the first prediction Christ had said that the disciple will have to suffer, but that he will also share in the glory of the Kingdom (Mark 9,1). On the strength of these facts it is natural to expect Mark, when depicting the future fate of the disciple, to mention both the passion and the resurrection (2).

For the close connection between Christ and the disciple we also draw attention to Mark 4,31-35, where it is emphasized for the first time. Christ says that the disciple takes the place of his mother and brothers. The passage is important and paradigmatical, because

**(1) Of course we have to assume that Mark expressly has given this representation of facts (Christ's not being acquainted with his return, etc.) which especially was to puzzle and annoy the later Fathers of the Church. According to Mark, Christ cannot have been acquainted with the exact moment of his return, for otherwise, on the strength of the intimate connection with the disciple, Christ could not have withheld the knowledge from him.**

**(2) I also point to the fact that for obtaining a seat in heaven (Mark 10,37), the resurrection is a necessary preliminary. Therefore, Christ's question in Mark 10,38 must be, if the disciples are able to share the passion and the resurrection.**

immediately afterwards the meaning of the Kingdom is revealed to the disciples (Mark 4).

The above examples show, in my opinion, that the details given in Mark 16,17 f. about the disciple's power, are in keeping with the mentality of the gospel of Mark. The close connection between Christ and the disciple, as illustrated in Mark, enables us to see that the strange qualities allotted to the disciple in Mark 16,17 f. are not inexplicable, when they are considered in the framework of Mark's gospel as a whole. By the resurrection Christ has entered upon a supernatural life. Thus we may expect that He will not only accord ordinary qualities to the disciple, but that He will give him powers which are typically supernatural.

In this connection, we may also remind the reader of our statement that Mark seems to have a predilection for telling important things by degrees. Now we see that on the occasion of the election of the disciples (Mark 3,14 f.) they receive the power of preaching, healing illnesses (1) and exorcizing demons. The same functions are again given to the disciples in Mark 6,7 and 12 f., when the Twelve are sent out. This time the importance of the disciples is underlined by the fact that they are called *ἀπόστολοι* (Mark 6,30). In Mark 16,15 and 17 f. the same functions are given to the disciples; this time, however, supernatural powers (taking up of serpents, etc.) are added.

With regard to the supernatural powers allotted to the disciple in Mark 16,17 f., we may also point to the following characteristic.

I think that a close investigation and comparison of the gospels shows that in Mark special attention is paid to the pneumatic-supernatural side of Christian life (2), whereas this factor is of far less importance in Matthew and Luke. I warn the reader that the investigation must be very minute and detailed, for we know that the three authors of the gospels often narrate the same events and that both Matthew and Luke make use of Mark. Thus similar parables and narrations of events will occur in Mark and in the other two authors. Since nearly the same words occur in Mark and in the other two authors, the reader will be inclined to assume that the meaning of the parables, etc. in

(1) This detail only occurs in the Koine and in D.

(2) We have already observed (cf. above p. 77 n. 1) that in St. Paul and in Mark a sharp distinction is drawn between the pneumatic and the carnal-human side of life.

Mark is the same as that which is offered in Matthew and Luke. Only slight differences reveal the mentality which is characteristic of Mark.

1 I wish to point to the following passages. 1 In Mark 13,11 Christ promises that when the disciples will be taken prisoner, the *pneuma hagion* shall speak in them. Thus at the time of persecution the disciple will have supernatural powers at his disposal. In Matth. 10, where Matthew borrows some details from Mark, he has also taken over this detail (Matth. 10,20). However, when Matthew himself deals with the future of the disciples (Matth. 24), he does not take over Mark's statement (cf. Matth. 24,4-14), though in this chapter he makes use of Mark 13. The fact is significant, for if Matthew had attached special importance to the statement about the *pneuma hagion*, he would have mentioned it here, too. Similarly in Luke's apocalyptic speech (Luke 21) no mention is made of the *pneuma hagion* (cf. Luke 21,15). In Luke 12,12, a passage which corresponds with Matthew 10, Christ says: το γάρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει νμας κτε. If we compare Mark 13,11, we see that Luke has toned down Mark's bold statement, for in Luke the *pneuma* will only teach the disciples.

