

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

THE LOST ENDING OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

A CRITICISM AND A RECONSTRUCTION

ROBERT OLIVER KEVIN

THE PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL

ONE of the most fascinating studies in the entire New Testament field is the problem presented by the ending of Mark's Gospel. That Mark has a double ending is apparent to readers of modern translations such as those of Moffatt and Goodspeed. One may take his choice between the Longer Ending, Mark 16 9-20, of the King James' Version or the Shorter Appendix. And there are other endings, four in all, with major differences.

The testimony of the manuscripts has an all-important bearing upon the question of the ending of Mark's Gospel but it can be briefly summarized.

The familiar Longer Ending of 16 9-20 is attached to nearly all of the manuscripts that have come down to us, but for many reasons it can hardly be genuine. As the text stands, any thoughtful reader must feel the difference in manner and atmosphere as he passes from 16 8 to the verses following.

Another ending in its stead is attached to a few manuscripts after the words *ἐφοβούντο γὰρ* in Mk. 16 8. It reads:

"But they reported briefly to Peter and his companions all they had been told. And afterward, Jesus himself sent out by them, from the east to the west, the sacred and incorruptible message of eternal salvation."

This ending, I believe, is an important witness for a reconstruction of the original ending, which I will suggest further on.

But in the two great codices of the Fourth Century, B and Aleph, neither the one ending or the other is attached, but the Gospel concludes with the words "for they were afraid — —" in Mk. 16 s.

A fourth ending is given in W, the Freer manuscript. The ending is interesting as an alternative ending, but few New Testament scholars regard it as of importance. It is generally thought to be a late apocryphal insertion in the Longer Ending. It reads:

"And they defended themselves saying: This world of lawlessness and of unbelief is under Satan, which does not suffer those unclean things that are under the dominion of the spirits to comprehend the true powers of God. On this account reveal thy righteousness now. They said these things to Christ.

"And Christ replied to them: There has been fulfilled the term of years of the authority of Satan, but other dreadful things are drawing nigh even to those for the sake of whom as sinners I was delivered up to death in order that they might inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness which is in heaven."

Great scholars have championed the genuineness of the traditional last twelve verses of the sixteenth chapter. Among these have been Bengel, Eichhorn, Scholz, De Wette, Olshausen, Bleek, Lange, Ebrard, Scrivener, Canon Cook, Salmon, E. Miller, Belser, and Dean Burgon.

But Hort in his *Introduction and Appendix to the New Testament in the Original Greek* summed up the evidence for and against them and concluded that they were a very early addition. Gregory likewise asserted that they had "no right to a place in the text of the New Testament."

A review of the evidence will bring any but the biased reader to the same conclusion. This is splendidly summed up in the introduction to *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, by H. B. Swete, 1898.

The fact that there were several endings after the words *ἐφοβούντο γὰρ* in Mk. 16 s, is evidence of a problem. Moreover, the two great codices which come down to us from the Fourth Century, and which Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort regarded

as the closest to the original autographs, are followed after Mk. 16 s by the subscription *κατὰ μάρκον*. In B, the scribe has left the column blank after the subscription, which has been taken to mean by Swete, that he was acquainted with a text of St. Mark which did not end at verse s, although his own copy failed him at that point.

The fact that the verses were ignored in the Eusebian Canons after verse s is evidenced in Codex 1, 1582, and others.

Eusebius declared that the oldest and best Mss. known to him ended the Gospel of St. Mark with the words, "for they were afraid." The Gospel ends at the same point in Syr. Sin. and in three old Mss. of the Armenian. A fourth Armenian Ms. contains the traditional 12 verses but they are separated from the rest of the Gospel with a note "of the Presbyter Ariston."

But since the time of Swete and Conybeare, who championed the validity of the note "of the elder Ariston" as of the first century, scholars have discounted the value of the testimony, since the manuscript on which the note is made is a tenth century document.

In still another manuscript of the Georgian version, dated 897 A. D., the Gospel ends at 16 s.

The Shorter Ending is found in L, ψ, 597, and two uncial fragments, in the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, in the African Latin k, in the margin of one Greek cursive, in the Harclean Syriac, and in the oldest manuscripts of the Bohairic.

Since the Shorter Ending is obviously an attempt to heal a wound to the original by some early editing, the Mss. having it as a whole afford evidence that their original ended with *ἔφοβούντο γὰρ*.

The uncials which have the short appendix, in each case, after the words "for they were afraid," break off the line, interpose a series of arrow-heads, and then proceed with the Shorter Ending.

