

**OTHER ENDINGS OF MARK AS RESPONSES TO MARK:
AN IDEOLOGICAL – CRITICAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE LONGER
AND THE SHORTER ENDING OF MARK’S GOSPEL**

JAYHOON YANG

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

DECEMBER, 2003

CXXI

161
ECCOLOCUS ILLIUS UBIFUIT POSITUS
SEDITE ET DICITE DISCIPULIS ET PETRO
PRAECE DOUOS IN GALILEAM ILLIC ME
UIDEBITIS Sicut uobis dixi Iuxta
TEM CUM EXIRENT A MONUMEN
TO FUGERUNT TENEBAE TENIMILLAS
TREMOR ET PAUOR PROPTER RUMOR E
OMNIA AUTEM QUAE CUMQUE PRAE
CEPTA ERANT EI QUI CUM PUERORUM
BREUITER EXPOSUERUNT POSTHAEC
EIPSE IN AD PARUIT ET LABORIENTE
USQUE USQUE IN ORIENTEM INIIT
PER IULIUS SANCTAE ET INCORRUPTAE HA
SAUINI SAETERNAE AMEN
PRAE DICAT IONIS

Codex Bobbiensis (k) fol. 41. recto. Mk 16.6-9

This photographic facsimile is from John Wordsworth, Henry J. White, and William Sanday, *Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew from the Bobbio ms. (k) now numbered G. vii. 15 in the National library at Turin* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1886).

ABSTRACT

The Longer Ending and the Shorter Ending of Mark's Gospel are the ancient Markan readers' responses to Mark's Gospel. This leads us to the question of how the authors of these endings read their Mark's Gospel. These endings reflect the ideologies of their authors. The ideologies are related to the interests of the author or the authorial community (ideological primary group), and are embedded within the text.

The Longer and the Shorter Ending were produced within a social context where the matter of apostolic authoritative leadership was a sensitive issue. A potential conflict is found in many contemporary texts from the NT and the extra-canonical texts, especially with regard to the apostolic authority of Mary Magdalene and Peter. Their struggles for apostolic authority are often found in the post-Easter narrative context.

The assumed ideological primary community of the Longer Ending is Pro-Magdalene. It acknowledged Mary Magdalene as its authoritative leader who enjoyed apostolic authority especially over Peter. This community was interested in mission, and re-authenticated the mission of the Eleven. The LE provides a certain guideline for the qualification of leadership in the LE's community, which is the visual experience of the resurrected Jesus.

The assumed ideological primary community of the Shorter Ending is Pro-Petrine. It was in favour of Peter, and suggested him as holding authoritative apostolic authority. This community wanted to clarify the resurrection of Jesus, and emended the empty tomb narrative of Mark's Gospel. It was also interested in mission, and the authority of disciples, especially that of Peter, in their performing mission tasks is highlighted in the Shorter Ending.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people used to tell me that I am blessed with teachers, and it has been proved once again during my life in Sheffield.

I thank Dr. Jorunn Økland, my supervisor, for her guidance and constant support over the past three years. She has always been a good friend and teacher not only in my research, but also in my life and Christian faith. Thank you for your encouragement and kindness, Jorunn. I am also grateful to Rev. Tor and two lovely kids; may God bless them for he has often yielded his wife and they, their mom to me with pleasure.

I also thank Professors J.K. Elliott and L.C.A. Alexander, my examiners. These great scholars gave me very helpful and supportive comments.

I wish to thank Professors S. Westerholm, E. Schuller at McMaster university, and A. Reinhartz, who is now in Laurier University. They challenged and encouraged me so that I could finish my master's degree successfully at McMaster, Canada.

I am grateful to my mentor, Rev. Dr. Young-Bong Kim, who is now ministering to a local church of the United Methodist Church. He is the first teacher who opened my eyes to see the Bible critically during my M.Div. studies at Hyupsung University, Korea. He taught me how to read the Bible, and more importantly, why I should read the Bible.

I would like to thank Dr. Ann G. Brock and Rev. David for their friendship. It is a blessing of God that I came to know them. Their prayerful support and encouragement were a great help during the final year of my research.

I want to say thank you to my colleagues in Sheffield University. Revs. Drs. Sang-Lae Kim, Jong-Yoon Kim, and Dr. Seung-Woo Chung, who helped me enjoy my study and life in Sheffield; Drs. Ulrike and Joe Whang – I will never forget the days that we had together.

I cannot forget the love that my friends at Hamilton Immanuel Methodist Church in Canada showed to me. I especially thank deacon Young-Hae Shim, who was my patron during my study at McMaster University. I thank McMaster

University and the Korean Methodist Church for the financial support so that I could finish my studies at McMaster University.

I am indebted to many friends in Sheffield Korean Church (Revs. Kong, James Chun, and Sang-Il Lee) for their love and prayers, especially to Professor Myung-Jin Baek and Samsoo Kim; may God remember their Christ-like love. I also thank Leeds Korean Church, where I ministered for a year; thank you for your endurance and love. I also thank Hoopyung Methodist Church and Bang-San Methodist Church for their prayers and financial support during my research in Sheffield. Thank you to friends in Crookes Valley Methodist Church for your prayer and fellowship in the Lord.

I want to say thank you again and again to my family in Chuncheon and Chunjoo. My parents (Rev. Han-Young Yang and Jung-Ja Kim) have sacrificed “everything” for me; I do not know how I can pay back their endless love. The love that my parents-in-law (Kye-Joo Lee and Ok-Hee Ahn) showed to me has also sustained me whenever hardships threatened to overwhelm me. They showed me what the love of God is like. I thank my brothers and sisters in Chuncheon and Chunjoo too. They have been faithfully supportive to me with kindness and love.

Finally, I want to say thank you, Ggot-Im, my wife, the best gift from God and the best choice in my life. She has always been on my side with respect, love, patience, gentleness, joy, faith and hope. Thank you Ggot-Im for having been with me always.

I thank God who has given me wisdom and inspiration; I pray this little thesis of mine be used in the service of God.

ABBREVIATIONS

1QpHab	Commentary on Habakkuk from Qumran Cave 1
<i>Act Phil.</i>	<i>Acts of Philip</i>
<i>Act Phil. Mart.</i>	<i>Acts of Philip Martyrdom</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquities of the Jews</i>
<i>1 Apoc. Jas.</i>	<i>The (First) Apocalypse of James</i>
<i>Apol.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Apology</i>
<i>Asc. Is.</i>	<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>
<i>Barn.</i>	<i>Epistle of Barnabas</i>
BG	Papyrus Berolinensis gnosticus
<i>Dial.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Dialogue with Tryphon</i>
<i>Dial. Sav.</i>	<i>Dialogue of the Saviour</i>
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
<i>EpApos.</i>	<i>Epistula Apostolorum</i>
FLE	The fragment of the Longer Ending of Mark's Gospel in the Codex Washingtonianus (W), fol. 184 recto, lines 9-24
<i>Gos. Heb.</i>	<i>Gospel of the Hebrews</i>
<i>Gos. Mary</i>	<i>Gospel of Mary</i>
<i>Gos. Pet.</i>	<i>Gospel of Peter</i>
<i>Gos. Phil.</i>	<i>Gospel of Philip</i>
<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>
<i>Hist. eccl.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>
KJV	King James Version
LE	The 'Longer Ending' of Mark's Gospel (Mk 16.9-20) in the Codex Alexandrinus (A)
LXX	Septuagint
MK	Mark's Gospel (Mk 1.1-16.8)
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
NEB	New English Bible
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OE	The original ending of Mark's Gospel (Mk 16.1-8)
OE _k	The original ending of Mark's Gospel (Mk 16.1-8) in Codex

	Bobbiensis (it ^b) (fol. 40, line 5 – fol. 41, line 7)
<i>Pis. Soph.</i>	<i>Pistis Sophia</i>
P. Oxy.	Papyrus Oxyrhynchus
<i>Pr. Pet.</i>	<i>Preaching of Peter</i>
<i>Prot. Jas.</i>	<i>Protevangelium of James</i>
P. Ryl.	Papyrus Rylands
<i>Rec.</i>	<i>Recognitions (Pseudo-Clementine)</i>
SE	The 'Shorter Ending' of Mark's Gospel (Codex Bobbiensis; [it ^b], fol. 41 recto, lines 8-14)
<i>Soph. Jes. Chr.</i>	<i>Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>
<i>Spec. Leg.</i>	Philo, <i>De Specialibus Legibus</i>
<i>TLevi</i>	<i>Testament of Levi</i>
<i>War.</i>	Josephus, <i>The Jewish War</i>
<i>Yeb.</i>	<i>Yebamoth, Mishnah</i> (English translation text from I. Epstein [trans.], <i>The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nashim, vol. 1</i> (London: The Soncino Press, 1936))
AB	<i>Anchor Bible</i>
ABD	D.N. Freedman (ed.), <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> (NY: Doubleday, 1992)
AJT	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>
AnBoll	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
ANRW	Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase (eds.), <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forshung</i> (Berlin: W.de Gruyter, 1972-)
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BHG	<i>Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graece</i> , Brussels, 1977
BI	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibRes	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BR	<i>Bible Review</i>
BS	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCSA	Corpus Christianorum: Series Apocryphorum
CR	<i>Currents in Research</i>

<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HTKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSNTSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JTSA</i>	<i>Journal of Theology for Southern Africa</i>
<i>ModT</i>	<i>Modern Theology</i>
<i>NedTTs</i>	<i>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>NHC</i>	<i>Nag Hammadi Codices</i>
<i>NHL</i>	J.M. Robinson (ed.), <i>The Nag Hammadi Library in English</i> , 3 rd edition (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988)
<i>NHS</i>	<i>Nag Hammadi Studies</i>
<i>NLH</i>	<i>New Literary History</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>RevB</i>	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>

<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
<i>TCAAS</i>	<i>Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Science</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VCSup</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae, Supplement</i>
<i>WBC</i>	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x

CHAPTER ONE **THE STUDIES OF THE MARKAN ENDING**

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Arguments concerning Mark's ending	5
1.2.1 'For they were afraid that...': Mk 16.8 is not the original ending	7
1.2.1.1 Mk 16.9-20, the product of Mark the author	7
1.2.1.2 The lost ending theory	15
1.2.1.3. The mutilated ending theory	19
1.2.1.4. The incomplete work theory	21
1.2.2 'for they were afraid.': Mk 16.8 is the original ending	25
1.2.2.1 'Can a book finish with γάρ?'	26
1.2.2.2 Markan ending for the polemics	29
1.2.2.3 'The song is over but the melody lingers on'	37
1.3 Recent study on Markan endings	42
1.4 Problems in the study of Markan endings	52

CHAPTER TWO **METHODOLOGY AND PRESUPPOSITIONS**

2.1 Introduction: text and interpretation	56
2.2 Methodological suppositions	57
2.2.1 Other endings as interpretations of Mark's Gospel	57
2.2.2 'ideology': 'No mouse ever looked like Mickey Mouse'	58
2.2.3 'ideological criticism'	66
2.3 Presuppositions in the examination of the LE and the SE	70

CHAPTER THREE **EXTRINSIC ANALYSIS**

3.1 Introduction	74
3.2 The assumed conflict between Mary Magdalene and Peter	77
3.2.1 <i>Gospel of Mary</i>	77
3.2.2 <i>Gospel of Thomas</i>	79
3.2.3 <i>Pistis Sophia</i>	81
3.3 The prominence of Mary Magdalene	83

3.4 The prominence of Peter and downgrading Mary Magdalene	87
3.4.1 <i>Acts of Philip</i> : discrepancy between the Greek and Coptic Version	88
3.4.2 Downgrading Mary Magdalene by means of Mary the mother of Jesus	89
3.4.3 Mary Magdalene: the Bride of Christ who became a whore	91
3.5 Conclusion: Mary Magdalene seesaws with Peter	93
 Excursus: Mary the mother of Jesus and the <i>Protevangelium of James</i>	 95

CHAPTER FOUR

INTRINSIC ANALYSIS OF THE LONGER ENDING

4.1 Introduction: searching for the <i>sound of silence</i>	97
4.2 Presupposition for the text analysis: Codex Alexandrinus and the LE	99
4.3 Text analysis	102
4.3.1 Structure of the LE	102
4.3.2 Part One – the first type-scene: vv. 9-11	104
4.3.2.1 Characterization of Mary Magdalene	104
A. Mary Magdalene: the brighter the sun, the darker the shade	106
B. Mary Magdalene versus Mary the mother of James and Joses	116
1. Jesus and οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ	116
2. Jesus in his hometown	119
3. Mary the mother of little James and Joses and Mary the mother of Jesus	122
C. Mary Magdalene: why casting out seven demons?	129
4.3.2.2 Characterization of 'τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις'	133
A. To those who had been with him ('τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις')	133
B. Mourning and Weeping	137
4.3.2.3 Summary of Part One	140
4.3.3 Part Two – the second type-scene: vv. 12-13	141
4.3.3.1 Structure	142
4.3.3.2 Text analysis	143
A. εἰς ἀγρόν: Jesus' appearance on their way to a country	143
B. Characterization of the two disciples and 'the rest'	146
4.3.3.3 Summary of Part Two	148
4.3.4 Part Three – the third type-scene: vv. 14-20	149
4.3.4.1 Text analysis (1): section one (v. 14)	150
A. Jesus' appearance to the Eleven at table: v. 14a	150
B. 'ὠκείδισεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν': v. 14b	154
C. Because they did not believe...: v. 14c	156
4.3.4.2 Text analysis (2): section two (vv. 15-18)	159
A. Jesus' commission: re-authentication of the apostleship	159
B. 'the one who believes...the one who does not believe' (v. 16)	165

C. ‘and be baptized...’ (16a): extrinsic and intrinsic examination of baptism	166
1. Extrinsic examination of baptism	167
2. Intrinsic examination of baptism in the LE	173
D. Signs and the LE (vv. 17-18, 20)	176
Signs (σημεία) in MK and the LE	176
4.3.4.3 Text analysis (3): section three (vv. 19-20)	181
A. ὁ κύριος (vv. 19a, 20b)	181
B. Ascension and session (v. 19b, c), and the Lord’s συνεργοῦντος (20b)	184
4.3.4.4 Summary of Part Three	188
4.4 Conclusion of the Chapter Four	189

CHAPTER FIVE INTRINSIC ANALYSIS OF THE SHORTER ENDING

5.1 Introduction	191
5.2 Text analysis	193
5.2.1 Translation and structure	193
5.2.2 Deletion (Mk 16.8) and insertion (fol. 40, line 10 – fol. 40b, line 5)	196
5.2.2.1 Deletion of ‘they said nothing to anyone’ from Mk 16.8	196
5.2.2.2 Insertion of fol. 40, line 10 – fol. 40b, line 5	197
5.2.3 Analysis of the first sentence: fol. 41, lines 8-10	199
5.2.3.1 Obscuring Mary Magdalene as an anonymous woman	199
5.2.3.2 Peter	201
5.2.3.3 Summary of the first sentence analysis	203
5.2.4 Analysis of the second sentence: fol. 41, lines 11-14	203
5.2.4.1 ‘IPSE HI ^s ADPARUIT (fol. 41, line 4)’	204
5.2.4.2 ‘PER ILLOS (fol. 41, line 13)’	205
5.2.4.3 Summary of the second sentence analysis	206
5.3 Conclusion of the Chapter Five	207

CONCLUSION	210
------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	221
--------------	-----

CHAPTER ONE

THE STUDIES OF THE MARKAN ENDING

- 物有本末, 事有終始¹

1.1 Introduction

One of the most exciting Bible stories that I used to listen to in my Sunday school days was the 'fish story', which is about Jonah and a scary monster whale that swallowed the poor prophet in one mouthful. God commands Jonah to preach imminent judgement to the Ninevites; Jonah, however, disobeys and flees from God's face, but God makes him return to His path through a deadly storm and a giant fish; Jonah repents of his faults in the darkness of the belly of the fish, and is eventually led to the city of Nineveh. Through his proclamation, all Ninevite citizens come back to God, and he spares them: happy ending!

This 'fish story' is a stereotypical Sunday school story that has a clear-cut beginning and a happy ending. At the beginning of the Jonah narrative, the narrator presents Jonah's disobedience to God's command, which is unexpected behaviour in a prophet. By doing so, the narrator leads the reader to think that the 'focalizer'² of this narrative is Jonah's disobedience. Furthermore, the reader is led to think that the narrator sets the conflict between the 'goodness of Yahweh versus the wickedness of Nineveh', as Walter B. Crouch mentions.³ Therefore, the reader is led to feel the

¹ 大學 (Dai-Hak, an ancient Chinese Confucian Document) chapter 42, meaning 'if there is a beginning, there should be an ending, and if there is an ending, there should be a beginning.'

² There are some literary devices that direct the reader to what direction and how to read the narrative as it unfolds by providing the reader with important 'initial information' (S. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* [London: Routledge, 1983], p. 119-21). The 'focalizer' is one of the narrative devices that 'instructs the reader where to focus the senses, where to look for the action that is about to take place.' (R. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* [Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988], p. 102).

³ W. B. Crouch, 'To Question an End, To End a Question: Opening the Closure of the Book of Jonah', *JSOT* 62 (1994), pp. 101-112 (p. 103).

sense of an ending when the 'complication [i.e., Jonah's disobedience] and conflict is resolved' by Jonah's obedience and the Ninevites' repentance (Jon. 3.10).⁴

The 'fish story', however, is not all about the Jonah narrative in the Hebrew Bible: the storyteller repeats the narrative, as J. Lee Magness well pointed out.⁵ The reader, who is satisfied with a happy and complete ending, reading the part about Jonah's repentance (Jon. 2.9) and the Ninevites' salvation (Jon. 3.10), is confounded by Jonah's sudden change of attitude when God changes his mind: 'This [...God changed his mind about the harm he had said he would cause them and did not do it] was absolutely disgusting to Jonah, and he became angry (Jon. 4.1).'⁶

What makes the reader more confounded is that the narrative ends in an unfinished dialogue between God and Jonah. God asks but Jonah does not answer. The reader might expect Jonah's response, but the narrator does not say anything. As Frank Kermode relates through his allegory of a ticking clock, human beings are inclined to expect an ending after a beginning:

Let us take a very simple example, the ticking of a clock. We ask what it *says*: and we agree that it says *tick-tock*. By this fiction we humanize it, make it talk our language. Of course, it is we who provide the fictional difference between the two [the same; *my insertion*] sounds; *tick* is our word for a physical beginning, *tock* our word for an end. We say they differ.⁷

The Jonah narrative, however, does not *seem* to fit into this category, where a beginning should be followed by a clear ending: the reader hears 'tick', but not 'tock'. This might show that the Jonah narrative is a highly sophisticated literary work rather

⁴ Crouch, 'To Question an End, To End a Question', p. 105.

⁵ J.L. Magness, *Sense and Absence: Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), pp. 61-62.

⁶ D. Stuart's translation (*Hosea – Jonah* [Word Biblical Commentary vol. 31; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987], pp. 498-99). This verse is translated literally as 'it became evil/wrong to Jonah as a great evil/wrong', and it shows that Jonah was very angry because he hated what God had done to the Ninevites, mentions Stuart (pp. 501-502).

⁷ F. Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (London; Oxford; NY: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 44-45.

than a simple myth.⁸

The Markan ending is fairly *similar* to the Jonah narrative in this light. Most reliable manuscripts of Mark's Gospel end at 16.8,⁹ by reading ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ,¹⁰ which is translated either as 'for they were afraid.' or 'For they were afraid that...' depending on scholars. Regardless of the differing translation as above, it is beyond question that the reader is perplexed by the odd and abrupt ending of Mark's narrative: a young man (νεανίσκος)¹¹ bids the women deliver the message of the

⁸ Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending*, p. 18. Crouch ('To Question an End, To End a Question', pp. 101-112) shows that the Jonah narrative is a very sophisticated literary work through his examination of the beginning and ending of the Jonah narrative.