2 Mark 4,21 speaks about the light which must be placed on the candle-stick. The reader who is acquainted with Matth. 5,14 f., where the same image has been used, is not in doubt about the meaning of this parable. For it is clear that in Matthew the image must be referred to the disciple who is to be regarded as the light of the world. However, when explaining the passage in Mark, we have to pay special attention to the surroundings in which the passage is given in Matthew and in Mark respectively. In Matthew Ch. 5-Ch. 7 Christ continuously addresses the disciple in order to make clear to him the obligations and commandments to which the disciple is subject. Matth. Ch.5-Ch. 7 gives an exposition of the N. T. Law. The disciple will only be saved, if he observes this N. T. Law (cf. Matth. 7,21 and 7,24-28). We must not forget that in Matth. Ch. 5-Ch. 7 the disciple is exhorted to observe the commandments and that, accordingly, the self-activity of the disciple is called upon. Thus we can understand that the disciple himself is called the light of the world.

In Mark, however, the situation is different. Mark 4 speaks about the Kingdom. First of all Mark 4,1-21 offers the parable of the divine sower. The seed is the divine logos; the parable itself describes the different attitudes which may be taken with respect to it. After the description of the divine sower and his different results

has been given, 4,21 sayS: *μήτι ερχεται ὁ λόγος ἡα νπό τον μῶδιον τεθη ἡ νπό την κλίνην κτε.* In my opinion, the meaning of this utterance, notwithstanding its close resemblance, is different from that of Matth. 5,14 f. For in Mark 4,1-21 the parable showed how the divine seed of the logos was sown in man and at the same time we saw how several hearers neglected the divine principle and suffocated the seed of the logos. It is clear that in v.21 Mark points to the same fact. This time, however, he illustrates his view by another image, because he replaces the image of the seed by that of the lamp. He needed this different image, because he wishes to exhort his hearers. Now the seed which has budded in the earth cannot be put in another place, whereas a lamp may be assigned its place by man.

Since the images tend to denote the same idea, the lamp serves to denote the divine principle, just as the seed in Mark 4,1 ff. represented the divine principle. Thus v. 21 can be connected with the preceding parable and gives it its conclusion, for it emphasizes that the divine and supernatural principle must be placed in the foreground of the lives of the Christians, just as the light must be placed on the candle-stick. Just as it is only under these conditions that the lamp can give its light, so it is only under these conditions that the divine logos has its results in man. We must not forget that in Mark 4,1-21 it is the divine logos on which the principal stress is laid, whereas no mention is made of any commandments which the disciples have to observe. This constitutes the fundamental difference with Matthew. Therefore, I cannot but believe that the two utterances have a different meaning in the two authors (1).

The same idea which, in my opinion, underlies the whole chapter may again be found in Mark 4,25, where Christ says: *ὁς γαρ εχει, δοθήσεται αὐτω. και ὁς ονκ εχει και ὁ εχει ἀρθήσεται απ αὐτον.* When Mark speaks about the man who has and the man who has not, his words are somewhat enigmatic. I think that the difficulty is solved, if here, too, we refer the utterance to the divine principle. The man who possesses and retains the divine principle, shall as a result receive

**(1) In the same way in Matth. 5,13 «sait» designates the disciple himself. In Mark 9,49, however, «sait» certainly does not designate the disciple, for Jesus says that the disciple must retain the salt in himself. For the meaning of «sait» here, cf. below p. 88.**

supernatural life, whereas the man who does not have and retain the supernatural pneuma, shall lose even his earthly life (1).

In this connection we should also pay attention to Mark 4,26-29, the parable of the miraculous growth of the seed. Ordinarily this parable is explained as an example of the self-activity of man (cf. e.g. Gould, Commentary Mark p. 81). In fact we can understand why this explanation has been given, when we read in Mark that the divine sower sows the seed and afterwards does not interfere with it (v. 27 *ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τον σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστᾷ*), while the seed grows in such a way as the sower himself does not know (*ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός*).