Speaking of that summary, Swete says: "It has been written by someone whose copy of the Gospel ended at *ἔφοβούντο γὰρ* and who desired to soften the harshness of so abrupt a conclusion, and at the same time to remove the impression which

it leaves of a failure on the part of Mary of Magdala and her friends to deliver the message with which they had been charged." "Terrified as they were," he adds, "they recovered themselves sufficiently to report to Peter the substance of the angel's words. After this the Lord himself appeared to the Apostles and gave them their orders to carry the Gospel from the East to the West; and these orders with his assistance, were loyally fulfilled."¹

Swete calls attention to the fact that the style of this ending is similar to that of Luke's prologue, but that it is out of harmony with the rest of Mark's gospel. He first suggested that it was an addition made at Rome. One or two verbal similarities suggest Pseudo-Clement. The place the ending has in k and in other versions points to an early date according to Swete, but it must have had a very limited acceptance, having been overshadowed almost at the first by the merits of the Longer Ending.

Since attention was first called to the differences in the Resurrection account of Mark and the variety of manuscript endings, hypotheses have been advanced to account for the phenomena.

The simplest explanation is that Mark ended his gospel with the words *ἐφοβούντο γὰρ*. This explanation has had its defenders. Professor A. T. Robertson says he is not sure that the gospel did not end at that point, and that while it may not be literary and is free Greek, "it is certainly Christian, for it establishes the fact of Christ's resurrection with the restoration of Peter to favor. The fear of the women does make a rather depressing close but we do not know what Mark's motives were, if he closed there. It is possible that he meant to write more and never did, being interrupted by a journey or possibly death."²

Against the theory that Mark ended his gospel with the words "for they were afraid," Professor McLean argues that it was impossible that the two words could be the end of a gospel. J. Rendel Harris is sure that two more words anyhow were written by the Evangelist. He reconstructs it, "For they were afraid of the Jews." Canon Streeter in his most recent work, *The Four Gospels*, published 1925, says: "Indeed the words

¹ Swete: pp. CI ff.

² A. T. Robertson, *Studies in Mark's Gospel*, p. 137.

ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ in Greek may not be even at the end of a sentence; they lead us to expect a clause beginning with μὴ, 'They were afraid lest they be thought mad,' or something to that effect."³

Most students of Greek however, are aware that γὰρ as a post-positive conjunction, can only come second in a clause or sentence and that to end anything with it would have the same "breaking off" effect that an English sentence of this sort would have: "They were afraid, for — —."

It has been plausibly conjectured that the autograph was accidentally mutilated at that point. It is possible that the last leaf of the papyrus roll of the autograph was torn off soon after its composition and before many, if any, copies could have been made from it. It is common enough with us to have the last leaf of a copy book worn or torn off. It may have been that Mark was interrupted in his work by arrest or martyrdom. Critics generally have inclined to the view that the autograph was mutilated in some accident, and Streeter has imagined a situation at Rome where, after a police raid or riot, the end of the Church Gospel of Mark was found to have been torn off.

But there have been other theories to account for the disappearance of the original.

Professor B. W. Bacon in a commentary on Mark published in 1909, *The Beginnings of the Gospel Story*, argued that the original ending of the Gospel was suppressed in the interests of harmony because of the rivaling Jerusalem and Galilean resurrection appearance traditions, which found their place in the Lukan and Matthean accounts respectively and jointly in chapters 20 and 21 of the Fourth Gospel, where the Galilean tradition is added as an appendix in the final chapter to reconcile both theories.⁴

³ p. 337. To declare that a sentence cannot end with γὰρ is contrary to the facts. Dr. James A. Montgomery, of the University of Pennsylvania, has called my attention to the use of gêr in the Syriac of the Peshitto in Jn. 18 13 and Acts 16 37, at the end of a sentence. The Syriac gêr is simply the Greek γὰρ and is used in the same way. Dr. Morton S. Enslin, of the Crozer Theological Seminary, has observed many sentences ending in γὰρ in the writings of Justin Martyr.

⁴ p. XVIII.

In answer to this theory Streeter asks, 1. Why did not the revisors or suppressors while they were about it, suppress the end of Matthew as well, since it conflicted with the Jerusalem tradition; and if they were "cutting," why did they not cut earlier before the phrase "they told no man," and thus be rid of the discrepancy immediately indicated in Mt. and Lk. where they went and told the disciples? 2. How did it happen that the harmonizers got the churches of Alexandria, Africa and Syria, to accept the excision without accepting the alternative ending proposed to harmonize the conflict? 3. The use of Mk. by the other synoptists proves that Mk. was widely read during the first century and in widely differing localities. The suppression of an ending then at such a point would have been possible only by means of a highly organized central ecclesiastical system, able to enforce such uniformity; and we are well aware that no such organization existed.⁵

In his more recent volume, *The Gospel of Mark*, published 1925, Professor Bacon modifies the "suppression theory" to one in which he declares that the conflict of traditions resulted in "the original ending of Mark" being "really 'improved' out of existence."⁶

But his more recent theory does not explain the abrupt ungrammatical ending of verse 8; nor why the original was "improved" out of existence at that exact point. Bacon's later theory is open to nearly all that has been said in answer to his first one.