⁹ The manuscripts \aleph (Codex Sinaiticus) and B (Codex Vaticanus) are the oldest witnesses to this abrupt ending at Mk 16.8. Four fathers, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius and Jerome, evidence the authenticity of this ending, as well. Despite some difficulties such as the stature of the text in these manuscripts and the minority in number of manuscripts supporting this ending, most scholars accept this ending as original (J.C. Thomas, 'A Reconsideration of the Ending of Mark', *JETS* 26/4 [December 1983], pp. 407-19 [p. 409]; D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* [NY; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997], pp. 124-25). I will introduce and discuss the debates concerning the endings later.

¹⁰ J.K. Elliott (*The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: an Edition of C.H. Turner's 'Notes on Marcan Usage' Together with Other Comparable Studies* [Leiden; NY; Koln: E.J. Brill, 1993], pp. 204-205. [Cf. idem, 'The Text and Language of the Ending to Mark's Gospel', *TZ* 27 [1971], pp. 255-62.]) classifies five different types of endings of Mark's Gospel in the Greek MSS.

(1) The longer ending (Mk 16.9-20) is included in the following MSS: A C D E H K M S U W X Y Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ Ω 047 055 0211 F13 28 33 274 (text) 565 700 892 1009 1010 1071 1079 1195 1230 1241 1253 1344 1365 1546 1646 2148 2174 etc., Lectionaries. 60 69 70 185 547 883, Latin (it. Aur c d^{mss}. Ff² 1 n o q) (vg). Syr. (c p h pal) Cop. (boh fay) Gothic Arm. ^{MSS} Geo.^B Diat. (Arabic, Italian, Codex Fuldensis and Old Dutch), Justin(?), Irenaeus, Tertullian, Aphraates, Apostolic Constitutions, Didymus, Hippolytus, Marinus (as quoted by Eusebius), Epiphanius.

(2) The longer ending is included in the following MSS. Marked with asterisks, or obeli, or with a critical note added: fl 22 137 138 205 1110 1210 1215 1216 1217 1221 1241 (vid) 1582.

(3) The following MSS. Add the shorter ending before the longer ending: L Ψ 083 099 (incomplete up to συντόμως) 0112 (omits πάντα ... μετὰ δὲ) 274 (mg) 579, Lectionary 1602, Syr. (h^{mss}.) Copt. (sah ^{MSS} Boh ^{MSS}) Eth. ^{MSS}.

(4) Latin (it. k) reads only the shorter ending after Mark 16.8: Latin [it. a] may also have originally contained the shorter ending only.

(5) The following MSS. of Mark end at 16.8: \aleph B (a large space follows 16.8) 304 (2386 and 1420 have a page missing at this point), Syr. sin Cop. sa^{mss} Arm. ^{2MSS}. Eth. ^{3MSS}. Geo.^{L, A}, Eusebius, MSS. according to Eusebius, MSS. according to Jerome.

Thomas ('A Reconsideration of the Ending of Mark' pp. 407-408) classified manuscript W (the Freer Logion) into an independent category. The ending of Mark in (5) above is often named as the Short Ending (Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, pp. 124-25). I, however, will refer to it as the 'original ending' to avoid the confusion of Markan original ending (OE; Mk 16.1-8) with the Shorter Ending (SE; manuscript it^k; Codex Bobbiensis), which I will introduce later.

¹¹ There have been a lot of debates concerning the identity of the young man (νεανίσκος). H. Wactjen ('The Ending of Mark and the Gospel Shift in Eschatology', *ASTI* 4 [1965], pp. 114-31 [pp. 114-16]) argued that the young man is not an angel. A.K. Jenkins ('Young Man or Angle', *ExpTim* 94 [1983], pp. 237-40) and S.R. Johnson ('The Identity and Significance of the Neaniskos in Mark',

resurrection of Jesus, but they flee away in fear and keep silent.

That is one of the reasons, I assume, why many versions of the English Bible such as the NRSV, NIV, NEB, KJV, and the Jerusalem Bible attach the Longer Ending (=LE; Mk 16.9-20)¹² – some versions along with the Shorter Ending (SE)¹³ – right after Mk 16.8 with only a small asterisk remarking in the footnote that some manuscripts do not record the LE.¹⁴ This may make the LE seem part of Mark's Gospel so that the reader, if she or he is not cautious, may think that Mark's narrative ends at Mk 16.20. This reading of Mark's Gospel, however, merely leads the reader

Forum 8 [1992], pp. 123-39) agree with Waetjen. R. Scroggs and K.I. Groff ('Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ', *JBL* 92 [1973], pp. 531-48 [esp. pp. 540-45]) interpreted the young man in terms of a metaphor which 'symbolises the believer who, now baptized, participates in the resurrection of Christ'. A.Y. Collins (*The Beginning of the Gospel: Probing of Mark in Context* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992], p. 135), although she does not explicitly argue that the young man is an angel, says that Mark does not present the young man as a human being. J.F. Williams (*Other Followers of Jesus: Minor Characters as Major Figures in Mark's Gospel* [JSNTSup 102; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994], p. 195) contends that the young man must be an angel. Traditionally, it has been understood that it is identified with an angel (e.g., E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* [Göttingen, 1957], p. 353; D.E. Nineham, *The Gospel of Saint Mark* [London: Penguin Books, 1976], p. 444; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* [NY: St. Martin's Press, 1966], pp. 606-607). For the list of scholars who support this argument, see Williams, *Other Followers*, p. 195. n. 2.

¹² The manuscript of the Longer Ending that I will examine in this thesis is manuscript A (Alexandrinus, dates ca. 5th century). The LE of manuscript A reads as follows: 'Αναστὰς δὲ πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίας τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια. ἐκείνη πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις πειθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν· κάκεινοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἠπίστησαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερῶθη ἐν ἑτέρῃ μορφῇ πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν· κάκεινοι ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς λοιποῖς· οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπίστευσαν. Ὑστερον ἀνακειμένοις αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἑνδεκά ἐφανερῶθη, καὶ ὠνειδίσειεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν ὅτι τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγγεγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται. σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν, γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν καιναῖς, ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν, κἄν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάβῃ, ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐκείνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου συνεργούντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων.

¹³ For the Shorter Ending (SE), I will use manuscript it^k (Codex Bobbiensis) for my thesis. For more information of Codex Bobbiensis, see Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), pp. 315-16. The SE of Codex Bobbiensis (fol. 41 recto, lines 8-14) reads as follows: omnia autem quaecumque praecepta erant et qui cum puero erant breviter exposuerunt post haec et ipse hi^s adparuit et ab oriente usque usque in orientem misit per illos sanctam et incorruptam ha salutis aeternae. amen. praedicationis. The Greek SE reads as follows: Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξήγγειλαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφάνη ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. ἀμήν.

¹⁴ More strikingly, my Korean Revised Version (150th edn.; Seoul: Korean Bible Society, 1990) does not put any mark between Mk 16.8 and verse 9, whereas New Korean Standard Version (4th edn.; Seoul: Korean Bible Society, 1993) brackets the LE.

to the 'fallacy of fish story'.¹⁵

The uneasiness at the seemingly unfinished story, along with a curiosity about the reason for such a way of ending Mark's Gospel, has led many Markan readers to suggest several explanations. C.E.B. Cranfield summarizes these explanations as follows: (1) Mark's Gospel is an unfinished work; Mark¹⁶ wanted to continue but he could not for some reason; (2) There was more to Mark's Gospel, but the ending, unfortunately, was lost or destroyed; (3) The conclusion was suppressed on purpose by someone; (4) Mark intended to finish his story in the way as he did.¹⁷

In this Chapter, I will survey the scholarly views concerning the ending of Mark's Gospel (part 1.2 and 1.3), and discuss some problems in the study of Markan endings (part 1.4).

1.2 Arguments concerning Mark's ending

Many scholars have dealt with questions for nineteen centuries, either directly or indirectly, concerning the ending of Mark's Gospel.¹⁸ The works of many ancient Church Fathers are witness to the existence of different manuscripts.¹⁹ For instance, Eusebius of Caesarea (260-339/340 CE)²⁰, Gregory of Nyssa,²¹ and Jerome (347?-

¹⁵ By the 'fallacy of fish story', I mean the fallacy caused by a tendency that the reader anticipates a clear-cut ending in a narrative. The reader tends to expect a narrative to end with a clear notion of ending such as a happy ending and the resolution of conflicts, so that the reader tends to stop reading where the narrative seems to finish (e.g., the fish story in Jon.1.1-3.10 and 4.1-11; the Parable of a Prodigal Son in Lk. 15.11-24 and 15.25-32), or to go further until she or he reaches a seemingly appropriate ending of the narrative (e.g., Mk 16.1-8 and 16.9-20), regardless of what the original ending is.

¹⁶ Mark refers to the author(s) of Mark's Gospel in this thesis.

¹⁷ C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), pp. 470-71.

¹⁸ S.L. Cox, *A History and Critique of Scholarship Concerning the Markan Endings* (Lampeter, UK: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1993), p. 3.

¹⁹ For Church Fathers' use of Markan Endings, see Cox, *History and Critique*, pp. 13-37. He provides a list of Fathers who cited Markan Endings as well (pp. 217-22).

²⁰ Eusebius, *Questiones evangelicae ad Marinum, libri 1*, PG, vol. 22. Although he does not explicitly exhibit his own opinion on the original ending of Mark's Gospel, he mentions that almost every copy of Mark's Gospel ends at Mk 16.8 while replying to Marinus concerning the discrepancy between the witnesses on the first Easter morning in Matthew's Gospel and Mark's: '... "καὶ

420? CE)²² quoted Mark's Gospel as ending at 16.8, the LE, and the FLE,²³ when they were dealing with questions about the ending of Mark's Gospel. The main question, since the nineteenth century, has been whether Mk 16.8 is the original ending or not.²⁴

The debate about the ending of Mark's Gospel can be classified by two main arguments: (1) Mk 16.8 is not the original ending of Mark's Gospel (2) Mk 16.8 is the original ending of Mark's Gospel. The first opinion leads to the following hypothetical explanations: (1) Mk 16.9-20 is Markan, and accordingly Mk 16.8 is not the original ending of Mark's Gospel; (2) There is more to Mark's Gospel after 16.8, which is the original ending, but it was lost or destroyed; (3) the original ending was mutilated by someone on purpose; (4) Mark's Gospel is an unfinished work caused by the author's personal reasons.

ἀκούσασαι ἔφυγον, καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδέν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ” ἐν τούτῳ γάρ σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγέλιον περιγράφεται τὸ τέλος...’ Cf. For the discussion of Markan ending in *ad Marinum*, see Kelhoffer, ‘The Witness of Eusebius’ *ad Marinum* and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark’s Gospel’, *ZNTW* 92 (2001), pp. 78-112.

²¹ Gregorii Nysseni, *In Christi resurrectionem, libri 2*, PG, vol. 46, pp. 644-45:

‘In the more accurate copies, the Gospel according to Mark has its end at “for they were afraid”. But in some copies this is also added: “And having risen early first of the week, he appeared first to Maria of Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons”’.

²² Jerome, *Against the Pelagians*, Book 2. 15. In this Latin text, he adds some sentences after Mk 16.14. About a thousand and five hundred years later, these additional passages were also found in a manuscript, Codex W (Washingtonianus). This manuscript was obtained by Charles L. Freer from an Arab dealer (B.M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968], p. 153), and was named Freer Logion (FL) following Mr. Freer’s name. For the photocopy of the manuscript of the Freer Logion, along with its transcription and translation, see Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 82-83.

²³ The FLE (the Codex W. fol. 184 recto, lines 9-24) is inserted in the middle of the LE (i.e., Mk 16.9-14, the FLE, and 16.15-20). The FLE reads as follows: κάκεινοι ἀπελογοῦντο λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος τῆς ἀνομίας καὶ τῆς ἀπιστίας ὑπὸ τὸν σατανᾶν ἐστίν, ὁ μὴ ἔων τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων ἀκάθαρτα τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ καταλαβέσθαι δύναμιν· διὰ τοῦτο ἀποκάλυψον σοῦ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἡῶν. ἐκεῖνοι ἔλεγον τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκείνοις προσέλεγεν ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ ὄρος τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ, ἀλλὰ ἐγγίζει ἄλλα δεινὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐγὼ ἁμαρτηρᾶντων παρεδόθην εἰς θάνατον ἵνα ὑποστρέψωσιν εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ μηκέτι ἁμαρτήσωσιν· ἵνα τὴν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πνευματικὴν καὶ ἄφθαρτον τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξαν κληρονομήσωσιν· ἀλλὰ

²⁴ This debate was made by Andreas Birch, Karl Lachmann, Samuel P. Tregelles, Henry Alford, Constantin von Tischendorf, and John W. Burgon (J.A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* [Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000], pp. 7-20).

1.2.1 'For they were afraid that...': Mk 16.8 is not the original ending

1.2.1.1 Mk 16.9-20, the product of Mark the author

Many Church Fathers, from Papias in the first century CE, have quoted verses from the LE.²⁵ There were, of course, some Fathers who witness to the SE²⁶ or FLE²⁷ as well. The majority of Fathers, however, quoted from the LE, and it was accepted as authentic²⁸ in the Eastern Church by the fourth century. Augustine especially, is noteworthy in supporting the Markan authorship of the LE. He is the first Father who understood Mark as the author of the LE in his *De Consensu Evangelistarum*.²⁹

The discovery of the manuscripts ⱼ (Codex Sinaiticus) at the Convent of St. Catherine, Cairo, in 1844 by young German critic Constantin von Tischendorf³⁰ and B (Codex Vaticanus) in the Vatican Library in the fifteenth century³¹ however, has led many scholars to doubt the authenticity of Mk 16.9-20, an *idée fixe* which had been accepted as a matter of fact. Those who doubted the authenticity of the LE are, for instance, Johann J. Griesbach (1745-1812),³² Fenton J.A. Hort and Brooke F. Westcott,³³ and Tischendorf who are the pioneers of the position against the

²⁵ Cox, *History and Critique*, p. 15. For the list of Fathers who quote from the LE, see *idem*, pp. 217-22.

²⁶ E.g. Clement Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc. (J. Schmid, *The Gospel According to Mark* [trans. K. Condon; Cork: the Mercier Press, 1968], p. 306).

²⁷ E.g. Jerome.

²⁸ Scholars adopt 'authentic/authenticity' in referring to Mk 16.9-20 to mean that it is Mark the author's work. This terminology in this thesis, therefore, will be understood as referring to 'Markan authorship' or 'Mark's own work'.

²⁹ Cox, *History and Critique*, p. 21.

³⁰ Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 42-46.

³¹ Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 47-48; *idem*, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, pp. 74-75.

³² J.J. Griesbach, *Io. Iac. Griesbachii Theol. D. et Prof. Primar. in academia Jenensi Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur, scripta nomine Academiae Jenensis, (1789. 1790) jam recognita multisque augmentis locupletata*; in B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff (trans. and eds.), *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text Critical Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 68-135; esp. pp. 127-28; Bo Reicke, 'Griesbach's Answer to the Synoptic Question', (trans. R. Walls), in B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff (trans. and eds.), *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text Critical Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 50-67 [p. 53].

³³ B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1898), pp. 112-13, 565; cf. pp. 556-59; *idem*, 'Notes on Selected Readings', in *The New Testament in the Original Greek* Vol. 2: Introduction and Appendix (London:

authenticity of the LE.³⁴

Some scholars since the nineteenth century however, have raised counterarguments against those who doubted the authenticity of the LE, and have supported the traditional understanding of the LE which accepts it as a Markan product. According to their argument, therefore, Mk 16.8 cannot be the original ending of Mark's Gospel. In this part, I will deal with John W. Burgon and William R. Farmer among those who supported the Markan authorship of the LE.³⁵

Burgon (1813-1888) is the most significant representative of those who support the Markan authorship of the LE. He argued that the LE is Mark's work, and that it belongs to the original Gospel of Mark. His argument is based on his conviction that the Byzantine text was the 'primary or basic text, the Traditional text', a touchstone which judges the authenticity of other texts, as Harry A. Sturz points out.³⁶ Burgon rejected the non-Byzantine texts very harshly. He mentioned that '... \aleph , B, D are three of the most scandalously corrupt copies'.³⁷

Burgon especially emphasized the impurity of two Codices, \aleph and B.³⁸ He condemned them as unreliable manuscripts arguing that 'the impurity of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and \aleph is not a matter of opinion, but a matter of fact'.³⁹ He

Macmillan, 1909), pp. 1-142 (pp. 29-51).

³⁴ J. Hug, *La Finale de L'Évangile de Marc (Mc 16.9-20)* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie Éditeurs, 1978), p.14.

³⁵ Others are, for instance, J.P.P. Martin (*Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament; vol 2* [Paris: Maisonneuve frères et C. Leclerc, 1884]), G. Salmon (*A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* [London: John Murray, 1885], pp. 187-93), J.L. Hug, M.L. de Wette, A. Hilgenfeld, C.Fr. Keil, P. Schanz (J. Hug, *La Finale*, pp. 12-13). They are, recently, followed by some scholars such as E.F. Hills ('The Magnificent Dean Burgon and the Original Text', in *Counterfeit or Genuine: Mark 16? John 8?* [Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975], pp. 15-24) and David Otis Fuller ('The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to St. Mark: Condensed by D.O. Fuller', in *Counterfeit or Genuine: Mark 16? John 8?*, pp. 25-130).

³⁶ H.A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984), pp. 32-33.

³⁷ J.W. Burgon, *Revision Revised* (London: John Murray, 1883), p. 16.

³⁸ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 315.

³⁹ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 315.

argued that the Codices \aleph and B were originated from the same copy, and the original copy was corrupt. He argued that these two Codices merely reproduced this corrupt copy, which is dated more or less late.⁴⁰

Burgon thought that the Codex \aleph is more corrupt than Codex B, and accordingly is less reliable than Codex B.⁴¹ He mentioned that Codex B was found on 'the forgotten shelf in the Vatican library' only four hundred years ago, and that Codex \aleph was 'in the waste-paper basket' of a convent several decades ago.⁴² He argued that these texts are not pure because they had not been accepted nor used for a long time, having been forgotten by people, and that this proved their impurity.⁴³ He believed that the Byzantine text was the result of inspiration by the Holy Spirit, and the church had rejected all the non-canonical books and preserved this true canonical text in spite of all the wicked attempts of Satan to corrupt it.⁴⁴

Burgon rejected the omission of the LE because he did not accept the authority of the Codices \aleph and B. He argued that forty four manuscripts witness the LE whereas only these two corrupt and the most unreliable manuscripts omit the LE.⁴⁵ He also argued for the authenticity of the LE by providing the witness of the Lectionaries; he argued that the LE had been used in the Lectionaries of all the Catholic Church, and that proves the authenticity of the LE.⁴⁶

Burgon defended the authenticity of the LE against scholars who rejected it, such as Robertson who provided evidence from Fathers such as Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, and Jerome. Burgon contended that these were incorrect

⁴⁰ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 317-19.

⁴¹ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 318-19.

⁴² Note that he lived in the nineteenth century .

⁴³ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 319.

⁴⁴ Burgon, *The Traditional Texts of the Holy Gospel* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1896), p. 20.

⁴⁵ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 36, 423.