However, I think that in this explanation of the parable, the stress has not been laid on the right point. In Mark 4,1-26 it is the divine principle which forms the central point. This principle is sown in man by the divine sower. Man himself has the task to put or to retain this principle in the right place. If the divine principle comes into or is retained in the right place, it is miraculous and yields manifold fruits (Mark 4,20). The very idea is to be found in Mark 4,26-29. If the divine seed, the divine principle, comes into the heart of man, in accordance with its supernatural quality, it has a miraculous growth. Nobody need interfere with it, but it yields fruits by its own qualities.

We must not forget that it is the seed which is depicted in this parable. The seed, however, is no human quality, but it is supernatural. Therefore, in my opinion, it is not the self-activity of man on which Mark wishes to focus our attention in this parable.

It may even be possible that Mark has intermingled or contaminated two ideas in this parable. The sower and the harvester of vv. 26 and 29 are Christ or God. It is possible that the man of vv. 27 and 28 represents the disciple. Vv. 27 and 28 state that the divine seed grows without human interference. I admit, however, that this interpretation, though, in my opinion, it seems to be tempting, is uncertain. At any rate, the parable makes plain the qualities of the divine seed. In this connection, I also point to the fact that the parable has not been taken over by Matthew or Luke. If, however, it had referred to the

**(1) It may be said that also the unfaithful disciple receives the divine principle. However, he does not retain it. Thus he cannot be said to «have» the divine principle.**

Christian's self-activity, neither author would have had any reason to omit it, for this very idea is a familiar feature in their gospels.

In this connection, I point to the fact that in Matthew the kingdom is also compared to a treasure or pearl which is found or bought at a great price (Matth. 13,44-46), parables which do not occur in Mark. In these parables the Kingdom is a thing that can be acquired by the disciples by means of strenuous effort. This fits in with the character of Matthew's gospel, since here the disciple is repeatedly exhorted to observe God's commandments, the N. T. Law (Matth. Ch. 5-Ch. 7). In Mark, however, the Kingdom is a supernatural entity which cannot be acquired by man himself but is sown within him.

If we compare Luke for the parable of the light and the candle-stick, we see that Luke 8,16 follows Mark's version. However, when Luke 11,33 uses the same image, he says: *ο λύχνος τον σώματός έστιν ο οφθαλμός σου*. Thus he clearly does not explain the *λύχνος* as the divine light, but applies it to man himself and to human activity. We may further refer to Luke 8,15, where Luke makes a similar alteration in Mark's statement (Mark 4, 20). Mark says: *οΐτινες άκούονσι τον λόγον και παραδέχονται*. Luke adds: *οιτινες εν καρδιά καλή και αγαθή άκούσαντες κτε*. Thus Luke again stresses the human qualities.

3 Finally we may refer to Mark 9,49 f., where Christ says to the disciples: *πάς γαρ πνρι άλισθήσεται..... εχετε εν έναντοις αλα και ειρηνεύετε εν αλληλοις*. Ordinarily *πνρ* is interpreted in the same way here, as it occurs in the preceding lines (v. 43), where it clearly refers to hell-fire and to the final judgement. This explanation seems in fact possible and it is even tempting; there only remains a difficulty which is, in my opinion, a serious one.