Although Professor Bacon figuratively "pooh-poohs" the "accident theory," as he calls it, still it is my candid opinion that it more acceptably accounts for the facts than his own, and it has the greater support of scholars. That there was an original ending to the Gospel seems evident from the manuscript evidence; that some accident occurred, either the death or arrest of the author of the Gospel, a raid or riot during the early unsettled Christian times in Rome, or the last page of a papyrus roll being torn off, seems more plausible than that the ending

⁵ Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 341 ff.

⁶ p. 190.

was "suppressed," "harmonized," "improved out of existence," or intentionally never written.

Before entering upon a discussion of the theories that have been advanced for the reconstruction of the ending, it would be well to call attention to the fact that if here was a loss of an ending it was a primitive loss.

We must ask ourselves the question whether the original ending of Mark was known to the authors of Matthew and Luke when they were writing their gospels.

So far as Luke was concerned, it may have been known to him and he purposely disregarded it. We know he used Mark consistently as a secondary source and preferred his own passion narrative to Mark's account. At the same time Luke omitted nothing in Mark that was interesting and inserted it in the context of his own story.

Now it is interesting to note that in regard to Luke's story, although he nowhere expressly mentions an appearance of the risen Lord to Peter alone, he anticipates in Lk. 21 32 that such an appearance will be made and later on in 24 34 refers to it as though it had been made, when the disciples say: "The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon."

Luke's allusion seems to indicate that he accepted the tradition that Jesus first appeared to Peter (1 Cor. 15 4-8) but that he knew no more about it than that and in the text of the Gospel of Mark where an appearance to Peter is twice anticipated in the body of the Gospel but not mentioned in the resurrection story. (Mk. 1 8 "I have baptised you with water, but he will baptise you with the Holy Ghost." And Mk. 14 28, "But after I am raised to life again I will go back to Galilee before you.")

Now if it is true that Luke inserted all that Mark included, that was important, into the body of his own narrative in the passion story, and he possessed Mark's resurrection narrative, we might look for some details that would correspond to what we find in Matthew's resurrection story, for up to Mk. 16 8 *the three synoptists tell essentially the same story.*

A brief examination of Matthew's passion narrative shows that he followed Mark closely up to 16 8 and then he departed from the Lukan account as Luke departed from his.

The message of the angel in Mk. 16 7, "Go tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him as he said unto you," clearly refers back to Jesus' prophecy in 14 28. And we are bound to infer that whatever the lost ending contained, it did have an account of an appearance in Galilee and particularly to Peter.

Now Matthew tells the story of a Galilean appearance of Jesus, and at the first glance one might be led to infer that in the ending of Matthew's Gospel we might find the original Mark. Such was the inference of Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed in the *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. 9, pp. 484—490.

Professor Goodspeed argues that in dealing with the passion week and the resurrection appearances, "Matthew shows an evident disposition to take over all that Mark affords, and this tendency having controlled him so long, can hardly have forsaken him seven or eight verses from the end. Since Mt. 28 1—8 parallels Mk. 16 1—8, whatever stood in the original conclusion of Mark may thus fairly be expected to appear in that part of Mt. subsequent to 28 1—8. When thus regarded, Matthew's conclusion yields two elements which so perfectly accord with the context in Mark, so naturally relieve its abruptness, and so briefly round out its narrative, as to seem even more fitting and original when appended to Mark."

The two elements Goodspeed speak of are the first reassuring words of Jesus to the women, "Be not afraid," since verse 8 of Mk. 16 ends, "for they were afraid," and the fact that the appearance finally was made in Galilee, as the angel in Mark foretold.

Although the first eight verses of the chapter in Matthew in a general sense parallel those of the chapter in Mark, they do not do so in particular. Matthew speaks of but two women, Mark of three. In Matthew an angel descends from heaven and is seated outside on the stone which he has rolled away. In Mark "a young man" is seated within the tomb. And there is nothing like the verbal agreement in the passages that one finds between Matthew and Mark in other sections of the synoptic gospels.

Canon Streeter, instead of being won to Professor Good-

speed's theory, finds that Matthew becomes meagre of detail at the same spot where the authentic text of Mark now ends. (i. e. 16 s).⁷

Moreover, if Matthew possessed such a conclusion to his copy of Mark, he would hardly have recorded an appearance to the eleven in Galilee without some special mention of Peter in it, for in Matthew's gospel, Peter is clearly the prince of the Apostles.

Because of Matthew's failure to particularize Peter and his meagreness of detail through the resurrection narrative, Streeter believes that the copy of Mark possessed by that evangelist ended at 16 s. And he is convinced that Luke fared no better.

We must keep in mind that St. Paul expressly declares Peter to have first seen the risen Lord, and that that statement in Corinthians is the earliest tradition in the New Testament. That is, that the Galilean appearances are primary and that the Jerusalem appearances of Mt. and Jn. as first to the Magdalene are secondary.