⁴⁶ Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to Mark* (Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1987), p. 210.

evidences; he argued that some of them did not mention the LE at all, and others, on the contrary, quoted the LE as genuine.⁴⁷ Burgon rejected the argument that the LE is not Markan because of its different literary style from that of Mark's Gospel (MK, Mk 1.1-16.8); he argued that the literary style of a work could be different within itself although written by only one author.⁴⁸ He provided the words εὐθέως and πάλιν which are favorite Markan words as evidences; he asserted that the argument that the LE is not Markan because of their absence in the LE should be dismissed because these words are not found in some other chapters in Mark's Gospel (i.e. MK) as well.⁴⁹

Many scholars have criticized Burgon's argument. Sturz, for instance, points out that Burgon's argument (along with the idea of E.F. Hills who agrees with Burgon) is based on a theological and dogmatic presupposition.⁵⁰ Sturz questions whether it is appropriate to argue for the 'providential preservation' of a certain text or text-type by understanding it as a result of divine 'inspiration'; he challenges Burgon and Hills, whose argument is based on their preference for the Byzantine texts, mentioning that no one is able to guarantee that the divinely preserved text should only be the Byzantine text.⁵¹

Sturz also points out the weakness of Burgon's argument (along with his followers such as Zane C. Hodges⁵² and W.N. Pickering) in that it rests on the numerical superiority of their preferred Byzantine text. Sturz gives three reasons for the numerical superiority of the Byzantine texts: Latinism, Moslem conquest, and

⁴⁷ Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 39-40.

⁴⁸ Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 138-43.

⁴⁹ Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses*, p. 169.

⁵⁰ Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type*, p. 37.

⁵¹ Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type*, pp. 38-45.

⁵² A quote from Hodges shows well what their argument is: 'Thus the *Majority text* [my italics], upon which the King James Version is based, has in reality the strongest claim possible to be regarded as an authentic representation of the original text.' ('The Greek Text of the King James Version', *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 125/500 [October-December, 1968], pp. 339-45 [pp. 344-45]).

late Moslem influence on the Byzantine region.⁵³ He argues that Latin prevailed over Greek in the Alexandrian region and the West, and that this has resulted in the numerical inferiority of the Greek manuscripts in these areas. Secondly and thirdly, the Moslems conquered Alexandria in the early seventh century, whereas the Byzantine area was safe until the mid-fifteenth century. This has made the incessant reproduction of manuscripts in this region possible. Therefore, Burgon's argument for the authenticity of the LE, which is based on his preference for the Byzantine texts due to its numerical superiority, is under criticism.

William R. Farmer is another scholar who is in favour of Markan authorship of the LE. In his monograph, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, which was originally a response to Kenneth W. Clark's presidential address of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1965,⁵⁴ Farmer deals with the Markan authorship of the LE. He applies two approaches for the examination of the LE, viz., the external and the internal evidence. In part one, he examines the witnesses of the Fathers and manuscripts to the inclusion or omission of the LE. In the second part, as for the internal evidence, he examines the vocabulary and phrases of the LE in comparison with the 'rest of Mark'.⁵⁵

Farmer explores the problem of inclusion versus omission of the LE, questioning, 'Why do some manuscripts omit the LE, whereas others do not?' For the investigation, he classifies the manuscripts according to Burnett H. Streeter's local text theory: Alexandria, Antioch, Caesarea, Italy and Gaul, and Carthage.⁵⁶

⁵³ Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type*, pp. 47-48.

⁵⁴ Clark's address was published as 'Theological relevance of textual variation in current criticism of the Greek New Testament', *JBL* 85 (1966), pp. 1-16.

⁵⁵ It is noteworthy that Farmer mentions 'the rest of Mark' when he examines the LE with its relationship to Mark's Gospel, which is Mk. 1.1.-16.8 (*The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974], p. 83). This is suggestive in that he understands the LE as a part of Mark's Gospel.

⁵⁶ Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, p. 50

Farmer points out that the local text of Antioch, Caesarea and Carthage are divided, exhibiting both inclusion and omission; that of Alexandria is favouring omission, whereas those of Italy and Gaul are strongly in favour of inclusion. He reclassifies these five manuscript groups into three, which are (1) Alexandrian for Alexandria, (2) Eastern for Caesarea and Antioch, and (3) Western for Italy-Gaul and North Africa respectively, and adds the fourth group of manuscripts, (4) the later Byzantine. He concludes that the Alexandrian textual group predominantly supports omission of the LE, the Eastern group leans to inclusion, and the Western group is predominantly for inclusion.⁵⁷

Farmer finds his explanation of this discrepancy between groups of manuscripts concerning the inclusion and omission of the LE in the arguments of Ernest C. Colwell and Günther Zuntz. Colwell argues that the Beta texttype, which Farmer refers to as \aleph and B, is an Alexandrian production.⁵⁸ On the other hand, Farmer quotes Zuntz's argument that the Alexandrian bishopric took over the scriptorium, the result of which has 'set the standard for the Alexandrian type of Biblical manuscript'.⁵⁹ Farmer connects Zuntz's argument with Colwell's, assuming that the omission of the LE from the Alexandrian texts is probably due to the influence of the Alexandrian textual criticism and its concern for the church.⁶⁰

Farmer assumes that the Alexandrian school could not accept mysterious phenomena such as taking deadly drugs with no harmful effect and laying hands of healing on the sick in their literal sense. They interpreted allegorically any supernatural phrases within the text in spiritual light. Accordingly, the Alexandrian

⁵⁷ Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 51-52.

⁵⁸ Colwell, 'The origin of texttypes of New Testament manuscripts', in A.P. Wikgren (ed.), *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby* (Chicago: Quardangle Books, 1961), pp. 128-38 (p. 137).

⁵⁹ Colwell, *The origin of texttypes*, p. 131; he quotes G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 271-73.

text could not accept the supernatural aspects in the LE, viz., 'picking up serpents and drinking poison without harm', as well. Therefore, Farmer assumes the Alexandrian church omitted this 'doubtful reading' from text, and they 'tolerated and perhaps even approved the reproduction and use of copies of Mark', which ends at 16.8.⁶¹

In the second part of his monograph, Farmer examines the use of language in the LE in comparison with the 'rest of Mark'. He criticizes R. Morgenthaler who conducted a statistical examination of words in the LE and concluded that the LE was not written by the same person who wrote the Gospel of Mark.⁶² Farmer himself conducts the linguistic and stylistic investigation of the LE, examining whether the words of the LE have any affinity with Mk 1.1-16.8.

Farmer examines the LE on statistical basis, which, ironically, his opponent Morgenthaler likewise had done to produce an opposite conclusion. Through his linguistic and stylistic examination of the LE, Farmer reaches a preliminary conclusion that: Mk 16.9, 11, 13, 15, and 20 are authentic Markan; Mk 16.12, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are considered neutral; and it is suspicious whether Mark himself created Mk 16.10.⁶³

In the conclusion, Farmer suggests five possible solutions to the question of Markan authorship of the LE.⁶⁴ He discards the options that the LE was the *de novo* creation of Mark the author, and that the LE was a later composition without any affinity to Mk 1.1-16.8. He is open to the alternative; that the LE was written by another author(s) who imitated Mark's literary style. However he prefers the solution

⁶⁰ Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, p. 71.

⁶¹ Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 65-71.

⁶² Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 79-83.

⁶³ Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 83-103.

⁶⁴ Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 107-108.

that the LE was Mark's redactional work of older material, which implies the Markan touch of the LE. Although he is reserved about making a confident and definite conclusion for Markan authorship of the LE, he basically accepts the LE as part of Mark's Gospel.

In spite of his cautious augmentation, Farmer has been criticized severely by many reviewers. George R. Beasley-Murray, for instance, doubts Farmer's suggestion concerning the Alexandrian omission of the LE, mentioning that it is implausible that Alexandrian scholars omitted such a lengthy passage due to some embarrassing passages.⁶⁵ Beasley-Murray also views Farmer's argument with a sceptical eye, because it leads to the corollary that Mark's Gospel was the last of the Synoptics produced, which costs too much risk to maintain it.⁶⁶

Gorden D. Fee points out several weak points in Farmer's argument. He states that the continuity between Mk 16.1-8 and 16.9-16 is so poor, because, for instance, there is no mention of the Galilean appearance in the LE that is promised in Mk 16.7.⁶⁷ J. Neville Birdsall also harshly criticizes Farmer. For example, he mentions that Farmer, like Burgon, wrote as if the numerical superiority endows the LE with dominant authentication.⁶⁸ Birdsall speaks that 'Farmer's hypothesis fails' because it is highly improbable that they omitted what they had received, considering the Christian philological traditions in Alexandria and elsewhere, which were very 'careful and responsible'.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Review of "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark" by W.R. Farmer', *RevExp* 72 (1975), pp. 373-75 (p. 374).

⁶⁶ Beasley-Murray, *Review*, p. 375.

⁶⁷ G.D. Fee, 'Review of "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark" by W.R. Farmer', *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 461-64 (p. 462).

⁶⁸ J.N. Birdsall, 'Review of "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark" by W.R. Farmer', *JTS* 26 (1975), pp. 151-60 (p. 153).

⁶⁹ Birdsall, *Review*, pp. 157-60.

1.2.1.2 The lost ending theory

Against the argument that supports the Markan authorship of the LE, many scholars have contended that the LE is not Mark's original ending and there must have been an original ending of Mark's Gospel somewhere. Those who do not accept the suppositions of the Markan authorship of the LE and the original ending at Mk 16.8 have suggested their alternatives; the lost ending theory and the mutilated ending theory. Some furthermore, have even tried to reconstruct the assumed lost or mutilated ending of Mark's Gospel.⁷⁰

The lost ending theory⁷¹ is based on the assumption that Mark's Gospel cannot have finished with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, which is inappropriate for an ending of a sentence or a paragraph.⁷² This argument also notices the discontinuity between MK and the LE, especially between Mk 16.8 and 16.9.⁷³ Johann J. Griesbach, one of the earliest scholars supporting the lost ending theory, argues as follows, recounting on what basis this theory is built:

... we know that these verses [Mk 16.9-20] are missing in the important Codex Vaticanus and were formerly lacking in many other ancient manuscripts. Nevertheless, it is very unlikely indeed that Mark ended his book at verse 8 with

⁷⁰ They are, for instance, E.J. Goodspeed ('The Original Conclusion of the Gospel of Mark', *AJT* 9 [1905], pp. 484-90 [p. 489]), H.E.H. Probyn ('The End of the Gospel of St. Mark', *Expositor* Ninth Series 4 [1925], pp. 120-25), C.J. Reedy ('Mk 8.31-11.10 and the Gospel Ending: a redaction study', *CBQ* 34 [1972], pp. 188-97), C.F.D. Moule ('St Mark 16.8 Once More', *NTS* 2 [1955], pp. 58-59), D.B. Taylor (*Mark's Gospel as Literature and History* [London: SCM Press, 1992], pp. 354-56), and B.H. Streeter (*The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* [London: Macmillan, 1930]); cf. E. Trocmé, *La Formation de l'Évangile selon Marc* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963). Trocmé argues that the original Mark's Gospel consisted of chapters 1-13 (see his chapter four and the conclusion).

⁷¹ This theory was argued by Griesbach (*Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium*, pp. 68-135; esp. p. 127), H. Alford (*The Greek New Testament: with a Critically Revised Text, Prolegomena and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary; vol 1. The Four Gospels* [London: Rivington, 1868], p. 39), F.C. Burkitt (*The Old Latin and the Itala* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896], pp. 49-50; idem, *Two Lectures on the Gospels* [London: Macmillan, 1901]), R.O. Kevin ('The Lost Ending of the Gospel according to Mark', *JBL* 45 [1926], pp. 81-103), C.J. Reedy ('Mk 8.31-11.10 and the Gospel Ending'), D. Guthrie (*New Testament Introduction* [London: The Tyndale Press, 1970], pp. 76-79), H.B. Swete (*The Gospel According to St Mark: the Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Indices* [London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1908]), G.W. Trompf ('The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel', *NTS* 18 [1972], pp. 308-30).

⁷² Burkitt, *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, pp. 25ff; Swete, *St. Mark*, p. 399.

⁷³ Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, p. 77.

'for they were afraid'. It is therefore reasonable to conjecture that the real ending of the Gospel ... was accidentally lost ...⁷⁴

The lost ending theory assumes that the original ending of Mark's Gospel existed, but by accident was torn off and lost forever.

One of the most significant scholars who argue this theory is Burnett H. Streeter. Firstly he thinks that the words 'ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ' cannot be positioned at the end of a sentence, and accordingly there must be more after Mk 16.8. He then points out that the Mark's Gospel that ends at Mk 16.8 does not record the appearance of Jesus to the disciples that was promised at Mk 14.28 and 16.7. Therefore he argues that 'the author of the Gospel [of Mark] cannot have originally meant to end it without the account of the Appearance to the Apostles in Galilee which is twice prophesied in the text.'⁷⁵

Streeter argues that the original ending of Mark's Gospel was lost by accident. He mentions that the appearance of the resurrected Jesus to the disciples in Galilee, which was promised in Mk 14.28 and 16.7, is missing in Mark's Gospel, and that accordingly the lost ending must have contained the reunion of Jesus with his disciples. He assumes that Luke conferred his own source and if there was anything missing in Lukan source, Luke read Mark and added it to Luke's Gospel. Streeter points out that Luke, concerning Jesus' appearance to Peter, did not know more than 1 Cor. 15.5 and Mk 16.7, which is why Luke could not describe Jesus' appearance to Peter in more detail than Luke 24.34.⁷⁶ Therefore, Streeter assumes that the Gospel of Mark that Luke had did not include the original ending part, viz., that Luke had the Gospel of Mark with the lost ending.

Mentioning very cautiously that his argument is to be read 'not as

⁷⁴ Griesbach, *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium*, p. 127.

⁷⁵ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 337.

⁷⁶ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 342-44.

“criticism”, but merely as “scientific guessing”,⁷⁷ Streeter conjectures that the lost ending of Mark’s Gospel contained Jesus’ appearance to Mary Magdalene and to Peter who was fishing in Galilee with the other disciples. He also assumes that John’s description of Jesus’ appearance after the first Easter morning to Mary and his disciples was from the lost ending of Mark’s Gospel.⁷⁸

Streeter believes that the reappearance story in John’s Gospel came from both the Markan source and the Lukan or Proto-Lukan source.⁷⁹ He argues that Jesus’ appearance to the disciples in Jerusalem came from Lukan tradition, whereas that to Mary Magdalene, Peter in the Lake of Galilee, and Jesus’ final commission to ‘feed the sheep’ came from the Markan source, which was the lost ending of Mark’s Gospel. He believes that this lost ending of Mark’s Gospel was from the church in Ephesus.

He assumes that Mark’s Gospel was sent to Ephesus right after its composition, and the original ending of Mark’s Gospel was preserved in the form of oral tradition in Ephesus, whereas it was lost immediately in the Church of Rome.⁸⁰ This oral tradition in Ephesus could not survive because Mark’s Gospel without the original ending had already been accepted as authentic in Rome, and it happened before the communication concerning the Canon between Rome and Ephesus was made. Therefore, he argues that the original ending, had it even survived in Ephesus, could not have been restored.⁸¹

This argument is supported by Garry W. Trompf, who provides an answer to the question as to why we have no copies of the original. Trompf assumes that the

⁷⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 351.

⁷⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 351-52.

⁷⁹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 356-57.

⁸⁰ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 352-53, 356

⁸¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 352-53.

original ending was lost and it was replaced by the LE, which is a 'second edition' of Mark. He supports Streeter's argument by answering the question above in a quite simple manner, 'that we have no copies of the original ending of Mark because no first edition (or at least one containing xvi) is extant'.⁸²

Against the objection that the lost ending theory cannot be plausible because the local church must then have included the lost ending,⁸³ Streeter argues that the original ending of Mark's Gospel was lost almost immediately after its composition.⁸⁴ He assumes that, had the original ending been lost in a later period of time, it would have been recovered from another copy. Therefore he suggests that the original ending should have been torn off before it was circulated.

To the objection that the ending of a scroll cannot be torn off because it is protected by being positioned at the innermost side of a scroll,⁸⁵ Streeter argues that the end of a scroll was not safe, providing the example of copies of Romans with the last two chapters torn off, because a scroll was rolled from both ends.⁸⁶

There are some other scholars who reconstruct the assumed original ending of Mark's Gospel, presupposing that it was lost by accident. Charles J. Reedy, for instance, suggests that the original ending must have included the instruction about discipleship and the depiction of Jesus as the Messiah.⁸⁷ He examined Mk 8.11-11.10

⁸² Tromf, 'First Resurrection Appearance', pp. 327-28.

⁸³ E.g. R.H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), pp. 82-83; Cox, *History and Critique*, p. 108. Cox also criticizes this lost ending assumption, questioning why the scribe did not consult another copy of Mark's Gospel. He argues that the manuscripts of Mark, at least the oral tradition of Mark, were accessible so that the scribe could have filled in the missing parts.

⁸⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 338.

⁸⁵ Cf. Thomas, 'A Reconsideration of the Ending of Mark', p. 415.

⁸⁶ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 338-9. Cf. P. Katz, 'The Early Christians' Use of Codices instead of Rolls', *JTS* 46 (1945), pp. 63-65. Katz argues that the early Christian community wanted to differentiate themselves from the customs of the contemporary synagogues when they were splitting off from Judaism. The substitution of codices for rolls, he suggests, was one of the by-products of this tendency. C.H. Roberts ('The ancient book and the ending of St. Mark', *JTS* 40 [1939], pp. 253-57 [p. 253]) also argued that the Christians of the first century already used the gospels in the form of codex, and that it was not impossible for an ending of a manuscript to be torn off.

⁸⁷ Reedy, 'Mk 8.31-11.10 and the Gospel Ending', p. 196.

and observed a pattern of motif: the prediction of the passion (A), death (B), and the resurrection (C), which is followed by a section containing an instruction about the true meaning of discipleship (D) and the portrayal of Jesus as a Messianic figure with authority (E).

Reedy notices that this literary pattern is broken up at Mk 16.8. Therefore, he argues that there must have been some passages after Mk 16.8, and the missing part must be the original ending of Mark's Gospel. He concludes that the missing parts after Mk 16.8 are D (teaching on the true discipleship) and E (depiction of Jesus as endowed with Messianic authority).

C.F.D. Moule also suggests that the fear and silence of the women at the empty tomb should be understood in the same light of 2 Kings 4.29 and Lk. 10.4. Based on the assumption that ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ should not be an appropriate manner of ending, he suggests the fear of the women to be parenthesized, followed by an assumed ending; καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου (εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις. καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν. ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.), καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν τοῖς μαθηταῖς περὶ πάντων τούτων. He suggests that the fear and silence of the women should be an excuse for their flight, and they eventually delivered the message to the disciples, which is the missing part of the ending of the Gospel of Mark.⁸⁸

1.2.1.3. The mutilated ending theory

Another alternative that rejects the Markan authorship of other endings such as the LE and the SE and the assumption of Mk 16.8 as the original ending of Mark's Gospel is the mutilated ending theory.⁸⁹ It is argued that the original ending of

⁸⁸ Moule, 'St Mark 16.8 Once more', pp. 58-59.

⁸⁹ For the recent argument for this hypothesis, see N.C. Croy, *The Mutilation of Mark's Gospel* (Nashville: Arbingdon Press, 2003).

Mark's Gospel existed, but for some reason it was suppressed on purpose. This theory assumes that those who received the original Mark's Gospel with a complete ending omitted the original ending because they could not accept it.