Since Christ is here speaking to the disciples, it seems strange to me that He should say that every disciple shall be salted by the fire of the coming judgement. One would expect the faithful disciple who will share in Christ's triumph to be exempted from the fire of the coming judgement. Therefore, I should like to suggest that *πνρ* may have been used here in another sense. At any rate, even if we take *πνρ* in the above-named sense it will be admitted that the idea of salt which occurs here, too, cannot be interpreted in this way. When Christ says : «The salt is good, but it can become saltless» and when He exhorts his disciples «Retain in yourself the salt», it is clear that «sait» cannot have been used here in the meaning of hell-fire or punishment. On the contrary, it is apparent that «sait» must denote a quality which is

favourable and to which special value has to be attached. The idea of salt can be explained, if we pay attention to the following fact. When we salt a thing, we change its whole character by the addition of a portion of salt which is small, when compared with the thing that is salted. Nobody will pretend that the character of man is changed by the final judgement or that hell-fire is to be considered small when compared with man himself. We are rather reminded of the parable about the leaven (Matth. 13-33), where a little portion of leaven alters the whole character of the flour which is leavened. In the parable of Matthew, leaven denotes the Kingdom. I think that the same explanation must be given to the «sait» occurring in Mark 9,49 f. It denotes the divine principle which is sown or planted in the disciples.

It seems to me that the idea of «fire» is to be explained in the same sense here. It is well-known that «fire» is often connected with divine and pneumatic powers (1). It is true that the word does not occur in this meaning in other passages of Mark. However, we may observe that the words *πνεύμα* (Mark 14,38) and *ἀντίλτροον* (Mark 10,45) are also used only once in Mark (2).

I think that this is the only possible explanation here, for if we refer »fire« to the coming judgement or to the temptations awaiting the disciple, Christ would say that «Everybody shall be salted with fire» i.e. will pass through judgement, an utterance which is in itself entirely acceptable. However, one wonders, why Christ should then add an observation about salt and about its qualities and say that the disciples must retain the salt in themselves. These words seem to me superfluous or incoherent in these surroundings. Therefore, as I observed above, I think it best to take «fire» and «sait» here as parallel ideas denoting the same thing.

We saw above that in Mark 9,33-50 Christ discusses the treatment of the fellow-disciple. He first of all warns the disobedient disciple against hell-fire (Mark 9,43-48). Then He draws attention to another point which the disciple must not forget. The latter is also bearer of

(1) For the testimonia about the connection between fire and spirit, cf. e.g. H. Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist*.

(2) We observe that in Matth. 3,11 and in Luke 3,16 «fire» may perhaps refer to the judgement, though this interpretation is not completely certain.

the supernatural principle, the pneuma (1); he contains the seed of the divine logos which, as Mark 4,1-21 said, has been sown in him. If he sins, he weakens the power of the divine principle and will run the risk of destroying its power, just as in Mark 4,16-19 the seed of the logos was choked.

Therefore, Christ says (Mark 9,49 f.): «Everybody (i.e. every disciple) shall be salted with fire» i.e. shall partake of the divine pneuma. «And every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. The salt is good, but if it becomes saltless, how shall you prepare it» i.e. if by your sins the divine principle loses its power, how are you to retrieve this loss. «Retain in yourself the salt and be peaceful towards one another».

Thus Mark approaches the matter from two sides. Christ negatively warns the disciple against hell-fire and positively draws his attention to the divine principle. For the fact that Mark makes use of two images (fire and salt), we may refer to Mark 4,21, where he replaces the image of the seed by that of the lamp, when the latter could not be used equally well.

The words «Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt» which are a quotation from the O. T. (Lev. 2,13) are considered an interpolation by most modern critics, because they are missing in a number of important mss. (They occur in the Koine).

Moreover, the verse seems to be out of place in the context, because there is no question of a sacrifice here. In my opinion, the verse is genuine. We must bear in mind first of all that a quotation from the O. T. would lend special authority to Mark's words (2). Further we must take into consideration that a sacrifice which is offered to God, thus stands in close relation with God and with holy things.

Now the Christian disciple is also specially connected with God and with Christ. We must not forget that it is precisely the text of

(1) For this fact, cf. also St. Paul in 1 Cor. 6,19, where the body of the disciple is called a temple which contains the *ἄγιον πνεῦμα*.