Bacon presents an interesting if somewhat difficult theory to account for the variant Markan resurrection stories. He has called attention in *The Gospel of Mark* to some significant cross references in the other gospels which he thinks may have resulted in the original Markan ending being "improved out of existence." His facts are stimulating to thought, if his conclusions remain slightly unconvincing.

Because of the Lukan reference to Peter's rallying the disciples in Galilee in Lk. 21 32, "And thou, when thou art restored, establish thy brethren," Bacon feels that this tradition conflicted with a tradition originally contained in Mark's resurrection story, which consisted of Jesus himself rallying his disciples in Galilee. (Mk. 14 28).

"From the testimony of Paul and a subsequent allusion to Lk. 24 34 we know," says Bacon, "that Peter did become the living stone on which the Church was built. But Mark substitutes another version of the origin of the faith whereby the leading part is no longer taken by Peter but by Jesus in Person." (p. 183.)

⁷ Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 343—344.

Dr. Bacon continues:

"It is true that the actual carrying out of this predicted rally of the flock by Jesus in Galilee fails to be related in Mark, on account of the mutilated condition in which this gospel has come down to us. But enough remains in Mk. 15 40—16 8 to show what the Roman evangelist substituted for the Manifestation to Peter mentioned by Paul in First Corinthians and in Galatians 2 7."

"The substitution," he says again, "is the most probable cause of the mutilation; for had it been due to mere accident it is incredible that the gap should not have been filled out in better agreement with the primitive tradition."

For the moment, let us turn to page xviii in the introduction to Bacon's work, *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*. There naturally, because it is an earlier theory, he has nothing to say about the conflict of the Petrine tradition and the "Jesus Tradition" for the rallying of the disciples. On the contrary, he expressly says, "The author of Mk. 1 8 and 14 28 must have at least intended to describe both Jesus' resurrection appearance to Peter with the reassembling of the scattered flock, and also the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit . . . Why indeed should the evangelist write his gospel at all if not vindicate the apostolic witness of which the Church claimed to be the bearer?"

Although in the "Beginnings" Bacon holds that the original ending was suppressed because it failed to harmonize the conflicting traditions, in his later work, where the original ending was "improved out of existence," it was for another reason entirely, namely because it failed to vindicate the apostolic witness! One can not be blamed for suspecting a theory when two such different stones kill the same bird.

Nevertheless, Bacon feels in his more recent work that the presence of the foreign element of the Galilean resurrection appearances in Mark's original ending, which from Mk. 15 42 and following was a Jerusalem source, presented the irreconcilable conflict. Bacon thinks that from 15 42 ff., Mark used the same special source used by Luke in his passion narrative, although he did it less skillfully, and that Luke preferred his own source to Mark's account of it.

Canon Streeter in his volume *The Four Gospels*, published in 1925, presents another theory and a reconstruction of the lost ending of Mark that is more natural and simpler than Bacon's, if it does draw a little too heavily on surrounding imaginative history.

In justice to Dr. Streeter, however, it must be said, that he presents his suggestion purely as a "conjecture" and not as a scientific hypothesis. He adopts the "accident theory" that Bacon ridicules. And in spite of all Bacon has had to say regarding Mark's method, his sources, and his failure, the conclusion that the end of the gospel was improved or suppressed from existence is not convincing. And if his conclusion to account for the disappearance of the ending is unconvincing, the evidence he adduces to prove it may be equally unwarranted.

Streeter finds no difficulty in supposing that the original copy of Mark, especially if the gospel were written for the Church at Rome, almost immediately lost its conclusion. Since he argues for the late dating of the gospel he places that loss at about 65 A. D.

His conclusions, however, would not go as well with an earlier dating if we feel that the writing of the gospel was nearer 50 or 55 A. D. than 65. I cannot feel the force of his argument that Luke's version of the Little Apocalypse in Mark's Gospel, with the changes that Luke makes concerning Jerusalem being encompassed with armies, necessarily requires the supposition that the siege of Jerusalem by Titus had begun or was about to begin. (c. 70 A. D.)

But to revert to the lost ending of Mark.

"The two ends of a roll would always be the most exposed," says Streeter. "The beginning ran the greater risk but in a book rolled from both ends the conclusion was not safe. The author of Hebrews writing to the Roman Church alludes to the patient endurance of 'spoiling their goods.' Curiously enough there is evidence that copies of Romans were in circulation which lacked the last two chapters, which looks as if one of the earliest copies of that epistle, the one other document of which we can be quite sure that the Roman Church had a copy at this time, was similarly mutilated."

Streeter's reconstruction of the lost end of Mark, he makes from the twenty-first chapter of the Fourth Gospel. He supposes that in the lost ending there were stories of appearances to the Magdalene, followed by one to Peter and to the others while fishing on the Lake of Galilee.