C.S.C. Williams has suggested an answer to the reason for the mutilation of this ending of Mark's Gospel.⁹⁰ He supposes two possibilities; Firstly, the mutilation was caused because of the discrepancy of witnesses to the appearance of the resurrected Jesus in the gospels. He mentions that Mk 14.28 and 16.7 imply that the author of Mark's Gospel wanted to put the resurrected Jesus in Galilee not in Jerusalem. The appearance accounts in Luke, John 20⁹¹, and the LE, however, limit its spatial setting within Jerusalem or the region around Jerusalem. The discrepancy between the original Markan ending and other gospel narratives concerning the appearance of the resurrected Jesus led the scribe to mutilate the original ending of Mark's Gospel.⁹²

Secondly, Williams supposes the Markan phrase 'after three days' has influenced the mutilation of the original ending.⁹³ He points out that Mark mentions 'after three days' in reference to the first Easter day (Mk 8.31; 9.31; 10.34), whereas Matthew and Luke puts it as 'on the third day'. Williams assumes that Matthew and Luke knew that Mark did not mean the fourth day when he mentioned 'after three days', and they corrected it into 'on the third day'. He contends that the mutilation was done 'not by a Council but by an individual' who believed Luke's account that the disciples waited for Jesus in Jerusalem. The scribe who believed Luke's witness,

⁹⁰ C.S.C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), p. 44.

⁹¹ Williams ascribes the discrepancy of appearance places between John 20 and 21 to the difference of authorship of the Fourth Gospel, i.e., John 21 as a Johannine appendix.

⁹² See also B.W. Bacon, *The Beginning of the Gospel Story: a historico-critical inquiry into the sources and structure of the Gospel according to Mark: with expository notes upon the text for English readers* (New Haven: H. Frowde, 1909), p. 18; idem, *The Gospel of Mark: its composition and date* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925), p. 190.

⁹³ Williams, *Alterations*, pp. 44-45.

therefore, could not accept the Markan account of Easter that dates it as ‘after three days’, and accordingly he mutilated this offensive ending of Mark’s Gospel.

The mutilation theory, however, has been criticized by many scholars. C. René Gregory, for instance, rejects the possibility of mutilation of the original ending and the replacement of it with the passages from the LE, (i.e., Aristion ending, as Gregory understands) by pointing out the failure of the two assumed cases that are necessary to support the hypothesis.⁹⁴ For the hypothesis to be acceptable, according to Gregory, one of two cases should have happened: both the manuscripts with the proper ending that the scribe could not access and the manuscript with Aristion ending should have been available to us. If this is not the case, viz., if the scribe had all the manuscripts with him, it means that we should have had only one manuscript with the Aristion ending.

Gregory however, dismisses these two possibilities, mentioning ‘neither of these things is the actual case.’⁹⁵ He mentions that we have old manuscripts whose scribe must have understood the ending of Mark’s Gospel at Mk 16.8. Furthermore, Gregory provides the manuscript with the SE followed by the LE (i.e., the Aristion ending), which he himself found at Mount Athos to support his argument. He understands that the existence of various types of Markan ending proves the improbability of the mutilation hypothesis.

1.2.1.4. The incomplete work theory

Unlike the lost and the mutilation theory, the incomplete work theory believes that the original ending never existed. This theory assumes that the author of Mark’s

⁹⁴ C.R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), p. 512.

⁹⁵ Gregory, *Canon and Text*, p. 512.

Gospel could not finish his writing for some reason. Like the two theories above, its argument is based on the assumption that Mk 16.8 is not an appropriate ending of Mark's Gospel. This section will deal with C.E.B. Cranfield and A.E.J. Rawlinson, who support this theory.

Cranfield, in his commentary on Mark, argues that the original ending of Mark's Gospel was never written.⁹⁶ He points out that the fear of the women at the tomb should be understood in parallel with such words that express fear and amazement as ἐξεθαμβήθησαν, μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε, ἔφυγον, τρόμος, ἔκστασις, which are found in the empty tomb pericope. He maintains that the women's fear should be understood as a temporary human emotion: 'It is not surprising that the women were afraid and rendered speechless *for a while* [my italics].'⁹⁷

Therefore, Cranfield argues that something should have happened after this temporary silence of the women. Disagreeing with John M. Creed who believes that Mark's Gospel ends at 16.8,⁹⁸ he mentions that had it been the intended ending, Mark should not have finished his sentence with such an odd expression.⁹⁹ This has led Cranfield to reject the hypothesis that Mk 16.8 was the original ending, stating that it 'should surely be rejected'.¹⁰⁰

Cranfield mentions that the report of the resurrection appearances was not supposed to be omitted because it was a very important element of primitive preaching.¹⁰¹ Accordingly, he argues that it is improbable that Mark, the author, finished his story without mentioning the appearance of the resurrected Jesus, and he too should have wanted to include it in his narrative as other Gospel authors and Paul

⁹⁶ Cranfield, *St. Mark*, pp. 469-71.

⁹⁷ Cranfield, *St. Mark*, pp. 470.

⁹⁸ J.M. Creed, 'The Conclusion of the Gospel According to Saint Mark', *JTS* 31 (1930), pp. 175-80.

⁹⁹ Cranfield, 'St. Mark 16.1-8', *SJT* 5 (1952), pp. 398-413 (p. 406).

¹⁰⁰ Cranfield, *St. Mark*, p. 471.

did. Therefore, he concludes that; 'we judge that the most likely alternative is that Mark intended to include an account of at any rate one Resurrection appearance, but for some reason never finished his Gospel.'¹⁰²

A.E.J. Rawlinson argues that the original ending of Mark's Gospel was not written for some reason.¹⁰³ His argument, like that of Cranfield, begins with doubt whether 'for they were afraid' is an appropriate conclusion of a book. He maintains that this phrase is not suitable for the conclusion of a book, not to mention a sentence. Therefore, he assumes that there should have been something beyond the fearful flight of the women.

The second step on which his argument rests is the assumption that Mark should have included the pericope about the appearance of the resurrected Jesus. He assumes that 'it appears in any case to be virtually certain that Mk must have intended to chronicle an appearance of the Risen Lord to S. Peter, and probably other appearances as well.'¹⁰⁴ Therefore, his assumption leads to three possibilities: the lost ending, the mutilated ending, and the unfinished ending.

Rawlinson examines the two hypotheses, the lost and mutilation theory.¹⁰⁵ He points out that these two theories are based on the assumption that the original ending was lost or mutilated right after its composition and before its circulation. He notices these theories suppose that Matthew and Luke did not know the content of the original ending of Mark. Based on these observations, he questions where else, then, it survived.

Rawlinson suggests two possibilities where the original ending of Mark's

¹⁰¹ He provides 1 Cor. 15.5ff; Acts 1.22; 2.32; 3.15; 10.41; 13.31 for examples.

¹⁰² Cranfield, 'St. Mark 16.1-8', p. 408.

¹⁰³ A.E.J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1936), pp. 267-71.

¹⁰⁴ Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 268.

¹⁰⁵ Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, pp. 268-69.

Gospel might have survived; the Gospel of Peter and the Gospel of John chapter twenty-one. Firstly, the author of the Gospel of Peter might have known the alleged original ending of Mark's Gospel. Agreeing with Cuthbert H. Turner however,¹⁰⁶ Rawlinson observes that the author of this apocryphal document knew the Mark's Gospel that ends at Mk 16.8, and relied on the witness of John's Gospel concerning the appearance of the resurrected Jesus. Secondly, the assumption that John 21 relied on the disappeared original ending of Mark's Gospel subsequently leads to another assumption that the author of John 21 is identified with that of chapters 1-20. Rawlinson, however, refutes this possibility mentioning it is 'quite fanciful'.¹⁰⁷

Therefore, Rawlinson concludes that the allegedly disappeared original ending of Mark's Gospel did not survive anywhere, and in fact, it never existed. He argues that the author of Mark's Gospel did not finish his work:

[T]hey never existed – that the Gospel was unfinished. The author broke off in the middle of a sentence, and never resumed. Did he die? Was he suddenly arrested and martyred? Or did he leave Rome, where he was working, and for some reason never return? We have no data for answering these questions, but at least it is probable that even if the original autograph of the Gospel were damaged or torn, the missing portion would surely have been restored by the author himself, had he been living and accessible.¹⁰⁸

The incomplete ending theory, along with the other two theories above, have been criticized by many scholars, especially by those who argue that Mark's Gospel ends at 16.8 from a literary perspective.¹⁰⁹ Robert H. Lightfoot, for instance, contends that the incomplete ending theory is not probable because had it not yet been written, the local church would have provided a suitable conclusion. However, no attempt or

¹⁰⁶ C.H. Turner, 'The Gospel of Peter', *JTS* 14 (1913), pp. 161-95.

¹⁰⁷ Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 269.

¹⁰⁸ Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 270.

¹⁰⁹ C.F. Evans (*Resurrection and the New Testament* [London: SCM Press, 1981], p. 72) introduces many of them.

action was made to do so.¹¹⁰

This theory is not plausible in that it does not provide historical evidences; we do not know for sure, as Rawlinson himself admits above, how and why it happened. Williams criticizes the incomplete ending theory because it tries to solve the problem from a historical perspective, which in essence should be dealt with from a literary point of view.¹¹¹ Steven L. Cox too points out that this hypothesis lacks proof to support its argument and is, accordingly, a conjecture.¹¹²

1.2.2 'for they were afraid.': Mk 16.8 is the original ending

The hypotheses above, although their arguments are different from each other, are all based on the common assumption that Mk 16.8 is not the original ending of Mark's Gospel. This common assumption is rooted in two kinds of scepticism: the grammatical or linguistic scepticism and the literary scepticism. The linguistic scepticism that has resulted in the objection to the hypothesis of the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 finds its pivotal expression in Burkitt's comment: 'In no case would the Gospel have originally ended with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Ought we not, indeed, to print ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ ... with a grave accent? It is very unusual to find clauses, much less paragraphs, which end with γάρ.'¹¹³ That is to say, they object to the hypothesis of the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 by answering 'No' to a question, 'Can a book or a sentence end with γάρ?'

The second scepticism against the hypothesis that assumes Mk 16.8 as the original intended ending, questions whether it is an appropriate ending of a literary work. This literary scepticism about the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 is well expressed

¹¹⁰ Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message*, p. 83.

¹¹¹ Williams, *Other Followers of Jesus*, pp. 192-93.

¹¹² Cox, *History and Critique*, p. 109.

¹¹³ Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 49.

by Westcott and Hort; ‘It is incredible that the evangelist deliberately concluded either a paragraph with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, or the Gospel with a petty detail of a secondary event, *leaving his narrative hanging in the air* [my italics].’¹¹⁴

Some, however, did not agree with these hypotheses by maintaining that Mk 16.8 is the original ending of Mark’s Gospel. Their arguments are mainly focused on these two sceptical questions that their opponents make. In the following part, I will deal with scholars who argue for the hypothesis that the original Markan ending was Mk 16.8 by giving a positive answer to these questions.

1.2.2.1 ‘Can a book finish with γάρ?’

Many scholars contend that γάρ in Mk 16.8 is not inappropriate for ending Mark’s Gospel. For this argument to be accepted, it needs two supporting evidences, as Paul Danove well pointed out;

The response to this objection [arguing that Mark originally did not intend to finish his Gospel with γάρ] requires the determination of whether contemporary Greek texts admitted the use of an ending in γάρ and whether such a usage is in keeping with the narrative techniques of the Gospel of Mark.¹¹⁵

That is to say ‘Did contemporary Greek works often finish with γάρ?’ and, ‘Was this literary style adopted by Mark?’ Scholars, therefore, have investigated ancient Greek texts to find external evidence that answers the first question on the one hand, and have examined Mark’s Gospel itself, on the other hand, to provide internal evidence that answers the second question.

The external evidence to answer the first question was provided by some scholars in the 1920’s.¹¹⁶ Carl H. Kraeling, one of the pioneers of this investigation,

¹¹⁴ Westcott and Hort, ‘Notes on Select Readings’, p. 46.

¹¹⁵ P.L. Danove, *The End of Mark’s Story: A Methodological Study* (Leiden; NY; Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993), p. 128.

¹¹⁶ They are, for example, C.H. Kraeling (‘Brief Communications: a philological note on

provided a business document P. Oxy. No. 1223 dating from the fourth century CE, and containing a sentence that ends with γάρ. Considering this ancient text, he concluded that Mk 16.8 ending in ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is acceptable.¹¹⁷ R.R. Ottley and Henry J. Cadbury have added more supporting evidences to Kraeling's. They found many sentences ending with γάρ in ancient Greek literary texts written by such writers as Homer, Aeschylus, and Euripides,¹¹⁸ as well as in some documents dated from the first century to third century CE.¹¹⁹

Furthermore, Morton S. Enslin has supported the argument that a sentence can end with γάρ by providing some evidence not only from contemporary Greek texts but also from biblical texts.¹²⁰ He gave a few sentences from the LXX that end with γάρ as examples.¹²¹ He provided Genesis 18.15 as strong evidence that proved the hypothesis that Mark's Gospel ending with γάρ was not impossible. He mentioned that the author of the pericope in Gen. 18.1-15 finished his sentence by making his narrator comment Sarah's emotion with the phrase '...ἐφοβήθη γάρ.', which is fairly similar to Mark's style at Mk 16.8.¹²²

In spite of these textual evidences, some scholars have hesitated to accept the validity of a sentence ending with γάρ.¹²³ Pieter W. van der Horst, however, criticizing Robert H. Stein as an example of those scholars, argues that a paragraph, as well as a sentence, can finish with this Greek word. Providing many examples of

Mark 16.8', *JBL* 44 [1925], pp. 357-58), R.R. Ottley ('εφοβουντο γαρ Mark xvi 8', *JTS* 27 [1926], pp. 407-409), H.J. Cadbury ('Brief Communications: Mark 16.8', *JBL* 46 [1927], pp. 344-45), and M.S. Enslin ('εφοβοουντο γαρ Mark 16.8', *JBL* 46 [1927], pp. 62-68).

¹¹⁷ Kraeling, 'Brief Communications', p. 358.

¹¹⁸ Ottley, 'εφοβουντο γαρ Mark xvi 8', pp. 408-409. For a list of authors and works that contain sentences ending in γάρ, see Cox, *History and Critique*, pp. 222-27.

¹¹⁹ Cadbury, 'Brief Communications', p. 345.

¹²⁰ Enslin, 'εφοβοουντο γαρ Mark 16.8', pp. 62-68.

¹²¹ They are, for instance, Gen. 18.15; 45.3; Is. 29.11; Jn 13.13; Rom. 3.3; Phil. 1.18, etc.

¹²² Enslin, 'εφοβοουντο γαρ Mark 16.8', p. 63.

¹²³ They are, for example, Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, p. 337), V. Taylor (*St. Mark*, p. 609), R.H. Stein ('The Proper Methodology for Ascertainning a Markan Redaction History', *NovT* 13 [1971], pp. 181-98 [p. 196, n. 6]).

ancient texts whose sentences, paragraphs, and even the entire text itself ending with γάρ, he concludes that ‘Mark 16.8 was the real ending of Mark.’¹²⁴

The second question to be answered is whether this literary style of ending a sentence or a paragraph with γάρ is applied to Mark’s Gospel as well. Thomas E. Boomershine and Gilbert L. Bartholomew give an answer to this question.¹²⁵ Boomershine and Bartholomew, raising an objection to Wilfred L. Knox who viewed Mark’s ending at Mk 16.8 not as Mark’s style but as a ‘highly sophisticated type of modern literature’,¹²⁶ argue that ending in ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is Markan literary style.

Boomershine and Bartholomew examine Mark’s Gospel to provide three internal evidences that support the ending at Mk 16.8 as the original ending of Mark’s Gospel. They suggest (1) narrative commentary, (2) inside views, and (3) short sentences. They firstly argue that Mark, the author, employs a literary technique of narrative commentary¹²⁷ that functions both as an explanation of an embarrassing event that occurred in the previous pericope and as a catalyst that draws the audience into the narrative by raising further questions. They provide two pericopae, ‘Walking on the Water (Mk 6.45-52)’ and ‘The Plot to Kill Jesus (Mk 14.1-2)’, as examples of Markan narrative commentary, and argue that each ending of these pericopae functions just like Mk 16.8.¹²⁸

Boomershine and Bartholomew examine some pericopae in Mark’s Gospel

¹²⁴ P.W. van der Horst, ‘Can a Book End with ΓΑΡ? – a note on Mk 16.8’, *JTS* 23 (1972), pp. 121-24.

¹²⁵ T.E. Boomershine and G.L. Bartholomew, ‘The Narrative Technique of Mark 16.8’, *JBL* 100/2 (1981), pp. 213-23.

¹²⁶ W.L. Knox, ‘The Ending of St. Mark’s Gospel’, *HTR* 35 (1942), pp. 13-23 (pp. 22-23).

¹²⁷ Narrative commentary refers to a literary device that a narrator interrupts a narrative to give information or to comment on an event or the character directly to the reader. D. Rhoads refers to it as ‘asides’. For more understanding of this device, see D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999, 2nd edn), pp. 41-42.

¹²⁸ Like Boomershine and Bartholomew (‘Narrative Technique’, pp. 215, 222), W.C. Allen (‘St. Mark 16.8, “They were afraid.” Why?’, *JTS* 47 [1946], pp. 46-49 [p. 48]) argues that ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is related to the women’s experience of surprising and confusing phenomenon. They understand that this last sentence is the answer to the question why women fled away and kept silence.

such as the pericope of ‘Paying Taxes (Mk 12.13-17)’, ‘Walking on the Water (Mk 6.45-52)’, where the Markan narrator adopts the technique of the inside views, and argue that this technique is also employed in Mk 16.8.¹²⁹ They find that Mark uses the device of the inside views that shows the emotional responses of characters at the end of each pericopae above. They argue that Mark’s technique of inside views is employed to end some pericopae, and that it is also applied to the end of Mark’s Gospel.

Boomershine and Bartholomew, thirdly, argue that ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is an independent and separate sentence. They maintain that γάρ is not connected to the alleged missing part that follows it but to the preceding sentence, which explains why the women kept silent. Therefore, they argue that ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ is not a Greek *phrase* which is translated into ‘because they were afraid of...’ but is a Greek *sentence* to be translated into ‘because they were afraid.’

1.2.2.2 Markan ending for the polemics

As I have mentioned above, those scholars who object to the hypothesis of Mk 16.8 as the original ending of Mark’s Gospel ask whether it is appropriate to end a text by leaving the narrative ‘hanging in the air’.¹³⁰ It is argued that such a narrative ending is a very sophisticated literary work, and does not seem to be an ancient but a modern literary technique. J. Lee Magness, however, has argued that such a highly sophisticated literary technique was not new to ancient authors.¹³¹

In this part (1.2.2.2) and the following one (1.2.2.3), I will deal with two groups of scholars respectively who argue for Mark ending at Mk 16.8 from a

¹²⁹ For ‘inside views’, see D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 39-45; W. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd edn; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983), chapters 7,8, and 9.

¹³⁰ Westcott and Hort, ‘Notes on Select Readings’, p. 46.

¹³¹ Magness, *Sense and Absence*. pp. 25-85 *et alibi*.

literary or sociological point of view. The scholars who will be discussed in this part interpret the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 in terms of certain conflicts between an assumed Markan community and its opponents. The other group of scholars (1.2.2.3) understand the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 in the light of its relationship with the reader. Regardless of the difference of their arguments, they understand that Mark's Gospel, being examined from a literary or socio-critical point of view, ends at Mk 16.8.