(2) It may perhaps be observed that it was precisely Mark who, in our opinion, attacked the authority of the O. T. Law. This is true. However, we must not forget that notwithstanding these utterances and criticisms of Mark, the O. T. was one of the most authoritative scriptures for the circles in which Mark moved. We may remind the reader of our discussion of Mark 10. There, too, we see that Mark attacks a command of the O. T. (Mark 10,7). However, he did so, as we saw, by referring to and making use of another text of the O.T. (Mark 10,7 f.).



the O. T. which shows that salt is no ordinary matter, but that it is used for things (sacrifices) which are connected with and offered to God. Accordingly the text from the O. T. gives particular emphasis to the specific significance of the idea of salt which was to be used by Christ in v.50 with respect to the disciple. This verse which seemed to disrupt the context, is on the contrary especially apposite here. Just as the sacrifice was salted, so Christ's disciple will be salted; he must, however, be cautious lest he lose the divine salt.

Thus I think that we may learn from the passages discussed above that the pneumatic side of the Christian life is important in Mark and much more so than in Matthew or Luke. In this way we can understand that in Mark 16,17 f. supernatural qualities are allotted to the disciple. We can also understand why Matthew and Luke should not have taken over these peculiarities. These particulars are best illustrated and find their closest parallel in St. Paul. In both authors we see the tension which characterizes pneumatic life. On the one hand, it takes the disciple down to the greatest depths; in St. Paul the disciple is *πάντων ἐσχατος*, in Mark, he is *πάντων δούλος* (Mark 10,44). On the other hand, it takes him up to the greatest heights; to St. Paul the disciple is *συνεργος του θεοῦ*, in Mark he receives supernatural powers (Mark 16,17 f.).

#### EXCURSUS I

With regard to the authenticity of Mark 16,9 ff. we may also draw attention to Mark 16,19. The author narrates how after the resurrection Christ ascends to heaven and sits at the right hand of God. If in Luke 24,51 the reading *ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τον οὐρανόν* is genuine, as is assumed by a number of critics (1), Luke also mentions Christ's ascension to heaven, but he does not mention his sitting at the right hand of God. In Matthew neither fact is mentioned in the story of the resurrection. This is understandable, because Matthew presents a form of Christology in which the passion and resurrection are not the prominent facts. If Mark 16,9 ff. is genuine, we can see that in Mark the complete story of Christ is given, ending in his final triumph and his sitting at the right hand of God.

(1) For this question, cf above p. 55 n. 3.

We already have had an opportunity to observe that Mark is cautious. I believe that we can find a gradual ascent to a climax in his Christology. In my opinion, this is elucidated by the fact that Mark offers, beside the person of Christ, also the notion of the Kingdom of heaven. I may refer to Christ's first prediction of the passion, etc., where Christ says that the disciple who loses his life *ενεκεν εμοῦ και τοῦ εναγγελίου*, shall be saved (Mark 8,34). It is significant that Matthew (16,25) and Luke (9,24) omit the mention of *εναγγέλιον* and only say *ενεκεν εμοῦ*. Likewise Mark 9,1 says of the coming of Christ: *εως ἂν ἴδωσιν την βασιλείαν τον θεοῦ εληλυθνίαν εν δυνάμει*, whereas Matthew (16,28) says: *εως αν ἴδωσιν τον νιον τοῦ θεοῦ ερχόμενον εν τη βασιλεία αντοῦ*. We see that in Matthew's statement the person of Christ is more prominent. We may further point to Mark 1,14, which relates the contents of Christ's first preaching. Most editors read with a number of mss. *κηρυσσων το εναγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ*. I think, however, that the reading of the Koine, etc. *κηρυσσων το εναγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ* is the right one. For in Mark the Kingdom of God is the important factor which stands beside Christ.

In Mark 4,11, where the parables are given, Christ says to the disciples: *νμῖν δέδοται το μυστήριον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*, Matth. 10,11 and Luke 8,10 speak of *γνώναι τα μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ*. I believe that the original force of Mark's expression is weakened here. In Matthew and Luke the parables are various mysteries of the *basileia*. In Mark, by the parables elucidated in Ch. 4 the disciples receive the clue to the Kingdom. Mark 3,31-35 had stated that the disciple is the nearest relative of Christ. Mark 4, thereupon, shows that the disciple is shown the way to the Kingdom of God.