Before discussing his hypothesis, I must call attention to the fact that Streeter meets two *a priori* objections. They are (1) that it may seem unlikely that a copy of Mark would be preserved as a whole at Ephesus and be lost at Rome. To this he answers that during Paul's imprisonment at Rome, Mark contemplated a visit to Asia (Col. 4 10), and a little later Paul summoned him to Rome (2 Tim. 4 11) "for he is useful to me for ministering."

If so, Mark had been working near Ephesus, and when he arrived at Rome and wrote his gospel nothing would have been more natural than that the first copy of it that was made, should be sent by messenger to Ephesus. In that case the copy for Ephesus would have been made before the original was mutilated. The acceptance of this theory, Streeter definitely makes to depend upon the supposition that Mark was written about 65 A. D.

(2) The other *a priori* objection that might be raised is that if the original ending survived at Ephesus, how did it happen that the variant endings we have took its place? Streeter replies that the Longer Ending was composed c. 100—110 A. D. and added soon thereafter. It then would have become part of the fixed tradition of the Roman Church before Ephesus and Rome exchanged notes on the canon; and Mark as a Roman gospel would have had its ending accepted as authentic rather than any Ephesian variation.

Streeter urges five reasons for believing that the 21st chapter of the Fourth Gospel contains the original of Mark. (1) The lost ending must have contained an appearance to the apostles in Galilee in which Peter may have figured in some way. (2) If John 21 had stood alone as a separate document we would suppose that the appearance at the Sea of Galilee was the first to the apostles without the note in verse 14 expressly stating that it was the third of the appearances.

(3) The addition of the miraculous draught of fishes in the story of the call of Peter in Luke 5 4-7, and the addition in Mt. 14 29-31 of the story of the walking on the water and of the incident of Peter leaving the boat to meet the Lord, are best explained as fragments of a story like that in John 21 which was current in oral tradition.

(4) The ending of John 21 is the kind of an ending that one would be led to expect to the Gospel of Mark where Peter's denial earlier would have been cancelled in the resurrection appearance. (5) A critical analysis of John shows that the author used Mark or Luke or Proto-Luke as his sources among others. If John 20 follows the Lukan Jerusalem tradition, John 21 might follow the Markan account as it was had in Ephesus about 90 A. D.

A PROPOSAL TO ACCOUNT FOR THE ORIGINAL ENDING OF THE GOSPEL

From what has been said, it is my belief that the average reader will be more readily won to what Streeter supposes than to Bacon's theory of either "suppression" or "improvement."

In reviewing the discussion so far, may I call attention to three general conclusions we may use as a basis for further work?

(1) Streeter and other scholars who have adopted the "accident theory" to account for the disappearance of the ending are more nearly right than theorists who have believed that Mark ended his gospel there intentionally or that the ending was suppressed or "improved out of existence."

(2) Streeter is right in his conviction that the loss of the ending was an exceedingly primitive one and took place shortly after the writing of the gospel, which he places at 65 A. D.

(3) Although Streeter's theory is an attractive one, it depends entirely upon a late dating for the writing of the Gospel (at least as late as Paul's imprisonment at Rome). Now if the supposition of the late dating for the Gospel is not satisfactorily demonstrated, the theory in some of its particulars must be unacceptable.

Now Streeter nowhere takes into consideration the challenge of Harnack for the early dating of the Synoptic gospels, as afforded by the unexplained ending to the Book of Acts, and developed in *Luke the Physician*, *The Acts of the Apostles* and *The Date of Acts and the Gospels*. Despite that fact a small but increasing number of New Testament scholars are being won to the challenge of the early date.

Briefly, it is Harnack's conviction that the Book of Acts ends as it does because there was no more to say at the time when it was written (i. e., before 64 A. D.). It is Harnack's further conviction, and surely he, Ramsay, and Hawkins have been piling up sufficient evidence to prove it, that the author of the Book of Acts and of the Gospel of Luke is one and the same. Since Luke used Mark as a source, the writing of the latter must clearly have antedated the writing of Luke. It is possible that Luke wrote his narrative in 58 A. D. while Paul was at Caesarea Philippi and that Mark was one of the documents that lay before him at that time.

Now what is the evidence against this view?

It has been claimed that the passage on the "abomination of desolation" in Mark 13 14 and the changes that Luke makes in the passage are a reference to the siege of Jerusalem in the year 70, and in so being are an argument for the late dating of both gospels and thereby render Harnack's challenge worthless.

Mark says: "When ye see the abomination of desolation standing where *he* ought not (let him that readeth understand);" and Luke changes it to "But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation has come near" (Luke 21 20-24).