There are a group of scholars¹³² who assume that Mark the author intended to finish his narrative at Mk 16.8 for a polemical purpose. They interpret the Markan ending as reflecting certain conflicts between the Markan community and its opponents. They suggest that Mark's community, thought to be Galilean, was at odds with the Jerusalem community. They argue that Mark's community needed to denigrate the disciples, because they were leading the Jerusalem community. They believe that the author of Mark's Gospel achieved his purpose by depicting the women, the first witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, failing to deliver the message to the disciples; Mark finished his Gospel at Mk 16.8, and the Jerusalem community that did not see the resurrected Jesus, therefore, lost its apostolic authority.

Theodore J. Weeden, one of the most significant scholars who argue for the assumption that Mark's Gospel was composed for polemical purposes,¹³³ understands that Mark's Gospel ends at Mk 16.8. He assumes that Mark's community was in

¹³² This group includes T.J. Weeden (*Mark: Traditions in Conflict* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971], idem, 'The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel', *ZNW* 59 [1968], pp. 145-58), J. Schreiber ('Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums', *ZTK* 58 [1961], pp. 175-79), J.B. Tyson ('The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark', *JBL* 80 [1961], pp. 261-68), J.D. Crossan ('Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16.1-8)', in W.H. Kelber [ed.], *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976], pp. 135-52), W. Munro ('Women Disciples in Mark?', *CBQ* 44 [1982], pp. 225-41), and W.H. Kelber (*The Kingdom in Mark: a New Place and a New Time* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974]; idem, 'Apostolic Tradition and the Form of the Gospel', in F.F. Segovia [ed.], *Discipleship in the New Testament* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], pp. 39-42).

¹³³ Weeden, 'The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel', p. 145.

crisis because of internal and external threats: the delayed *parousia* and the *theios-aner* 'interlopers'. He argues that Mark's Gospel was composed to deal with these two problems, and Mark's Gospel ending at Mk 16.8 is playing a crucial role for them.

Weeden supposes that the Markan community was disturbed by persecutions and the delay of *parousia*, whereas the first generation eyewitnesses were passing away one by one. Therefore, he needed to encourage his community through the verification of the kerygma that Jesus indeed rose again and would be sure to return.¹³⁴ What makes the matter worse in this situation was the penetration of the *theios-aner* Christology which characterized Jesus as a splendid and glorious miracle-working messiah into the community by the disciples.¹³⁵ Accordingly, Weeden assumes, the Markan community had to find the best solution to treat both problems: to encourage his community on the one hand and to reject the *theios-aner* Christology on the other hand.

One of Mark's best solutions to these problems, according to Weeden, was the way of ending his story. Weeden, partly¹³⁶ adopting Neil Q. Hamilton's argument,¹³⁷ argues that Mark substituted the empty tomb story (a translation story

¹³⁴ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 106-107.

¹³⁵ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 52-69, 162.

¹³⁶ Weeden agrees with N.Q. Hamilton in seeing Mark's empty tomb narrative as a translation (i.e., one in which a person is removed from people and translated to another place) story. However, Weeden, unlike Hamilton ('The Resurrection Tradition and the Composition of Mark', *JBL* 84 [1965], pp. 415-21 [p. 420]), regards it not as an anti-resurrection story but as an anti-appearance-tradition narrative (*Traditions in Conflict*, p. 108)

¹³⁷ Hamilton, 'Resurrection Tradition', pp. 415-21. Hamilton, building on E. Bickermann's argument, contends that the empty tomb story should be understood as a translation story, not as a resurrection story. Bickermann, providing evidence from the Hellenistic hero legends, argues that the empty tomb story should be interpreted as a removal, not as a resurrection ('Das leere Grab', *ZNW* 23 [1924], pp. 281-92). Opposing Bickermann and Hamilton's arguments, P.G. Bolt argues that the resurrection of Jesus in Mark is different from the Hellenistic translations of heroes (e.g., Ganymede, Herakles, Empedocles, Romulus, Semiramis, Aristeas, Euthymos, and Apollonius) or Jewish translations (e.g., Enoch and Elijah), because Mark reports not only the empty tomb (i.e., the disappearance of the body) but also Jesus' death, burial and resurrection. Therefore, Bolt contends that the empty tomb story should be understood as a resurrection story ('Mark 16.1-8: The Empty Tomb of a Hero?', *TynBul* 47.1 [1996], pp. 27-37). *Pace* Bolt, A.Y. Collins contends that the resurrection story

involving the absence of the resurrected Jesus) for the appearance story on purpose.¹³⁸ He argues that this substitution of the translation story for the appearance story serves a double purpose.¹³⁹ Mark verifies that Jesus indeed rose again, since the translation (although it does not directly mention Jesus' resurrection) implies that his resurrection really occurred. By this substitution, on the one hand, Mark could assure his community that Jesus rose, and also encourage them to remain in their faith. At the same time, Mark could polemize against the legitimacy of his *theios-aner* opponents, i.e., the disciples, by proving the resurrection of Jesus not by means of his appearance to the disciples but by means of an angel-epiphany to the women, and by depicting the women not delivering the message.

Weeden supports his argument by his interpretation of Mk 16.7 and 8b. He argues that Mark inserted Mk 16.7 into the translation story to assure his community of the *parousia*.¹⁴⁰ He interprets the future form ὄψεσθε (16.7) as referring to the *parousia*, whereas the aorist form is seen as a technical term for a resurrection appearance,¹⁴¹ which is implied in Mk 16.6 as well (i.e., Jesus as the Nazarene is located in Galilee).¹⁴²

Weeden interprets Mark's ending at Mk 16.8b as evidence for his *theios-*

in Mark followed the contemporary Greco-Roman 'translation' model ('The Empty Tomb in the Gospel According to Mark', in E. Stump et al. [eds.], *Hermes and Athena* [Notre Dame, ND: University of Notre Dame, 1993], pp. 107-40 [pp. 129-31]).

¹³⁸ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 106-111; cf. Hamilton, 'Resurrection Tradition', p. 420.

¹³⁹ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 109ff.

¹⁴⁰ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 111ff.

¹⁴¹ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, p. 112. V. Taylor (*St. Mark*, p. 608) disagrees with those who understand ὄψεσθε as a technical term for the *parousia*, arguing that this verb is common and is used also of the resurrection. While Weeden and W. Marxsen (*Mark, the Evangelist* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1969], pp. 111-16) understand the reunion with Jesus in Galilee at Mk 14.28 and 16.7 as a reference to the *parousia*, C.F. Evans ('I Will Go Before You into Galilee', *JTS* [1954], pp. 3-18) argues that the reunion with Jesus there points to the Gentile mission, not the *parousia*. R.E. Brown (*The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* [NY: Doubleday, 1994], p. 132) and A.Y. Collins ('Empty Tomb', p. 122) likewise argue that 16:7 does not refer to the *parousia*. N. Perrin (*The Resurrection according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977], pp. 25-34; idem, *The Resurrection Narratives: A New Approach* [London: SCM Press, 1977], p. 30), like Weeden, argues for the interpretation of these two verses as a reference to the imminent *parousia*.

aner theory.¹⁴³ He argues that Mark deliberately added Mk 16.8b, ending his story with the women's fearful flight in silence in order to suggest that the disciples did not receive the young man's message. Therefore, they did not meet the resurrected Jesus, and they were not commissioned with apostolic authority.¹⁴⁴

He argues that the silence of the women is not an expression of awe to the divinity but of cowardly fear, which portrays them negatively.¹⁴⁵ By ending his narrative with the negative characterization of the women, who keep silent in fear and do not follow the directions of the young man at the tomb, Mark denigrates the disciples who espouse the *theios-aner* Christology; their legitimacy is discredited. Mark's ending at 16.8 with the negative portrayal of the women as failures, therefore, plays one of the most crucial roles in his gospel in opposing the evangelist's *theios-aner* adversaries, and is a very purposeful and intended ending.

Joseph B. Tyson and John D. Crossan agree with Weeden in arguing that the Gospel of Mark reflects an assumed conflict between the Markan community and its opponents, and that the Markan ending at 16.8 is an intended ending which contributes to Mark's purpose to denigrate his adversaries. These two scholars,

¹⁴² Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, p. 109.

¹⁴³ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, p. 117.

¹⁴⁴ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, p. 50.

¹⁴⁵ Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, p. 48. Many scholars debate the question whether the silence of the women at 16:8b is a natural human response to theophanies or not. For instance, R.P. Meye ('Mark 16:8 - The Ending of Mark's Gospel', *BibRes* 14 [1969], pp. 33-43) argues that the response is just a human response to theophanies. R.A. Culpepper ('The Passion and Resurrection in Mark', *RevExp* 75 [1978], pp. 583-600) and D. Catchpole ('The Fearful Silence of the Women at the Tomb', *JTSA* 18 [1977], pp. 3-10), J.L. Magness (*Sense and Absence*, pp. 87-105), E.S. Malbon ('Fallible Followers: women and men in the Gospel of Mark', *Semia* 28 [1983], pp. 29-48 [pp. 43-45]), and T. Dwyer (*The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark* [JSNTSup 128; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], pp. 185-95) share the same idea with Meye. W. Munro ('Women Disciples in Mark?', pp. 225-41), in contrast, argues that the silence cannot be understood as a human response to theophanies. A.Y. Collins ('Mysteries in the Gospel of Mark', *ST* 1/49 [1995] pp. 11-23), on the other hand, comparing the patterns of responses to the theophanies in Dan. 8.18; 10.9-12; Rev. 1.17-20; 4 Ezra 10.29-36 with that of the women in Mk 16.8, suggests that although the response of the women at 16:8b is a normal human response to theophanies (idem, 'Empty Tomb' p. 122), it cannot portray them positively. Mary Cote ('Women, Silence and Fear (Mark 16.8)', in G.J. Brooke [ed.] *Women in the Biblical Tradition* [NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992], pp. 150-66) argues that the women kept silent because in the ancient world women were stereotypically depicted as keeping silent in public. Although her argument is interesting, it does not seem persuasive.

unlike Weeden, believe that the opponents are not only the disciples but also Jesus' relatives.¹⁴⁶

Tyson argues that the disciples in Mark misunderstood true messiahship. He claims that Jesus' three predictions of his passion (Mk 8.31-33; 9.30-32; 10.32-34) reveal the misunderstanding of the disciples. He argues that the disciples' response to these predictions shows that they expected a royal messiah, which is different from Mark's understanding of a suffering messiah.¹⁴⁷

Tyson assumes that the disciples took high-ranking offices in the Jerusalem Church. He argues that this Jerusalem Church was also under the control of Jesus' family from its earliest period, noting evidence from the record of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3. 11. 1; 3. 32.3; 4. 5. 3-4). Tyson argues that the Jerusalem Church adhered to Jewish customs regarding matters such as circumcision and kosher food, and that it had no desire for a Gentile mission.¹⁴⁸

Tyson, adopting Ernst Lohmeyer's argument, contends that Mark represents Galilean Christianity, which pursued a 'Son of Man' Christology. He argues that the Markan Church, i.e., Galilean Christianity, opposed the Jerusalem Church, which clung to a 'Son of David' Christology.¹⁴⁹ The Markan community, unlike the Jerusalem Church, had an interest in Gentile mission. Therefore, he concludes that Mark's Gospel challenged the Jerusalem Church represented by Jesus' family and the disciples.¹⁵⁰

Tyson finds that the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 contributes to his argument.

¹⁴⁶ W.H. Kelber agrees with them in this point (*The Kingdom in Mark*, pp. 64, 136), although he finds the reason of the Markan ending at 16.8 at Mark's attempt to answer the catastrophe of the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE (*Mark's Story of Jesus* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979], p. 91).

¹⁴⁷ Tyson, 'Blindness', pp. 262-64.

¹⁴⁸ Tyson, 'Blindness', pp. 265-67.

¹⁴⁹ Tyson, 'Blindness', pp. 266-68.

¹⁵⁰ Tyson, 'Blindness', p. 268.

According to his interpretation, Mark, by means of the silence of the women in Mk 16.8, suggests that the disciples did not receive the message to meet Jesus in Galilee.¹⁵¹ The failure of the disciples to meet Jesus leaves a negative impression of them. Tyson thus ascribes the negative portrayal of the disciples to the conflict between the Galilean Christianity and the Jerusalem Christianity, which was under the leadership of the disciples and Jesus' family.¹⁵²

Crossan also argues that Mark's Gospel reflects a conflict between the Markan community and its opponents. He understands the Markan ending at Mk 16.8 which portrays the women in a negative manner as directed against Mark's adversaries.¹⁵³ He too argues that Mark opposed the Jerusalem community which was under the leadership of the disciples and Jesus' family.¹⁵⁴ Mark, according to Crossan, could not agree with the theology of the disciples, and he challenged the 'doctrinal hegemony' of the disciples by opposing them. Mark also wanted to oppose Jesus' relatives who held the 'jurisdictional hegemony' in the Jerusalem community by depicting them negatively.¹⁵⁵

Mark's intentional ending at Mk 16.8 with a negative portrayal of the women at the empty tomb serves a double purpose: to oppose the disciples and the relatives of Jesus. With regard to the polemic against the disciples, Crossan traces the prototype of the story back to a credal statement such as 1 Cor. 15.3-7, where the death, burial, resurrection and appearance to Peter and the disciples are mentioned.¹⁵⁶

He attributes the difference between such a credal statement and Mark's

¹⁵¹ J.B. Tyson, *The New Testament and Early Christianity* (NY: MacMillan, 1984), pp. 175-76.

¹⁵² Tyson, *Early Christianity*, p. 177.

¹⁵³ Crossan, 'Empty Tomb', p. 146.

¹⁵⁴ J.D. Crossan, 'Mark and the Relatives of Jesus', *NovT* 15 (1973), pp. 81-113 (pp. 108-113).

¹⁵⁵ Crossan, 'Relatives', p. 112.

¹⁵⁶ Crossan, 'Empty Tomb', p. 145.

report of the empty tomb to Mark's redactional work. He argues that Mark ended his story with the women's fearful flight in silence in order to oppose the Jerusalem leadership. The failure of the women¹⁵⁷ brought discredit on the authority of the disciples.¹⁵⁸

With regard to the polemic against the relatives of Jesus, Crossan points to Mk 3.20-35, 6.1-6 and 15.40-16.8. He argues that Mark wanted to oppose the 'jurisdictional hegemony' of the relatives of Jesus in the Jerusalem community by including these three passages. First of all, he argues that the relatives of Jesus are very negatively portrayed in the first two passages: they blaspheme against the Holy Spirit (Mk 3.21); they dishonour Jesus (Mk 3.21); they are portrayed as allies of the Jerusalem authorities (Mk 3.21-31); they are identified with the townsmen who do not have faith (Mk 6.1-6).

Secondly, Crossan assumes that Mary and the two named persons (James and Joses) in the passion story (Mk 15.40, 47; 16.1) are identified as the relatives of Jesus in Mk 3.20-35 and 6.1-6.¹⁵⁹ Based on this assumption, he argues that Mark portrays the women at the empty tomb, one of whom is Jesus' relative,¹⁶⁰ negatively by ending his story in the women's fearful flight and silence at Mk 16.8 just as he portrays Jesus' relatives in Mk 3.20-35 and 6.1-10 negatively. Therefore, according to Crossan, the Markan ending at Mk 16.8, which finishes with this negative portrayal of the women at the empty tomb, shows the Markan polemic against the Jerusalem community.

¹⁵⁷ Crossan argues that the silence of the women in 16.8 is not meant as a natural response of human beings to the theophanies ('Empty Tomb', p. 149).

¹⁵⁸ J.D. Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity* (NY: HarperCollins, 1998), pp. 556-62.

¹⁵⁹ Some scholars such as V. Taylor (*St. Mark*, p. 598) and M. Barnouin ('Marie, Mère de Jacques et de José [Marc 15.40]: Quelques Observations', *NTS* 42 [1996], pp. 472-74), argue that Mary, James and Joseph (Jose) in Mk 15.40ff cannot be identified with Jesus' relatives in Mk 3.20-35 and 6.1-6.

¹⁶⁰ Crossan, 'Relatives', p. 110.

1.2.2.3 'The song is over but the melody lingers on'

Whereas one group of scholars interpret Mark's Gospel ending at Mk 16.8 in terms of a certain conflict between the assumed Markan community and its opponent the Jerusalem community, the other group of scholars¹⁶¹ understand it in light of the relationship between the Markan reader and the text. These scholars maintain that the abrupt ending of Mark's Gospel at Mk 16.8 is Mark's literary strategy to influence the reader. Therefore, the Markan ending at Mk 16.8, which seems to be 'hanging in the air' does not mean it is not the original intended ending of Mark's Gospel.

Thomas E. Boomershine is one of the scholars who argue that Mark's Gospel ends at Mk 16.8, and that it is the author's intention to finish as such. He contends that Mk 16.8 is a 'meaningful ending' by suggesting the idea of 'apostolic commission'. He argues that Mark's intended ending at Mk 16.8 urges his readers to fulfill the apostolic commission that the women at the empty tomb failed to perform.¹⁶² He maintains that the motif of 'disclosure and concealment' which is a part of the 'messianic secret' is totally reversed at Mk 16.8, and that this leads the reader to take over the role of the women while keeping a 'sympathetic distance' from the failing women.¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ It includes R. Tannehill, E. S. Malbon, M.A. Tolbert, T.E. Boomershine, J.F. Williams, A.T. Lincoln, P. Danove, M.J. Selvidge, E. Best, C. Bryan, and B.M.F. van Iersel, etc.

¹⁶² T.E. Boomershine, 'Mark 16:8 and the Apostolic Commission', *JBL* 100/2 (1981), pp. 225-39.

¹⁶³ M.A. Tolbert agrees with Boomershine in this light. Tolbert argues that Mark portrays the women as a 'rocky ground' model (*Sowing the Gospel* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989], p. 295), which is a 'change-of-heart' type ('How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character', *Int* 47 [1993], pp. 347-57 [pp. 352-54]). Agreeing with R. Tannehill ('Narrative Christology', *Semeia* 15 [1979], pp. 57-93 [pp. 83, 93]; idem, 'The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role', *JR* 57 [1977], pp. 386-405), Tolbert believes that the ending of Mark's Gospel is more or less ambiguous; therefore, according to Tolbert, the reader is curious whether the women finally delivered the news or not. She or he is also led to ask her/himself, 'If they do not deliver the news, who else will?' ('Mark', in C.A. Newsom and S.H. Ringe [eds.], *The Women's Commentary* [Louisville: W/JKP, 1992], pp. 263-74 [p. 274]). By ending his narrative ambiguously, Mark entices his readers to take over the role of followers of Jesus. E.S. Malbon also agrees with these two scholars above in arguing that Mark invites the reader to take over the role of the women by ending his narrative open-ended. She argues that the women at the cross, the burial, and the empty tomb are one of the fallible models in the Markan narrative ('Fallible Followers', p. 30), and that they are portrayed neither black nor white but gray

Boomershine develops his argument by dealing with Mark's characterization of the women at the cross, the burial and the empty tomb. He points out that Mark portrays them in a positive manner. According to Boomershine, the portrayal of the women from Mk 15.40 (the scene at the cross) to 16.7 (the scene of the young man's announcement) is positive.¹⁶⁴ The women are depicted as the only faithful followers of Jesus;¹⁶⁵ they serve (Mk 15.41, διηκόνουσι) in the same way as the angels (Mk 1.13), Peter's mother-in-law (Mk 1.31), and the Son of Man (Mk 10.45) do. The overall atmosphere of the scenes from Mk 15.40-16.7 is sympathetic as well;¹⁶⁶ the behaviour of the women in these scenes implies their mournful feelings. This sympathetic and positive portrayal of the women causes the reader to identify him/herself with them.