We further observe that the parables of Mark 4 are not Christological and are not placed in Christological surroundings. We may refer to Matthew, where the same parables occur in Ch. 13. Here we see that in the preceding chapters (Matthew 11 and 12) the question of Christology and of the position of Christ had been settled. Matthew had stated that Christ is the direct representative of God (Matth. 11,27). Then follow the parables about the Kingdom (Ch. 13). In Mark, on the other hand, the Christological problems are only settled in 8,27 — 10,45, where the predictions about the passion and resurrection occur, passages which are, in my opinion, the typically Christological parts of Mark. Thus we see that in Mark the parables about the Kingdom do not, as in Matthew, follow the Christological

statements but precede them. We can see that Mark shows a cautious attitude and proceeds gradually according to an ascending scale. Mark places beside Christ the Kingdom, first elucidates the significance of the Kingdom and thereupon proceeds to give the Christology.

The same method can be found in the narration of Christ's cures and public manifestations, where we can also find a gradual climax. We refer to Mark 1,21-3,13, where cures and the exorcizing of demons are narrated. Then Mark 5 mentions a very difficult exorcism and the raising of a dead person. Later on Mark 11 and 12 describe the triumphant and Messianic entry into Jerusalem. In Mark the story of Christ shows a climax which is necessarily interrupted by Christ's passion (Mark 14,34-15,36). Then, however, Christ's divine character directly shows itself again in the resurrection.

If we admit that Mark gradually shows Christ's divine character, we can understand that the sitting at the right hand of God is important for him as the triumphant close of Christ's career. If, however, Mark 16,9 ff. is spurious, it is curious that the detail of the sitting at the right hand of God should have been added by the interpolator. Though an interpolator is, of course, free in adding details, we must bear in mind that in later times, when the Christology had been definitely settled, the mentioning of the sitting, etc. was not so important. I believe that the notice of Mark 16,19 is typical of earlier Christian times and is in keeping with the Christological representation offered by the gospel of Mark.

## EXCURSUS II

We know that the statements of Mark 16,17 f. about the extraordinary powers of the disciple do not occur in Matthew or Luke. Nevertheless we can compare them with two passages viz. Matth. 16, 17-20 and Luke 10,19. Matth. 16,17-20 is important and has, in my opinion, special significance, because it is given on the occasion of the first prediction of the passion and resurrection (Matth. 16,21-29). Christ solemnly institutes the Christian Church and gives the power of the keys to Peter and to the Church. In the corresponding passage of Mark (8,27 ff.) nothing of the kind is said. There Christ, after the first prediction, says that the disciple will share the passion and will be a witness of the coming return of Christ. Both passages are characteristic of their authors.

Matthew chooses the moment of the first prediction to settle the question of the Church; he pictures the Christian community after the pattern of the Jewish synagogue and of the sacred assembly of the O. T. To this community special powers are allotted (the power of the keys).

To Mark it is not the Church but the individual disciple who is of great importance, as we have tried to show above. This is caused by the fact that in Mark the individual disciple is closely connected with Christ. The fate of the disciple is settled or determined, not because he belongs to a community which replaces the chosen people of Israel (as in Matthew), but because he shares or follows Christ's passion and resurrection.

Moreover, Mark, as we observed above, has a climax in his Christology. Therefore, he does not give the most important directions to the disciples in Ch. 8, 27 ff., because at that moment the Christology and the power of Christ had not yet reached their climax. He expressly reserves a pronouncement about the disciples or the Church till the moment of the resurrection, when Christ reveals himself in his divine glory.

It seems to me that Mark 16,17 f. is for the gospel of Mark what Matth. 16,17-20 is for the gospel of Matthew. In Matth. 16, 17-20 the N. T. Church is instituted; in Mark 16,17 f. the N. T. disciple receives the extraordinary powers which are characteristic of the new Kingdom.