But do they refer to the siege of Jerusalem in 70? And why did Luke change Mark's story? To enter into this discussion is to go far afield. But I think it is sufficient to call attention to the work of Canon Charles who has demonstrated the insertion in Mark 13 and Luke 21 of a Little Apocalypse. When that insertion took place, it would be impossible to say, for it might have been incorporated into the first writing of either gospel. But granting that it was, what then?

It would be interesting to know why Luke changed the Markan story to include the encompassing of Jerusalem by armies, but that inquiry is beyond our point. But I will call attention to the fact that even Streeter admits that the "abomination of desolation" in Mark does not refer to the siege in 70 A. D.⁸

Streeter admits that the idea of the "abomination of desolation" being the siege of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. has been exploded by the researches of Bousset and others into the origin and prevalence of the "Anti-Christ legend." The use of the masculine participle of "standing" with the neuter noun "abomination" is an interpretation of the prophecy of Daniel for the title of the Anti-Christ. The apocalyptist who wrote Mark 13 thought he had found the true interpretation of Daniel. "But if when Mark wrote," continues Streeter, "the Anti-Christ was expected to appear in the Temple at Jerusalem, the presumption is that the Temple was still standing."

That is an interesting admission on the part of a great New Testament scholar who believes in the later dating for the Gospel of Mark. If the Temple was still standing when that was written and "the Anti-Christ was expected to appear in the Temple," what is to prevent the interpretation of this passage as the threat on the part of Caligula to set up his own statue in the Temple at Jerusalem for divine honor, an act he was prevented from doing by his assassination in 41 A. D.

Luke's change of the picture to include "encircling armies" does not necessarily refer to the siege of 70, in the opinion of many scholars. Lonsdale Ragg, in his commentary on Luke, says: "Encircling armies and trenches . . . would be the natural forecast for an intelligent man who could gauge the possibilities of Jewish insurgence some years earlier. There is nothing distinctive in the reference to encircling armies." Shailer Matthews in the *Messianic Hope in the New Testament* (p. 230) remarks that "Jesus expected the fall of Jerusalem. This passage may have been sharpened up by Luke but such a hypothesis is really gratuitous. Any picture of the doom of

⁸ p. 492.

a city might easily run into the conventional picture of a siege."

The only other argument of any weight requiring a late dating for the Synoptics is the alleged dependence of Luke upon Josephus in the writing of the Book of Acts. That argument has been amply answered by Torrey in *The Composition and Date of Acts*, 1916. On page 71 Professor Torrey discusses at length the implications of the Judas-Theudas passage.

It was the practice of Josephus to follow written sources, Torrey declares, and there is no reason to suppose he was not doing that in *Ant.* XX: 5:1 ff. on which Acts 5:36 is supposed by Streeter to depend. In the *Antiquities* Theudas and his band are described in the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus. Then follows the chapter on his successor, Tiberius Alexander, XX: 5:2. This also contains an account of the execution of James and Simon, two sons of Judas of Galilee. To speak of it, the writer says he had to tell of the revolt of Judas which he had already described in XVII: 10:5. The revolt was a little thing, but the execution aroused general horror. Thus a history would have contained mention of Theudas and Judas, though the uprising of Judas was earlier. Torrey supposes that the author of the Aramaic source of the first part of Acts obtained a wrong impression from another history where the events, described later by Josephus in 93 A. D., were confused.

Acts says 400 were involved, *Antiquities* mentions "a great crowd." *Antiquities* is correct in the statement of the order, Acts is not. The supposition, therefore, is that Acts did not derive its account from Josephus but from an older source.

Instances of other alleged dependencies of Luke upon Josephus are so well answered by Professor Torrey, who is himself convinced of the early dating of Mark, as not to need repeating here. But it is easy to be seen that it is by no means necessary to connect the events of 70 A. D. with Mark 13 and Luke 21. Harnack's challenge, then, still stands, and Streeter's hypothesis for the lost ending of Mark is untenable.

It is my belief that the Gospel was written by St. Mark in

the decade 40—50 A. D. Whether it was first written in an Aramaic original we have not yet sufficient evidence to decide, although Professor Torrey feels that it was.

Practically all scholars are agreed that the most primitive resurrection appearance tradition is recorded in Paul's letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 15 3—8). That passage reads as follows:

“For I passed on to you as of first importance, *the account I had received*, that Christ died for our sins, as the Scriptures foretold, that he was buried, that on the third day he was raised from the dead, and that he was seen by Cephas, and then by the twelve; after that he was seen by more than 500 brothers at one time, most of whom are still alive, although some of them are fallen asleep. Then he was seen by James, then by all the apostles, and finally he was seen by me also, as though I were born at the wrong time.”

It is this tradition that St. Paul repeats as having been received by him that I believe was the original Petrine tradition and was in substance, if not in form, related in the original ending of the Gospel of Mark.