The high degree of identification of the reader with the women leads him or her to an embarrassment at Mk 16.8. The women react to the commission of the young man in a way contrary to the reader's expectation. Therefore Boomershine interprets the flight of the women in silence in an unambiguously negative way.

Boomershine however, understands the Markan ending at Mk 16.8, which finishes in a negative portrayal of the women, in a different way from the first group of scholars in the previous part. According to Boomershine, the reader is led to look at the women who flee in silence with a sympathetic eye, since she or he has received a positive impression of the women so far.¹⁶⁷ He argues that the flight and silence of the women is Mark's scheme to lead his reader to keep a 'sympathetic distance' from

('Text and Context: Interpreting the Disciples in Mark', *Semeia* 62 [1993], pp. 81-102 [p. 93]). Therefore, the reader is led to reflect on him/herself against the women by asking 'what then is my response?' ('Disciples/ Crowds/ Whoever: Markan Characterization and Readers', *NovT* 28/2 [1986], pp. 104-130 [pp. 124-25]).

¹⁶⁴ Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', pp. 231-33.

¹⁶⁵ Tolbert ('Mark', p. 273.) supports this argument.

¹⁶⁶ Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', p. 232.

¹⁶⁷ Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', pp. 228-30.

them.

Boomershine supports his argument by examining three emotional responses of the women at Mk 16.8, i.e., τρόμος, ἔκστασις and ἐφοβοῦντο.¹⁶⁸ He argues that these words have positive ethical connotations. These words are found at Mk 2.12; 4.41; 5.15, 33, 42; 9.6; 10.32, and they exhibit positive associations in each instance.¹⁶⁹ Therefore, the reader receives a positive impression of the women on the basis of these three words on the one hand; but on the other hand, she or he gets a negative impression because of the women's disappointing behaviour at Mk 16.8.

The reader is led to keep a 'sympathetic distance' from the women since the women at Mk 16.8 respond in both negative *and* positive ways. Mark, according to Boomershine, led his readers to realize that the women's response at Mk 16.8 was wrong, and by so doing, led him or her to keep a certain distance from them. However, Mark intended his readers to understand the women with sympathy as well.¹⁷⁰

Mark is appealing to his contemporary readers for repentance from the wrong reaction, as well as encouraging the right response, viz. the proclamation of the resurrection, by ending his gospel as he does. By means of the sophisticated literary strategy such as the complicated characterization of the women and the abrupt ending, Mark encourages his readers to fulfill the 'apostolic commission' that the women failed to perform.¹⁷¹

B.M.F. van Iersel is another scholar who believes that Mark ended his story

¹⁶⁸ Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', p. 228.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Nineham, *St. Mark*, pp. 447-48. Some scholars, such as A.T. Lincoln ('The Promise and the Failure', *JBL* 108/2 [1989], pp. 283-300 [pp. 285-87]) and Williams (*Other Followers*, p. 197), argue that these words in each pericope have negative connotations.

¹⁷⁰ Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', p. 237.

¹⁷¹ Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', p. 237. J. P. Heil agrees with Boomershine in this point ('The Progressive Narrative Pattern of Mark 14.53-16.8', *Bib* 73 [1992], pp. 331-58).

at Mk 16.8,¹⁷² and who understands Mark's manner of ending as the author's literary strategy to influence the reader. He argues that such an ending should be interpreted as Mark's intention to encourage his readers.¹⁷³ His argument is based on the assumption that Mark's community had undergone persecution,¹⁷⁴ and that severe persecution often caused Christians to betray fellow Christians.¹⁷⁵

van Iersel strengthens this argument of the contemporary Markan situation with the help of Timothy Radcliffe's investigation into the Markan social context. According to Radcliffe, Mark's Gospel was written for a community which experienced severe persecution at the hands of the Roman Empire, like the great Neronian persecution in 64 CE.¹⁷⁶ He argues that Christians were often betrayed to their persecutors by other Christians.¹⁷⁷ He provides a passage from Tacitus' *Annals* as evidence: 'First, then, the confessed members of the sect were arrested; next, *on their disclosures*, vast numbers were convicted... (*Ann.* 15.44; my italics)'¹⁷⁸

van Iersel also supports his hypothesis concerning the Markan situation by examining a few passages in Mark. He argues that Mk 9.40-48 alludes to the Markan situation of persecution.¹⁷⁹ The verb 'σκανδαλίση (Mk 9.42)', according to van Iersel,

¹⁷² B.M.F. van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary* (JSNTSup 164; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 507-508.

¹⁷³ A.T. Lincoln ('The Promise and the Failure', p. 297) and J.F. Williams (*Other Followers of Jesus*, p. 202) agree with van Iersel in this light. van Iersel, however, suggests a concrete social context for the first century reader, whereas Lincoln and Williams do not mention any specific situation of the reader to whom the encouragement was given. Cf. J. Hanson ('The Disciples in Mark's Gospel: Beyond the Pastoral/Polemical Debate', *HBT* 20/2 [1998], pp. 128-55) understands Mark's Gospel, especially with regard to his characterization of the disciples, as encouraging readers by leading them to look at not only their helplessness but also divine promise that restores them from their failure.

¹⁷⁴ B.M.F. van Iersel, 'The Gospel according to st. Mark - written for a persecuted community?', *NedTTs* 34 (1980), pp. 15-36.

¹⁷⁵ B.M.F. van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark: Mark 13:12 as a Key for the Identification of the Intended Readers', *CBQ* 58 (1996), pp. 244-63.

¹⁷⁶ T. Radcliffe, 'The Coming of the Son of Man: Mark's gospel and the subversion of "the apocalyptic imagination"', in B. Davies OP. (ed.), *Language, Meaning and God: Essay in honour of Herbert McCabe OP* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1987), pp. 176-89.

¹⁷⁷ Radcliffe, 'The Coming of the Son of Man', pp. 178-79.

¹⁷⁸ Radcliffe, 'The Coming of the Son of Man', p. 178.

¹⁷⁹ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', pp. 252-53.

refers to a betrayer's behaviour of naming other Christians, leading them to apostatize from their faith. In this light, he argues that the passage "Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε implies a situation in which a fugitive Christian is asking for help in the name of Jesus.¹⁸⁰

van Iersel presents Mk 10.28-30 as another example exhibiting the Markan situation of persecution and betrayal among the early Christians.¹⁸¹ This passage states a promise which will be given to those who have left their family and possessions for the sake of Jesus' name. This promise, according to van Iersel, implies a situation closely related to the persecution (μετὰ διωγμῶν; Mk 10.30). A further passage which exhibits the Markan situation of persecution and betrayal is Mk 13.9-13.¹⁸² Many Markan Christians handed over their brothers and parents in the faith to death (παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον; Mk 13.12) by naming them because of the unbearable torture.¹⁸³

These passages stress the motif of betrayal that is prevalent in Mark's narrative. John the Baptist, who foreshadows Jesus' destiny, is handed over to death by his protective custodian Herod (Mk 6.20). Like John, Jesus is handed over by Judas, one of his disciples. Peter, who made an oath that he would not abandon Jesus denies him three times. The disciples, who promised not to forsake Jesus (Mk 14.31b), betray him by fleeing (Mk 14.50). A young man in a linen cloth also flees naked when Jesus is arrested (Mk 14.51-52).

van Iersel interprets the ending of Mark's Gospel in this light. He assumes that the Markan Christians were failures; they had apostatized from their faith, and betrayed their fellow Christians. They were in great agony because they felt guilty

¹⁸⁰ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', p. 252.

¹⁸¹ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', pp. 253-24.

¹⁸² van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', pp. 244-63.

¹⁸³ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', pp. 256ff.

about their behaviour. Therefore, according to van Iersel, Mark needed to encourage them to overcome their guilt, and he finished his gospel at Mk 16.8 in order to make it serve this purpose.

van Iersel argues that Mark used two ways to encourage the Markan Christians. One is to present other failures such as the disciples of Jesus and the women at the empty tomb to them. The failure of the characters in the Markan ending would alleviate the pain of guilt which Mark's readers were suffering from, leading them to realize that even the great disciples had not succeeded. That is, the ending provides a place in which Markan Christians, who felt guilty because of their betrayal of their fellow Christians, could identify themselves.¹⁸⁴

The other is to teach readers that they will be forgiven despite their fall. Mark affirms that Jesus will be reconciled to the failures (Mk 16.7), and that his promise never disappoints.¹⁸⁵ By so doing, Mark encourages his readers who had failed by betraying his or her fellow Christians to overcome and to take a stance for Jesus once again after reading or hearing Mark's narrative. In this light, van Iersel's interpretation of Mk 16.8b appropriately presents his argument: 'the narrator's final comment on the flight of the women, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, sounds more like an apology than a reproach'.¹⁸⁶

1.3 Recent study on Markan endings

As I mentioned above, the Markan scholarship has focused on Mark's Gospel, ending at Mk 16.8, since it had been accepted as an authentic Markan ending. This

¹⁸⁴ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', p.245.

¹⁸⁵ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', pp. 258-62. See also, N.R. Petersen, 'When is the End Not the End? Literary Reflections on the Ending of Mark's Narrative', *Int* 34 (1980), pp. 151-66; idem, *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), pp. 77-78; J.D. Kingsbury, *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), pp. 112-13; idem, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), pp. 135-36.

has led many scholars to neglect the study of the other passages beyond Mk 16.8. For instance, most commentaries on Mark's Gospel deal with the other endings beyond Mk 16.8 only in a few pages, briefly describing what they are about.¹⁸⁷ However some scholars¹⁸⁸ have studied other endings in more detail, and I will deal with two scholars below.¹⁸⁹

James A. Kelhoffer explores the LE in his monograph *Miracle and Mission*, which was originally his doctoral dissertation. He makes a wide-ranging research of the LE in this monograph as he surveys the Markan scholarship concerning the ending of Mark's Gospel. He examines the LE text in comparison with other Gospels, Acts, Greco-Roman texts, Apocryphal documents, writings of ancient Church Fathers, Jewish writings of the Second Temple Periods, etc. His research consists of two parts; one illuminates the identity of the LE and the other its characteristics. The first part focuses on the questions when, how and why the LE was formed, and the second one on how the miracle-works described in the LE was formed and understood.

With regard to the formation of the LE, Kelhoffer argues that the author of the LE composed his writing in order to provide a more suitable conclusion to

¹⁸⁶ van Iersel, 'Failed Followers in Mark', p. 258.

¹⁸⁷ E.g. C.S. Mann, *Mark* (the Anchor Bible 27; NY: Doubleday, 1986); van Iersel, *Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*; H. Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark: based on the Revised Standard Version* (New Century Bible Commentary; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981); B.H. Branscomb, *The Gospel of Mark* (Moffatt New Testament Commentary; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946); L.W. Hurtado, *Mark* (A Good News Commentary; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983); L. Williamson, *Interpretation: Mark* (A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching; Atlanta: J. Knox Press, 1983), Cranfield, *St. Mark* etc. Some commentaries such as P.J. Achtemeier, *Mark* (Proclamation Commentary; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986) and D.H. Juel, *Mark* (Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament; Minneapolis, Augsburg Pub. House, 1990) do not deal with the other endings at all.

¹⁸⁸ E.g. W.L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974); H. Riley, *The Making of Mark: an exploration* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989); P.L. Danov, *The End of Mark's Story*.

¹⁸⁹ J. Hug also studied the ending of Mark's Gospel in more detail (*La Finale*), but I will not deal with him in this section for these two scholars' researches are more recent than Hug's. However, I will discuss his argument from time to time throughout my thesis.

Mark's Gospel.¹⁹⁰ Firstly, he performs a comparative examination of the LE with Mark's Gospel itself in the second chapter. He compares the writing style of the Markan author with that of the LE's author, and finds that many parts of the LE resemble Mark's Gospel in their vocabulary and grammatical aspects. He also compares the LE with other Gospels and Acts to suggest that the author of the LE knew other Gospels and probably Acts as well.¹⁹¹

Through his examination of the vocabulary and grammatical elements in the LE and other Gospels and Acts, Kelhoffer argues that the author of the LE did not intend to create a new writing. The author of the LE wanted to provide a more natural end to Mark's Gospel, the ending of which seemed unsatisfactory as a conclusion. Thus this ancient author imitated the endings of other Gospels and added an ending equivalent to the endings of other Gospels.¹⁹²

Kelhoffer asks what material the author of the LE used to create his ending in chapter three. He compares the LE with the manuscripts of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as well as Acts, and concludes that the author of the LE knew these Gospels and probably Acts too.¹⁹³ He assumes that the author of the LE should be dependent on these materials. Furthermore, he argues that the author of the LE did not merely know these materials but also reworked them consciously to make them suitable for the ending of Mark's Gospel. Based on his comparative examination, he assumes that the LE was composed no earlier than ca. 110-120 CE, when all four Gospels

¹⁹⁰ Kelhoffer, *Mission and Miracle*, p. 473.

¹⁹¹ Kelhoffer, *Mission and Miracle*, p. 150.

¹⁹² Kelhoffer, *Mission and Miracle*, p. 121. Cf. F. Wisse, 'The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Chapters in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels', in W.L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Traditions, Text and Transmission* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), pp. 39-54. He understands the LE as a sort of the result of harmonization by using other gospel sources in order to provide the incomplete ending of Mark's Gospel (pp. 47-48).

¹⁹³ Kelhoffer, *Mission and Miracle*, p. 150.

must have been collected and could be compared with each other.¹⁹⁴

Kelhoffer's arguments concerning the identity of the LE are as follows; it was written by one author and it is not a mere attachment or appendix that was added later to Mark; it is an intentional composition of an ancient author who wanted to provide a more appropriate ending to Mark's Gospel. The author wanted to make his conclusion of Mark in compliance with the endings of other Gospels. For instance, he borrowed the motif of disbelief and the appearance to two disciples from Lk. 24 and the appearance to Mary Magdalene and the disbelief of the disciples from Jn 20.¹⁹⁵

Kelhoffer has contributed to Markan scholarship in that he showed an interest in the passages beyond Mk 16.8 that have been neglected. His survey of the Markan scholarship of the endings, along with Steven L. Cox,¹⁹⁶ also provides an well-organized summary of the history of this topic. However, Kelhoffer's research of the LE is not noticeably different from what his preceding Markan scholars have made.¹⁹⁷ He is mainly interested in illuminating the LE's literary relationship with other texts or the origin of sources that the author used to compose his ending, which has been studied and debated for a long time among Markan scholars.

Eugene LaVerdiere has also recently examined the LE in his four articles contributed to *Emmanuel* in 1997.¹⁹⁸ This series of articles is part of his commentary

¹⁹⁴ He explores the ancient Church Fathers' writings to make an assumption that the LE was composed around 120-150 CE (p. 243).

¹⁹⁵ Kelhoffer, *Mission and Miracle*, p. 243.

¹⁹⁶ Cox, *History and Critique*.

¹⁹⁷ Jayhoon Yang, 'Review of "Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark" by J.A. Kelhoffer', *JSNT* 25/4 (2003), p. 499.

¹⁹⁸ E. LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20)', *Emmanuel* 103 (April 1997), pp. 156-64; idem, 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20). Interpretation', *Emmanuel* 103 (May 1997), pp. 232-39; idem, 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20). Interpretation (cont.)', *Emmanuel* 103 (June 1997), pp. 282-90; idem, 'The Gospel According to

on Mark that he was then working on. In these articles LaVerdiere argues that the LE is not an appendix or supplement to Mark's Gospel that completes the unfinished Markan ending, but an alternate ending of Mark's Gospel.

LaVerdiere begins his argument with the question of the relationship between the original Markan ending (OE; Mk 16.1-8) and the LE (Mk 16.9-20). He contends that there lies a discontinuity between them.¹⁹⁹ He argues that the LE is not a part of Mark's Gospel, and that the author of Mark's Gospel did not add the LE later either.²⁰⁰ He doubts why the connection between the OE and the LE is not natural, if the author of MK had really written the LE. Furthermore, he argues that the literary style, vocabulary and theology of MK exhibit differences from those of the LE.²⁰¹ He also contends that the pastoral setting of the LE was different from the world that the author of MK was situated in.

LaVerdiere examines the LE to prove that the LE is not a supplement nor an addition to complete the unfinished Markan ending but an 'alternate ending' that is another independent literary creation. He connects the beginning of the LE, not with Mk 16.8, but with Mk 15.46.²⁰² He maintains that Mk 16.9 is following Mk 15.46 because only Mary Magdalene is introduced as visiting the empty tomb in the LE, whereas Mk 15.47 mentions three women as witnesses to the burial. Therefore, he argues that the LE should not be understood as a continuation of the OE, but a 'new' ending that replaces Mk 15.47 and the OE (Mk 16.1-8).

LaVerdiere, like Kelhoffer, assumes that the author of the LE was familiar

Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20). Interpretation (cont.)', *Emmanuel* 103 (July, August 1997), pp. 358-65.

¹⁹⁹ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark', (April), p. 163.

²⁰⁰ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark', (April), pp. 162-63.

²⁰¹ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark', (April), p. 163; idem, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), p. 234.

²⁰² LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark', (April), p. 163.

with the appearance reports of the New Testament.²⁰³ He divides the LE into four sections; Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene (Mk 16.9-11), to two disciples (Mk 16.12-13), to the Eleven (Mk 16.14-18), and the conclusion of the LE, which describes the ascension of Jesus and mission of the Eleven (Mk 16.19-20). He states that these four sections relate the events told by other gospel authors.²⁰⁴

LaVerdiere examines the LE in comparison with the parallels in Matthew, Luke, John and Acts. He argues that the authors of these gospels tell the post-Easter stories in detail with regard to the setting, characters and the situations, whereas the author of the LE does not do so. He contends that the author of the LE was not interested in describing the post-Easter events in detail but merely lists the events.²⁰⁵ Furthermore, he maintains that the author of the LE changed the post-Easter stories obtained from other gospel sources for his own purpose.

LaVerdiere concludes that the LE should be interpreted in the pastoral context. That is, it should be understood as an apologetic that builds up the faith of contemporary Christians.²⁰⁶ Based on his comparison of the LE with its parallels in other gospels, he contends that the LE is not merely describing the appearance stories of Jesus. He also argues that the author of the LE did not provide the appearance stories in order to make MK, which lacks the appearance, balanced with the other gospels. Rather, according to LaVerdiere, the author of the LE wanted to encourage his readers to keep their faith in the resurrection of Jesus on the one hand, and he intended to help them defend their faith against non-believers on the other, through the LE. He assumes that the author of the LE thought the OE was inadequate to

²⁰³ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), p. 233.

²⁰⁴ The appearance to Mary Magdalene is related to that in Jn 20.11-18, Mt. 28.9-10 and Lk. 8.1-3; to two disciples is to Lk. 24.13-35; to the Eleven is to Lk. 24.36-49, Acts 1.3-5, 6-8; 10.40-42, and Jn 20.19-25; the ascension is to Lk. 24.50-53 and Acts 10.40-42.

²⁰⁵ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), p. 233.

²⁰⁶ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), p. 233.

fulfill this purpose.

LaVerdiere explores the four sections of the LE to prove his hypothesis. Firstly, he examines the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene (Mk 16.9-11).²⁰⁷ He argues that this first section of the LE exhibits many differences from the OE in its literary style and vocabulary. He maintains that this section is not a continuation of the OE, but a new creation that offers a different witness from the OE. The words that the author of the LE used to describe the resurrection scene (e.g. ἀναστὰς, ἐφάνη), are different from those that are employed in other gospel accounts of the resurrection as well.