In the following point also we can observe the different mentality of the two authors. For the Jewish-Christian Matthew the Jewish institutions and the chosen people of the O. T. are the great and unsurpassable models to which he looks back continuously. Therefore, it is Matthew's principal aim to represent the powers of the N. T. Church after the pattern of those of the already existing institutions of the synagogue and the O. T. assembly. He is content, if he can show and make it acceptable that the N. T. Church has inherited the prerogatives of the chosen people of the O. T. Mark, however, as we tried to show, does not take the O. T. institutions or the O. T. Law for his model. To the latter he prefers the new pneumatic powers of the new Kingdom. We also saw that to Matthew Christ's teaching is the fulfilment of the O. T. (cf. Matth. 5,17 ff.), whereas to Mark it is something new (cf. Mark 1,27 and 2,21 f. and our observations above). Therefore, Mark does not copy the institutions of the O. T., but allots to the disciples new and supernatural powers (Mark 16,17 f.) and for

this reason, too, he does not attribute these powers to the disciples until Christ himself has entered upon his divine glory.

Luke does not take over the statements of Mark 16,17 f. either. Now it is very probable that Luke tried to avoid things which might appear to have any magical character (1) and, therefore, we can understand his omitting Mark 16,17 f., too. I think, however, that Luke has preserved a reminiscence of it in Christ's speech to the Seventy (Luke 10,19). In this connection I observe that in Ch. 10 Luke, when relating Christ's speech to the Seventy, seems to follow two sources. The main part of the speech is derived from Matth. 10 or from its source. However, the details occurring in Luke 10,19 f. are not found in Matthew and thus he must follow another source here. Now Luke speaks here about powers which are allotted to the disciple and which will consist in treading on serpents: *δέδωκα γμῖν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄψεων καὶ σκορπιῶν* and in not being harmed by anything : *καὶ οὐδεὶν ἡμᾶς ὄν μὴ ἀδικήσῃ*. One can readily assume that Luke followed another source here. However, it will be admitted that it is very tempting to compare Mark 16,17 f. For there, too, Christ says that the disciple will come into contact with serpents without being harmed and also He promises: *καὶ θανάσιμον πῖωσιν, ὄν μὴ ἀντονος βλάψῃ*.

I think that it is clear that Luke did not follow some unknown source, but that he made use of Mark 16,17 f. and adapted it to his purpose. Therefore, he assimilated the words about the serpents to a situation from the O. T. (Ps. 90,1). In Mark the statement about the lifting of serpents had a magical ring; the adaptation by Luke to the authoritative text of the O. T. made it acceptable to the readers. In the same way the idea of drinking deadly poison was magical and strange, too. By altering it into a general statement to the effect that nothing would do harm to the disciples, Luke made it inoffensive. Further he added a statement (Luke 10,20) that the powers taken over by him from Mark 16,17 f., were superseded by the fact that the names of the disciples were written in heaven. Thus he completely changed Mark's pneumatic point of view; he altered the supernatural

(1) We remind the reader of the fact that the scene of Christ's walking on the sea (Mark 6,45 ff.) does not occur in Luke, whereas it has been taken over by Matthew (14,22 ff.) and by John (6,15 ff.). We also point to the passage of the barren fig-tree (Mark 11,12 ff.) which has been completely altered in Luke, cf. above p. 70 n. 1.

powers which were attributed to the disciple by Mark into qualities which were warranted by the O. T. or which were quite normal and inoffensive.

Further we see that just as in Matthew the promises which in Mark 16,17 f. are only given at the resurrection, are here given already during Christ's earlier career. We also see that Luke did not simply take over the statements of Mark 16,17 f. but modified them. If Luke already took exception to details and statements contained in this passage (Mark 16,9 ff.), we can understand how other Christians likewise took exception to them. Thus it becomes clear why the passage (Mark 16,9 ff.) was omitted in a number of mss.

Rumpt — The Netherlands

M. VAN DER VALK