My reasons are as follows:

(1) There is hardly the necessity to review the evidence for the Petrine and Pauline influences in the Gospel of Mark. They have been commented upon many times. The ecclesiastical tradition that Mark set down the memorabilia of Peter is sufficiently well known and there has never been any real reason to dispute its essential authenticity. Papias and Justin are early witnesses to that tradition. Moreover, the prominence of Peter in Mark's Gospel, the scenes about Peter's home in Capernaum, the denial, etc., have often been remarked upon by scholars.

At the same time Professor Bacon has called attention to a noticeable Paulinism about Mark. “The manner in which the evangelist conceives his task,” he feels to be the most compelling point of similarity. “Mark's effort is simply to produce belief in Jesus as the Son of God.” From Mark 8 27 to 10 52, known in Bacon's analysis as the Doctrine of the Cross, “is simply the Pauline principle of ‘the mind that was in Christ Jesus.’”

In this discussion of the ending of Mark's gospel I want to reason somewhat inductively, since I do not feel that a recovery of the exact form of the Markan ending to the gospel is possible (from our present available evidence). But its substance may be found. At all events, we can recognize in the Gospel of Mark both a Pauline and a Petrine influence.

(2) Paul in Galatians gives us the source of his resurrection tradition. In 1:18 ff., he says: "Three years later I went up to Jerusalem to become acquainted with Cephas, and I spent two weeks with him, but I did not see any other apostle, except James the Lord's brother."

The specific mention of Peter and James as having been witnesses to separate resurrection appearances and their separate mention here as having given Paul the things wherein he had been instructed concerning the Christian tradition, and which he himself admits was the account he had received, point to only one thing and that is that Paul gained his resurrection appearance tradition at that time in the converse with Peter and James.

(3) That Mark accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their missionary journey is evident in Acts 12:25. Since Mark was not an apostle he must have been dependent upon the story of the gospel as he received it secondarily; and both the internal evidence and external evidence from the nature of his gospel, and the circumstances of his association with Peter and Paul, indicate his sources. Now, the Pauline-Petrine resurrection tradition was the same and Mark would more likely have drawn upon it than upon any other.

Even Luke, although in writing his gospel he preferred another tradition, recognized the force of the Petrine tradition as he, too, no doubt had received it from Paul, and permitted it to enter his gospel account (Lk. 24:34).

(4) Although Paul never speaks of the resurrection tradition as in Galilee, nevertheless, from what we know of the Galilean tradition and the Jerusalem tradition, in Matthew, Luke and John, the picture that Paul gives is essentially that of Galilee, for it corresponds to nothing we know of in the Jerusalem tradition, except in the later appearances he enumerates.

The Jerusalem tradition has for its chief witnesses Luke, John 20, and the Longer Ending to Mark. The Galilean tradition given in Matthew 28 16-20 and in John 21 is also reflected in the Shorter Appendix to the Gospel of Mark given in a few of the manuscripts as a variant ending.

Now concerning this Galilean tradition there are two versions. The one is that Jesus appeared *first* to Peter and then to the eleven; and the second is that Jesus appeared to Peter *in company* with the rest. Paul clearly distinguishes an appearance first to Peter and then to the "Twelve." Just as clearly Jn. 21, the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter, and Matthew distinguish an appearance to Peter *and* the other disciples. Luke admits that Jesus had been seen first by Peter.

In attempting to discover how far we can fit the essential features of Paul's belief concerning the order of the resurrection appearances into what we may suppose was Mark's account, we must examine the Gospel of Mark as it stands. In Mark 16 7, the message of the angel to Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome, is, "Go, tell his disciples and Peter, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." Clearly this is a hearkening back to Mark 14 28.

It is interesting to observe that although in Matthew the message is essentially the same, nevertheless Peter is not mentioned. In neither Luke or John, which are primarily concerned with the Jerusalem tradition, does the angel tell them to go to Galilee, much less imply that the Lord would appear there to Peter.

In this connection may I raise the question whether the distinction in the appearances to Peter alone first or to Peter as one of the twelve is not more apparent than real? On this point scholars who have worked over the problem have often commented, particularly Professor Bacon, who professes to see in the two statements a conflict. But that Paul was not entirely careful in his statement is evidenced in his remark immediately afterwards, that Jesus was then seen of the "Twelve!" Should not the careful historian have said the "Eleven?" Matthias can hardly have been included so soon!

But if there was a distinction in the appearances, does not

the Gospel of Mark bring that out by mentioning Peter particularly, whereas the particularization is omitted in the other accounts?

I think we are on solid ground in believing that the conclusion of the Gospel of Mark contained an account of an appearance first to Peter in Galilee and then to the other disciples probably as described in Jn. 21, where Peter too is singled out for converse with the Master.