LaVerdiere mentions that the story of Jesus' appearance to Mary Madgalene in the LE is presented in a different way in some parts, from those presented by other gospel witnesses. The description of this female character in the LE is different from that of Luke and John in detail. Mary Magdalene's encounter with the resurrected Jesus in the graveyard as described in John is different from that in the LE. The response of Mary's addressees in the LE also exhibits difference from that in John and Luke. Therefore, LaVerdiere contends that the author of the LE did not simply copy the Mary Madaglone event from other gospels, but created his own account for his own purpose.

LaVerdiere moves on to the passages of Jesus' appearance to two disciples (Mk 16.12-13). He argues that this section also functions as an apologetic, related to the situation of the contemporary Christians implied in the LE.²⁰⁸ This second section of the LE does not give the full description of the appearance event. The author of the LE briefly states the event, whereas Lk. 24.13-35, with which the author of the LE was familiar, relates the event in detail. LaVerdiere contends that had the purpose

²⁰⁷ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), pp. 234-37.

of the author of the LE merely been to describe what happened, he should have told the story in more detail.

LaVerdiere examines the word φανερώω, which is employed in this section, and relates it to the contemporary Christian life.²⁰⁹ He argues that this word is used in the sense of manifestation rather than of visibility in the New Testament, and that it is related to the 'mystery of Christ and Christian life'. He understands this word as Paul did in his letter (2 Cor. 2.14; 3.3; 4.10-11) and as other NT writers did (Col. 3.4), and argues that it is related to the Christian life in church such as the Eucharist or a manifestation of and unification with the body of Christ. Therefore, LaVerdiere interprets this second section in terms of the contemporary Christians' mystic experience.

The third section of the LE is the appearance to the Eleven (Mk 16.14-18). LaVerdiere argues that the author of the LE is not interested in the symbolic meaning of the Twelve, whereas the author of MK is.²¹⁰ The authors of MK, Matthew and Luke think that the number 'twelve' maintains a significant symbolic meaning in their narratives. For this reason, according to LaVerdiere, Matthew's Jesus sends the Eleven to substitute the missing one with the Gentiles, through their mission to them; Luke reconstitutes the Twelve by choosing another apostle (Acts 1.15-26); the author of MK also continues mentioning the Twelve even when the number 'Twelve' no longer carries the original meaning because of Judas' defection from the group of Twelve (Mk 14.10, 20, 43).

LaVerdiere argues that the author of the LE, when referring to the disciples (Eleven), puts an emphasis on 'solidarity in their unbelief and hardness of heart'.²¹¹

²⁰⁸ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), pp. 237-38.

²⁰⁹ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation', (May), p. 238.

²¹⁰ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation (cont.)', (June), pp. 284-85.

²¹¹ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation (cont.)', (June), p. 285.

The author describes that the Eleven see the resurrected Jesus but they do not believe in him and their hearts are hardened. LaVerdiere contends that the emphasis on the disciples' unbelief in the LE is the author's strategy to influence his readers. He assumes that the author of the LE believed that to see does not necessarily mean to believe.²¹² The author was interested in the faith and mission of his contemporary Christians, who did not see the resurrected Jesus but merely heard about the event. He, according to LaVerdiere, wanted to encourage these secondary witness readers to perform their mission by teaching them that faith does not come from their being eye-witnesses but from their belief.

Jesus' rebuke to the Eleven should be understood in the same light, contends LaVerdiere. He argues that the rebuke was not actually addressed to the disciples but to the contemporary Christians.²¹³ The author describes Jesus as rebuking the disciples because they should have believed without seeing him. By doing so he wanted to emphasize and teach his contemporary Christians that believing without seeing is important, argues LaVerdiere. The Christian addressees of the LE were not eyewitnesses but addressees of the resurrection, and accordingly the author of the LE needed to encourage them to perform their mission task, not based on their eyes, but on their ears. The author of the LE therefore emphasizes that 'seeing' does not have anything to do with 'believing'.

LaVerdiere interprets the five signs in the LE as serving the author's pastoral and apologetic purpose.²¹⁴ The miracle workers and new tongue speakers are not the Eleven but the believers who believe and are baptized through the missionary work of the Eleven. That is, the sign performers are the contemporary Christians who

²¹² LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation (cont.)', (June), p. 283.

²¹³ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation (cont.)', (June), p. 287.

²¹⁴ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation (cont.)', (July, August), pp. 360-63.

believed in what they had been told. He argues that the author encourages them to accelerate their missionary efforts by promising them these divine signs.

The last section of the LE is the ascension of the Lord and the mission of the Eleven (Mk 16.19-20).²¹⁵ LaVerdiere points out that this section reminds us of the ending of Luke's Gospel but is different from it. Luke recounts that the ascension of Jesus is followed by a communal prayer, whereas it is followed by the immediate proclamation of the gospel to the world in the LE. By so doing the author of the LE encourages his readers to perform missionary tasks and assures their mission by promising the signs. Therefore LaVerdiere argues that the last section of the LE is pastoral and apologetic.

LaVerdiere's argument has provided a fresh answer to the question of the identity of the LE, in that it is not a supplement but an alternate ending of the OE. Those who argue that the LE is a supplement assume that the author of the LE added the LE because he felt uncomfortable with Mark's way of ending his story at Mk 16.8. LaVerdiere's hypothesis, however, is noticeable in arguing that the author of the LE felt uncomfortable, not with the manner of ending at Mk 16.8, but with the OE itself.²¹⁶

LaVerdiere's hypothesis based on the assumption of the discontinuity between the OE and the LE, however, can be challenged. He argues that the LE was created in order to replace Mk 15.47 and the OE. I think this argument presupposes two versions of Mark's Gospel, one of which ends with the OE (1.1-16.8) and the other which ends with the 'new ending' (1.1-15.46; 16.9-20). He has shown the distinctiveness of the LE as an ending to a story. But he does not explain why then

²¹⁵ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark. Interpretation (cont.)', (July, August), pp. 363-65.

²¹⁶ Cf. Chapter Five.

we have a version of Mark's Gospel where the OE and the LE coexist as one combined ending (Mk 1.1-16.20). That is, if the LE is the 'alternative ending' that *replaces* Mk 15.47 and the OE, why do we *have* Mark's Gospel with both the OE and the LE together as we see in the Codex Alexandrinus? I believe that the scribe or the author of Mark's Gospel in this codex found no problem with combining the OE and the LE into one comprehensive ending.

If the LE was composed as a 'new' and 'alternative' ending of Mk 15.47 and the OE, why do we *not* have a version of Mark's Gospel that LaVerdiere assumes, viz., a version with the 'alternate' ending only without Mk 15.47 and the OE (i.e., Mk 1.1-15.46 and 16.9-20)? The OE and the LE recount different stories of the empty tomb and the appearance of the resurrected Jesus respectively. Then, why cannot the LE be an (additional) ending to Mark's Gospel, i.e. Mark's Gospel as Mk 1.1-16.20?

1.4 Problems in the study of Markan endings

Studies on the Markan ending have been done for many centuries. The Markan ending studies, however, have only been focused on the question of what the original ending is; 'Is Mk 16.8 the original ending of Mark's Gospel?' As I have surveyed above, many Markan scholars have debated whether the author of Mark's Gospel wrote the passages beyond Mk 16.8. This question of the authenticity of the LE has produced many hypotheses, but has taken many centuries to reach the consensus that Mk 16.8 is the original ending of Mark's Gospel.

Markan studies that have been focused on the illumination of authenticity of the LE have fallen in the dilemma of historicism. The process of production and interpretation of a literary work always involves ideologies of the author and the

reader. The inevitable involvement of ideologies prevents us from relying on a literary production as reflecting the historical reality.²¹⁷ However, most arguments of the Markan ending scholarship are based on their positivism about historical fact or truth; they believe that they can draw the 'historical' picture of Mark's Gospel out of the text. They see the text not as a 'mirror' but as a 'window'. Therefore, their arguments cannot be contended because they are not based on solid fact but on imagination. As is found in many hypotheses that I have surveyed above, those hypotheses are built upon other hypotheses.

The consensus that Mk 16.8 is the original ending of the second gospel has produced another problem in Markan study. The other endings of Mark's Gospel have been neglected. Since Markan scholars reached this agreement, they have not paid much attention to the passages beyond Mk 16.8 just because they are not part of Mark's Gospel. In particular, literary critics of Mark's Gospel exclude the endings from their studies because they are interested in the literary unity of Mark's Gospel that covers only Mk 1.1-16.8.

The indifference to the other endings beyond Mk 16.8 has resulted in rare production of commentaries that deal with the LE and the SE. As I mentioned above, only a few scholars have studied these other parts. To the best of my knowledge, most recent commentaries on Mark provide merely a brief explanation about them. Only a few scholars, such as Kelhoffer and LaVerdiere surveyed above, have performed a fuller investigation into the other endings than others have.

However, even recent studies on other endings are focused on the LE. Even the scholars who show their interest in the passages beyond Mk 16.8 are as indifferent to the SE as other Markan scholars have been to the passages after Mk

²¹⁷ Cf. Chapter Two.

16.8. The SE has been excluded from Markan ending studies. The SE is the outcast among the outcasts.

Studies on the LE (as well as the SE) need a new direction. Those who have investigated the LE are interested only in the LE itself. Although they have examined the LE in relationship with other gospels and the NT writings, they have tried to prove whether the author of the LE borrowed his source from those writings or not. They simply state that the author did so in order to supply the Appearance story and to complete Mark's Gospel.

Those who study other endings have never made a deep exploration of the relationship between these two endings and MK. They have not examined these endings with an assumption that the authors of these endings were readers of MK. They have neglected the significance of the differences that these endings exhibit from each other. They have never questioned what had made these earliest readers write *their own endings as such*. They have been interested in how the LE is related to other Appearance accounts in other gospels and NT writings, but they have not been concerned with the question of how other endings are related to what these ancient readers read and *responded to*, i.e. MK.

The question of how other endings are related to MK does not mean to ask the outdated question about the authenticity of the LE and the SE, i.e. Markan authorship of the LE and the SE. The question is how each author of the other endings responded to MK; why each of them wrote as such after reading MK. It is not only the question of the content of their endings, but also that of rhetoric in relationship with what they read. The question is not focused on what and how they adopted and changed their sources from other gospels, if any, but on what in MK has made these ancient readers produce their responses as such.

All of these points and problems have not yet been questioned, explored, nor answered. Therefore, my investigation into the other endings will be focused on these matters.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY AND PRESUPPOSITIONS

‘In order to say anything, there are other things *which must not be said.*’
- P. Macherey¹

2.1 Introduction: text and interpretation

In ‘Wui’, one of the ancient Chinese countries, there was a pretty boy, ‘Mi-Ja-Ha’ who got all the king’s love;² he was so fair-faced and good-looking a lad that the king pampered him in everything and approved whatever he did. One day Mi-Ja-Ha went on a picnic to an orchard with the king. He picked a peach, took a bite of it and gave it to the king. The king highly praised the boy saying, ‘My dear Mi-Ja-Ha loved me so much that he restrained himself from eating that sweet peach and gave it to me.’

As time passed, this fair boy grew up and eventually lost the king’s love. Then one day, Mi-Ja-Ha did something wrong to the king and was dragged to the king’s court. The king condemned him harshly, saying, ‘This bastard was so rude and wicked that one day he gave me a left-over peach after he had tasted it and found it unpalatable!’

This ancient anecdote is a good example that reveals how a fact or a text is interpreted differently, depending on the interpreter’s conditions or positions. Stephen Fowl provides us with good examples of this in interpretations of the Bible.³ He proves that an interpreter’s interests, concerns, point of views, status in his or her community, ideologies, etc. influence his or her interpretation of the text through the

¹ P. Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production* (trans. G. Wall; London: Routledge, 1985), p. 85.

² 史記 (History), vol. 63, ‘老子 韓非子 列傳 (anecdotes of Lao-Tzu), book 3’

³ S. Fowl, ‘Texts Don’t Have Ideologies’, *BI* 3 (1995), pp. 15-34.

example of Philo, Paul, and Justin Martyr, showing how they interpreted the Abraham story in the Hebrew Bible differently.⁴

2.2 Methodological suppositions

2.2.1 Other endings as interpretations of Mark's Gospel

The production of the LE and the SE dates later than that of Mark's Gospel (1.1-16.8),⁵ and each authors added his ending to it. This implies that the authors of the LE and the SE are (some of the earliest) readers of Mark's Gospel. In other words, each author is the interpreter of Mark's Gospel. They read Mark's Gospel, and added the post-Easter story to it for some reason. The questions why they added such a story and what functions their stories have are to be dealt with later in this thesis. At this stage, it suffices to state clearly that they *did* read or listen to Mark's story, and *did* put more stories at the end of it, viz., *these texts are readers' responses to Mark's Gospel*.

Assuming that the LE and the SE are the earliest readers' interpretations of and responses to Mark's Gospel on the one hand, and considering that each deals with the common topic of the Appearance story on the other, it leads me to ask why then, do they tell the story *differently* from each other? In other words, 'Why for instance, did the author of the SE produce his text when the LE already existed, if he knew it?' Even providing that each author did not know the others' productions, this question does not matter; 'simply, why is each version different?' and 'what has

⁴ Fowl supports his argument by quoting Michael Cartwright who reveals how the curse of Ham (Gen. 9.23-26) has been used by the slave lords to justify the salvery on the one hand and been interpreted by African-Americans as a prediction of God's blessing to them ('Ideology and Interpretation of the Bible in the African-American Christian Tradition', *ModT* 9 [1993], pp. 145-52). Young-Bong Kim also persuasively argues that Philemon has been interpreted by the privileged interpreters to legitimize their interests, positions and ideologies ('Rereading Philemon', in <http://mail.hyupsung.ac.kr/~bongbong/articles3.zip> accessed on Dec. 20th 2001).

⁵ See Chapters Four and Five.

made the authors of the LE and the SE respond to Mark's Gospel, as can be seen in the way that these other endings are written?

2.2.2 'ideology': 'No mouse ever looked like Mickey Mouse'⁶

If the authors of the LE and the SE are interpreters of Mark's Gospel, I am led to the term of 'ideology' because 'No interpretation is ideologically innocent.'⁷ That is to say, every interpretive act always involves 'ideology', and this results in different interpretations according to 'ideological primary groups/individuals' whose ideology is not objective.⁸

It is impossible to be objective and neutral in reading and interpreting a text,⁹ and it is the case not only with the text, but also with artistic productions such as music, paintings, photography, and film etc. In this light, Christopher Butler's argument that all the human modes of expression convey ideological assumptions beneath them is amenable.¹⁰ Therefore, I believe that my methodological presuppositions for my examination of other endings in Mark's Gospel should be related to 'ideology', i.e. 'ideological criticism'.

⁶ G. Graham, *Philosophy of the Arts: An Introduction to Aesthetics* (London, NY: Routledge, 1997), p. 89.

⁷ C. Butler, *Interpretation, Deconstruction and Ideology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), p. 94.

⁸ E. Shils, 'Ideology: The Concept and Function of Ideology', in D.L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 7 (London: Macmillan Co and Free Press, 1968), pp. 66-76 (p. 70). An 'ideological primary group' refers to a 'characteristic and primal' group/individual that bears an ideology. This group is characterized by its strong comrade affinity and solidarity among its adherents, loyalty to its ideology, and exclusive boundary-marking against outsiders or opponents:

⁹ D. Penchansky, 'Up For Grabs: A Tentative Proposal for Doing Ideological Criticism', *Semeia* 59 (1992), pp. 35-42. By 'being objective' and 'neutral', I mean 'not being subjective'. I prefer stating 'being subjective/objective' to 'being biased or being prejudiced', because 'bias and prejudice' seems to convey a value-judged implication of 'right or wrong'. As Frederic Jameson appropriately pointed out, there is no right or wrong/correct or incorrect interpretation or reading ('A Conversation with Frederic Jameson', *Semeia* 59 [1992], pp. 227-38 [p. 233]).

¹⁰ Butler, *Interpretation, Deconstruction and Ideology*, p. 103. Agreeing with him, see D.J.A. Clines, *Interested Parties: The ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 14-15; C. Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988), pp. 26-28.

In order to adopt 'ideological criticism' for my examination of the LE and the SE,¹¹ it is necessary to clarify the concept of 'ideology'. This terminology is originally from sociology,¹² but it has been broadly adopted by various disciplines.¹³ The definition of 'ideology' differs depending on scholars. For instance, Marxist structuralist Louis Althusser understands ideology as the mechanism by which the bourgeoisie reproduces and maintains its *status quo* of domination.¹⁴ Sociologist Edward Shils thinks that ideology is the highly systematized belief in human societies, that it requires those who accept it to have complete subservience under their full consensus, and that its collective form i.e. the organization of adherents, tends to maintain its control of the adherents and to dominate others.¹⁵ Michèle Barrett defines ideology as 'processes of mystification that arise around other (non-class) social divisions and other forms of social power and dominion.'¹⁶

In religious studies, the terms 'theology' and 'ideology' are often understood as meaning the same in a sense, although the former is more frequently

¹¹ In this thesis, I will not examine the FLE (the Codex W, fol. 184 recto, lines 9-24) and the LE with FLE but only the LE and the SE due to the limit of time and space. The LE and the SE are the responses to Mark's Gospel. The FLE, however, is initially the response to the LE, although it is eventually a response to Mark's Gospel too. To examine the ideology of the assumed ideological primary community that produced the LE with FLE is complicated; first of all, the FLE should be examined as a response to the LE; and then the LE with FLE should be examined as a response to MK. Therefore, the FLE and the LE with FLE are too much to be dealt with in this limited thesis. Thus, I will not discuss them here. However, it never means that the study of the LE with FLE is impossible or meaningless. I believe that the research of them must be done and that it will be definitely contributing to Markan scholarship. See my Conclusion.

¹² S. van Tilborg, 'Ideology: Ideology and Text: John 15 in the Context of the Farewell Discourse', in P.J. Hartin and J.H. Petzer (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 259-70 (p. 259). For the history and further understanding of the concept of ideology in sociology, see J. Larrain, *The Concept of Ideology* (London: Hutchinson, 1979). For the brief introduction to ideology in sociology, see E. Shils, 'Ideology: The Concept and Function of Ideology', pp. 66-76, and H.M. Johnson, 'Ideology: Ideology and the Social System', in D.L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 7 (Macmillan Co and Free Press, 1968), pp. 76-85.

¹³ For the examples of how it is connected to other areas of study, see Graham, *Philosophy of the Arts*, pp. 74-76 (musicology), 88-89 (paintings and film study), 137-40 (architecture); C. Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, pp. 26-28 (film study).

¹⁴ L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (trans. Ben Brewster; London: New Left Books, 1971), pp. 121-73.

¹⁵ Shils, 'Ideology: The Concept and Function of Ideology' p. 66.

¹⁶ Barrett, *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), p. 167.

used than the latter.¹⁷ I think sharp distinction between these two concepts may not be particularly meaningful. However, I will use ‘ideology’ rather than ‘theology’ in my thesis, because I am not only interested in what these ideologically charged interpretive Markan readers (‘ideological primary groups’) believed or pursued (‘what’), I am also interested in the dynamic *relationships* among them, i.e. what their strategies were to achieve what they pursued (‘how’).¹⁸

Literary critic Terry Eagleton’s definition of ‘ideology’ would be suitable for my thesis in this light. He enumerates a list of definitions of ‘ideology’ that are ‘currently in circulation’ as follows:¹⁹

- a. the process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life;
- b. a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class;
- c. ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power;
- d. false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power;
- e. systematically distorted communication;
- f. that which offers a position for a subject;
- g. forms of thought motivated by social interests;
- h. identity thinking;
- i. socially necessary illusion;
- j. the conjuncture of discourse and power;
- k. the medium in which conscious social actors make sense of their world;
- l. action-oriented sets of beliefs;
- m. the confusion of linguistic and phenomenal reality;
- n. semiotic closure;
- o. the indispensable medium in which individuals live out their relations to a social structure;
- p. the process whereby social life is converted to a natural reality

He also provided a set of narrower definitions of ‘ideology’ as follows:²⁰

1. the general material process of production of ideas, beliefs and values in social life;
2. ideas and beliefs (whether true or false) which symbolize the conditions and life-experiences of a specific, socially significant group or class;

¹⁷ J.E. Dyck, ‘A Map of Ideology for Biblical Critics’, in M. Daniel Carroll R. (ed.), *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 108-28 (p. 125); D.J.A. Clines, *Interested Parties*, pp. 12-13; cf. N.K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-150 BCE* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979), p. 65.