(5) But may not the ending of the Gospel have contained more than that? Professor Burkitt, in *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, professes a conviction that "it is not unlikely that the Gospel originally extended over much of the period covered by the first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles" (p. 94). Now St. Paul mentions other appearances besides the one to Cephas and the "Twelve." He continues to say, "And after that he was seen by more than 500 brothers at one time, most of whom are still alive, although some of them have fallen asleep."

In Mk. 16, we read the prophecy that the Lord will baptise the faithful with the Holy Ghost, but so far as the ending of the gospel is concerned, that promise is unfulfilled. But another promise made in 14:28 has its fulfillment at least implied in 16:7. We may conclude that it was the double purpose of the author of Mark, as Bacon has already indicated, to testify to the coming of the Holy Ghost and to the appearance of Jesus to the disciples in Galilee.

Can we not then identify the appearance to the 500 described by Paul with the description of the coming of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:1-42? That a great number beheld the manifestation, whatever it was, is apparent from the statement that about 3000 were baptised the same day.

Not only does Burkitt believe that the Gospel went on to describe the early Christian age, but Bacon likewise says (*Beginnings*, p. xix), "It is as certain as anything in the field of critical conjecture can be that our evangelist's story once went on to relate the substance of the early narrative of Acts and may have wound up, as Acts does with the planting of the Gospel in Rome."

Since considerable evidence seems to point to the conclusion that Mark was a Roman gospel, written in Rome and for Roman Christians, that supposition is not unlikely. If so, it would lend added weight to the similarity of the resurrection appearances listed by Paul and possibly by Mark.

In Corinthians, Paul continues: "Then he was seen by James, then by all of the apostles, and finally by me also." That Paul may have received the substance of the story of the appearance to James on his visit to Jerusalem which he describes in Gal. 1, we have already called attention to. So far as his statement of an appearance next to "all of the apostles" (1 Cor. 15 7) as distinct from the earlier one to the "Twelve" is concerned, we know nothing of it. But of the final vision to Paul himself, we know well enough. The later Gospel to the Hebrews tells of an appearance to James separately from the rest, though it may be derived from Paul or from another source, possibly from Mark.

(6) There is one further factor involved in the problem to which I think attention should be called. It is the so-called Shorter Ending to the Gospel that appears after Mk. 16 8 in a few ancient manuscripts and versions, notably L ψ 7 ρ ; and particularly the Old Latin.

It has little literary merit and naturally was soon superseded by the Longer Ending of the traditional 16 9-20. But if the Shorter Ending be compared with the Longer Ending, it will be seen to side with the Matthean-Markan Galilean tradition rather than with Luke, John 20, and the Jerusalem tradition to which the Longer Ending is also a witness.

Let us assume then, as many scholars have supposed, that an accident occurred to the autograph of Mark. If a portion of the page was torn off at the place in 16 8 leaving the words *ἐφοβούντο γὰρ* and the accident was not immediately discovered, there would probably have been some eventual attempt at reconstruction. Manifestly this is what happened; for if the discovery of the accident had been made immediately afterwards, the probabilities are that in each of the alternative endings that have come down to us there would have been a closer approximation to the facts in the original ending.

But if a time had elapsed and persons later reading the Gospel came to ἐφοβούντο γὰρ and there had to stop, at once automatically they would try to recall what they had read there before the accident had occurred. It is probable that certain key-words would stand out, just as a reporter of a speech who returns to his newspaper office, in modern times, without having made any notes of what he had heard (a not infrequent occurrence) recalls only a few picturesque words or phrases that stood out as he heard them, strives to remember only the essential facts, condenses possibly an hour's address into two paragraphs and then turns it into print.

Now assuming that this may have happened and that the author of the Shorter Ending had in mind only some key-words that he could add after a lapse of time to give the Gospel a dignified ending no matter how inadequate, let us see what kind of a reconstruction he would have made from what he remembered, just as certain words without the spaces being filled in would stand out in a reporter's notes or in his mind. The result might very well be something like this:

"They told . . . Peter . . . companions . . ." And then the summary of it all because of the inadequacy of the memory: "Jesus himself sent out by them from the east to the west the sacred and incorruptible message of eternal salvation," thoroughly editorial.

Others have called attention to the fact that the reference to the east and to the west makes it possible that this addition was made to the gospel at Rome, where at that time the furthest mission of Christianity to the west would have gone. If so, it fits in perfectly with the hypothesis that the Gospel, written at Rome, early suffered damage there, and readers who had known something of its complete contents had attached a reporter's summary. That summary contained the germ of the Galilean tradition and the particularization to Peter, as well as the spread of the Christian message through the Pentecostal power!

Perhaps I have read into this reconstruction more than the facts warrant. But so far as I can observe, it contains as large an element of plausibility as any of the other theories

that have been advanced and it may be open to less objection.

Whatever the ultimate solution of the problem may be, I doubt if the actual text of the ending of the gospel can be culled from any place in the New Testament, and in lieu of that one must reason inductively for what it may originally have contained.