¹⁸ See also D.B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1990), p. 145.

¹⁹ T. Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London, NY: Verso, 1991), pp. 1-2.

²⁰ Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 28-31.

3. the promotion and legitimation of the interests of such social groups in the face of opposing interests;
4. the promotion and legitimation of the interests of the dominant group;
5. ideas and beliefs which help to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation;
6. false or deceptive ideas which arise from the material structure of society as a whole.

For the application of 'ideological criticism' to my examination of the LE and the SE, I will consult these six narrower definitions. These definitions are concerned with the social aspects of ideology. They deal with the dynamics of different social groups that maintain their own world-views. That is, these six definitions of ideology put an emphasis on the relationship of different 'ideological primary groups'. Therefore, these narrower definitions of ideology will be suitable for my illumination of the dynamics among the ideological primary groups of the LE and the SE.

The first narrower definition can be understood as culture in a broad sense, which is a member's way of life in compliance with that of his or her society as Eagleton explains. The second is close to the world-view of a specific society. The sixth is the definition of ideology that is understood in terms of the problem of the material structure in a society. The third, fourth, and the fifth definitions are classified together by 'legitimation of the interests'. The fourth understands it in light of class strife between the ruling and the oppressed, whereas the fifth emphasizes the strategy for the domination.

The definitions, except for the third, are not directly relevant to my examination of the LE and the SE. The first and second definitions are too broad and vague to be considered in the examination of the identity and relationship of the LE's and the SE's 'ideological primary groups'. The sixth definition focuses on the system or structure of a society, especially material matters. This definition, however, seems

more concerned with the issue of class struggle in a society than with illumination of the relationships between different ideological groups.

The fourth and fifth definitions seem related to class domination. The fourth is about 'who holds the hegemony' and the fifth is 'how to hold it', both of which are concerned with the power struggle for dominion in a society. It does not seem appropriate to conjecture the relationship of the two ideological primary groups (i.e. the LE and the SE) in light of the power struggle for dominion among the different political and economical classes within a society. The fifth definition can be partially acceptable in terms of 'distortion and dissimulation', because these two groups could have distorted or at least changed what they knew as a fact or experienced for their political, theological, or some other purpose. But this too is not to be considered because it focuses on the class strife.

I want to focus on the third definition of ideology for my understanding of the concept of 'ideology'. The third category puts an emphasis on three aspects of ideology: interests of a group, promotion/legitimation, and opposition to other interests. These aspects need a few presuppositions; there should be more than two ideological primary groups; they pursue their own interests; these interests conflict with each other; those groups compete with each other; they want to win the competition by promoting and legitimizing their interests.

These three aspects are, therefore, summed up into two interrogatives of 'what' and 'how'. That is, 'What are the interests of each group?' and 'How do they pursue their interests?' Firstly, the question of 'interest' is, as Eagleton states, related to the matter of 'sustaining or challenging of a whole political form of life.'²¹ The 'interest' is a kind of motivation that causes the production of different texts, like our

²¹ Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 29.

two versions of endings. This implies the political relationship among the ideological primary groups, i.e. ‘the opposition to other interests’. They pursue different interests from others’, and they feel the necessity to maintain – in either active or passive ways – their interests. They often pursue their interests by challenging other groups’ interests as well. Their different interests motivate them to maintain and pursue their own interests, and this results in different versions of (literary) productions.

This struggle among the ideological primary groups with different interests is found in many forms such as visual arts, audio arts, and architectural productions.²² Literary production is not an exception. Eagleton argues that ‘ideology is a production of socio-historical realities’ and ‘literature is a production of ideology’.²³ Therefore, literary production and ideology are inseparable. That is to say, all literary productions reflect the political relationship among the ideological primary groups.

The political characteristic of the literary production has led some scholars to pay attention to the conflicting dynamics of literary works. David Penchansky mentions that literary productions are the places where the struggle for the interpretive hegemony is embedded.²⁴ Frederic Jameson states that literary productions are like a ‘discursive battlefield’, where all the interpretive struggles take place.²⁵ This shows the power-oriented characteristic of the literary production. In this light, David Jobling states:

All discourse is in relationship to power; any discourse is an effect of power and is a claim on power. Power tends to totalize itself in a “center”, and to prevent the

²² T. Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), p. 210. Eagleton mentions ‘Discourses, sign-systems and signifying practices of all kinds, from film and television to fiction and the languages of natural science, produce effects, shape forms of consciousness and unconsciousness, which are closely related to the maintenance or transformation of our existing systems of power... Indeed “ideology” can be taken to indicate no more than this connection – the link or nexus between discourses and power.’

²³ T. Eagleton, *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (London: Verso, 1976), p. 68.

²⁴ Penchansky, ‘Up For Grabs’, p. 35.

²⁵ F. Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 13; idem, ‘A Conversation with Frederic Jameson’, p. 232.

accumulation of power elsewhere than the center. Hence the discourse of the center is dominant discourse, while the discourse of the periphery, where power is diffused/defused, is marginal discourse.²⁶

The power-orientedness of the literary production that pursues the interests of the ideological primary group is followed by the question of 'how'. How then does the ideological primary group achieve its goal to be positioned in the center of power? This question is connected to the term of 'legitimation' above, which belongs to the literary strategy, as Eagleton puts it as 'suasive or rhetorical'.²⁷

For the processes of 'legitimation', Eagleton enumerates six different strategies.²⁸ They are: (1) promoting (2) naturalizing (3) universalizing (4) denigrating (5) excluding (6) obscuring. These strategies involve the actions that encourage and entice people to accept the beliefs congenial to what an ideological primary group pursues. The ideological primary group tries to make people accept what they argue or maintain as a 'matter of fact', which is very natural and without any problem. It also tries to remove its opponents or rivals (regardless of whether they are another ideological primary group or the ideologies and thoughts of such opponent groups) by disparaging and excluding them. It pursues its interests by adopting or distorting a fact or reality in favourable ways to itself. All these processes belong to the act of 'legitimation'.²⁹

The epithet that I cited for the title of this section, 'No mouse ever looked like Mickey Mouse', helps us understand what 'legitimation' is. Mickey is a mouse but not a mouse; he is a mouse, but he talks, he walks, he wears clothes, he drives a car, and he even makes a pet of a dog!³⁰ Not only Mickey but also all other animals

²⁶ D. Jobling, 'Writing the Wrongs of the World: The Deconstruction of the Biblical Text in the Context of Liberation Theologies', *Semeia* 51 (1990), pp. 81-118 (p. 99).

²⁷ Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 29.

²⁸ Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, pp. 5-6.

²⁹ Cf. Shils, 'Ideology', p. 68.

³⁰ If you did not notice any problem with my referring to Mickey as *he* instead of *it*, it may be another result of legitimation.

such as ducks, dogs, squirrels and cats behave as if they were human beings in the Disney animation. Walt Disney saw a mouse from his own perspective, changed this rodent, created it (*it*) as Mickey (*he*), and made the audience accept this grotesque animal as quite natural. No televiewer thinks that Disney must be mad to present them in that way. In *Cats and Dogs*, a Warner Brothers' film of year 2001, the audience is even surprised to find that the human characters are surprised to find cats and dogs talk to them! The audience believes that these animals are not animals but 'characters'. Walt Disney has succeeded in legitimizing his presentation of Mickey Mouse, and the audience comes to accept it as quite as natural.

Therefore, 'legitimation' is related to the question of 'how to present'. Eagleton understands 'legitimation' in the literary production as a matter of rhetoric, as I mentioned above. The strategy of 'legitimation' in the literary production is closely related to the way of narration, i.e. 'how to tell the story.' As Eagleton puts it, it is the matter of 'framing the interests in the first place in ways which make this plausible.'³¹

In the epithet of this Chapter, I quoted Pierre Macherey who stated that 'In order to say anything, there are other things *which must not be said*'. This quote illustrates how the process of legitimation is carried out. Every author has his or her own reasons for producing the text,³² and she or he tries to accomplish those purposes 'by saying what she or he wants to be told and not saying what she or he does not want to be told' in the ideologically charged text. That is, all the ideologically charged interpretive acts involve the act of 'selection'. It includes not only the matter of declaration/disclosure versus deletion/concealment, but also

³¹ Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p. 57.

³² Clines, *Interested Parties*, p. 23.

‘enlarging versus minimising, re-enforcing versus weakening, affirmation versus condemnation’.³³

2.2.3 ‘Ideological criticism’

I have defined the concept of ‘ideology’ for the understanding of ‘ideological criticism’. As I have examined above, ideology is closely related to the dynamics between *discourse and power*. Accordingly, ideological criticism is understood in this light. The purpose of ideological criticism is to illuminate ‘the structure and dynamics of the power relations’ by examining how they are embedded explicitly and implicitly in language and how the conflicting ideologies are working in discourses.³⁴ More concretely speaking, ideological criticism understands that the text is an ideological creation, and it is, as Fernando F. Segovia puts it, concerned with the ‘political character of all composition and texts as well as reading and interpretation’.³⁵

Segovia’s definition notices two aspects that ideological criticism is concerned with. They are firstly ‘political character’, and secondly the ‘three elements of a literary production’, which are ‘the author (composition)’, ‘the text’, and ‘the reader (reading and interpretation)’. That is, ideological criticism is interested in the *political dynamics* of three elements of the text, i.e. the author, the text, and the reader.

Firstly, the interest in the author raises questions about the author’s context that motivated the creation of a text. That is, ‘What is the context of the author that

³³ van Tilborg, ‘Ideology’, p. 263.

³⁴ Bible and Culture Collective, *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 274.

³⁵ F.F. Segovia, ‘Cultural Studies and Contemporary Biblical Criticism’, in F.F. Segovia and M.A. Tolbert (eds.), *Reading from this Place, vol. 2* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 1-17 (pp. 8-9).

has made him or her create his or her text?' 'What has made the author produce such a text?' The 'context of the author' is an inclusive term in that it does not merely mean a certain social situation of the author but all the elements that influence him or her.

Therefore, it is related to social factors such as gender, class, economic situation, race, religion or philosophy, social circumstances, etc. In a narrower sense it is, as I pointed out when I dealt with the concept of ideology above, the question of 'interests'. This is because these factors are eventually related to the interests of the group/the author who maintains a certain ideology (concerning gender, class, race or whatever) which serves what the group/the author pursues.

This question of the author's context, i.e. 'interests' is analyzed from an extrinsic approach. The extrinsic analysis tries to illuminate the shape of 'social, political, and economic structures wielding power when the text was written'. It examines the 'circumstances under which the author produced the text'.³⁶ It explores various factors which make a certain voice heard and others silenced; which make a certain ideological group/individual profit and others not.

One of the best ways of conducting extrinsic analysis of the LE and the SE is to examine their contemporary texts, because they are the best and most available 'representations' of the context from which these two literary works were produced. In this light, a few canonical and extra-canonical texts will be consulted in this thesis for the extrinsic analysis.

It should be kept in mind at this stage that these contemporary texts are 'representations'. That is, these texts are ideologically charged texts, which do not necessarily reflect the exact historical reality. For instance, some of the apocryphal

³⁶ G.A. Yee, 'Ideological Criticism', in J.H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), pp. 534-37 (pp. 535-36).

texts depict Mary Magdalene as holding apostolic authority while some other texts draw Peter as such. The extrinsic analysis does not presuppose that these texts reflect the historical fact; rather it is interested in the significance of such representations.

Secondly, the 'text' is related to the literary aspects that ideological criticism is interested in. This belongs to the intrinsic analysis of ideological criticism. The text is a useful tool for a certain ideological primary group/individual to persuade or entice the reader to accept what it, she or he wants; the author tries to influence the reader to read the text in his or her way.³⁷

Therefore, ideological criticism tries to explore the rhetorical function of a text in order to illuminate the power dynamics that lie under the surface of the text. Ideological criticism especially, is interested in the silenced voices. It assumes that there is something silenced behind something spoken in the text. It tries to make the silenced voice be heard by 'focusing on the text's gaps and absences'.³⁸ That is, ideological criticism tries to read the spaces between the lines.

Ideological criticism examines the dynamics among ideological primary groups that are embedded within the text. The process of this examination begins with the extrinsic analysis. Ideological criticism firstly surveys the social matrix from which the text was produced.

The next step is intrinsic analysis. Ideological criticism examines the literary elements such as plot, characterization, word choice (it implies the intentional elimination of certain words at the same time), point of view, etc., because these factors of rhetoric are the author's strategy to persuade the reader. It is also because they implicitly convey the ideology of the author (the ideological primary group). The intrinsic examination of the LE and the SE will be focused especially on the

³⁷ Penchansky, 'Up For Grabs', p. 40.

³⁸ Yee, 'Ideological Criticism', p. 536.

technique of characterization, besides other literary devices, in this thesis. It is because it is one of the effective literary strategies for an author to legitimize his ideology.³⁹

The last step is to build up the assumed context of the text production based on the outcome given from the extrinsic and intrinsic analyses. This is a kind of 'proposing a model for the production', which is necessary in every reading of the text, as David Jobling mentions.⁴⁰

As ideological criticism is dealing with the literary production, it is interested in literary criticism. However it does not stand on the side of the extreme relativist such as Stanley Fish, a reader-response critic. Literary criticism, especially reader-response criticism, has been too sceptical about historical aspects of the text. It has accordingly neglected the authorial elements of the text.⁴¹ It is, however, undeniable that the text is produced within the contemporary social context by the author under the influence of the context.

On the other hand, it should be admitted that any literary production does not reflect the 'exact historical reality', because it is ideologically charged text. However, it does not nullify that there is historical reality; it is just to recognize that the reader has many gaps with the original author and the text so that the reader cannot reconstruct the 'exact historical reality' of the context that influenced the

³⁹ For further discussion of the technique of characterization, see Chapter Four (4.3.2.1).

⁴⁰ D. Jobling, 'Feminism and 'Mode of Production' in Ancient Israel: Search for a Method', in D. Jobling et al. (eds.), *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis* (Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 1991), pp. 239-52 (p. 247).

⁴¹ For the introduction of reader-response criticism, see J.P. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980); Suleiman and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980); W. Iser, *The Act of Reading* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); S. Fish, *Is There Text in This Class?* London: Harvard University Press, 1980).

production of the text. In this sense, my examination of texts is an exploration of 'historiographies' rather than the 'history'.⁴²

2.3 Presuppositions in the examination of the LE and the SE

An element that should be mentioned at this point is 'the reader'. This element is concerned with the consumption of the text by the reader. As I mentioned above, there are many gaps between the reader and the author/the text that she or he should fill in during the process of interpretation. Therefore, the consumption of the text is related not to detecting the original meaning, but to dialogue between the reader and the text, i.e. the process of filling gaps.⁴³

The text is, as Wolfgang Iser allegorically puts it, like stars in the sky, and interpretation is compared to drawing pictures by connecting the stars. The reader fills in the gaps between the stars. In this sense, the text is open to various interpretations, and it depends on the reader.⁴⁴ In this light, Umberto Eco states that the text is to be understood, not as the puzzle kit box that always ends up with the *Mona Lisa* but as the Lego box which allows the creation of various figures.⁴⁵ In this sense, Eco understands the phrase '*il n'y a pas de vrai sens d'un texte*' that Paul Valéry mentioned, meaning that the text allows various interpretations.⁴⁶

The reader's ideology is a crucial factor that influences the process of filling gaps. Every reading is ideological, and I myself am not to be excluded from the umbrella of this principle. As the authors of the LE and the SE read the Gospel of

⁴² The term 'history' is usually misunderstood as meaning the 'historical reality', and is believed to be accessed. However, it is not the 'historical reality' but merely a historiography in a strict sense.

⁴³ For the understanding of 'filling gaps', see Iser's reading theory in Iser, *The Act of Reading*, idem, 'Interaction between Text and Reader', in Suleiman and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 106-19; idem, 'The Reading Process. A Phenomenological Approach', *New Literary History* 3 (Winter 1971/2), pp. 279-99.

⁴⁴ U. Eco, *Lector in Fabula* (trans. W.C. Kim; Seoul: The Open Books Co., 1996), pp. 82-83.

⁴⁵ Eco, *Lector in Fabula*, p. 88.

Mark from their own ideological perspectives, so do I as I read these two texts. Therefore, I admit that my examination of these two endings cannot be free from my own ideology, as is the case no matter who does what I do now.⁴⁷

I have to confess that all theses suggested from my examination are accordingly hypothetical, because my reading of these texts is ideological. For instance, I will suggest models of the ideological primary groups of the LE and the SE in this thesis; but these models are hypothetical, and those ideological primary groups are assumed groups. They are not the exact picture of the historical reality; the ideological primary groups are only communities represented in the text.

These texts are literary works, which means that they should be examined as literature that functions as a mirror, and not as a window through which the reader reconstructs the exact historical realities.⁴⁸ The text is produced within a certain context in a certain period of time and space, which implies the historical character of the text. It does not, however, reflect the 'exact fact or historical reality' nor can we guarantee what the text tells is the truth; the text is ideologically charged. Therefore, the text should not be understood as a window through which we find the exact historical reality.

The literariness of these endings accordingly requires some presuppositions in the examination of them. Firstly, I will deal with these texts as literary works that are ideologically charged. Therefore, the suggested models of the ideological primary groups are not the historical groups, but the hypothetical and virtual groups represented in the text. The relationships and dynamics in these groups are also purely assumed, which are based on the extrinsic and intrinsic analysis of the *text*.

⁴⁶ Eco, *Lector in Fabula*, p. 91.

⁴⁷ Pechansky, 'Up For Grab', p. 41; D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 147-50.

⁴⁸ Cf. Murray Krieger, *A window to criticism; Shakespeare's Sonnets and Modern Poetics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964).

Reading the text as an ideologically charged literary production does not mean, allegorically speaking, that there is no Cinderella. As long as we have her shoes, we have *the* Cinderella,⁴⁹ although we do not know who *the* Cinderella is. Therefore, the ideological primary groups that I will suggest should be understood in terms of interpretive 'validity' rather than 'the truth'.

Secondly, the fact that these endings are literary works leads me to read them as a final form. I will deal with the texts as they are now available to us. There are small differences between different versions of the LE or the SE.⁵⁰ Some manuscripts exhibit only one or two differences of functional words such as conjunctions and prepositions. I will deal with two manuscripts: the manuscript A (Codex Alexandrinus) for the LE and the manuscript it^k (Codex Bobbiensis) for the SE.⁵¹

I am not interested in the formation history of these manuscripts. I will not examine how the texts of these manuscripts have been changed. I am not interested in how these manuscripts are different from other manuscripts with minor variants. That is, I will not perform a comparative examination between manuscripts. I will only examine these manuscripts as a final form.

As I mentioned above, my interpretation is ideological and accordingly can be subjective. But I will try to be logical and coherent in my argument, and try to avoid being arbitrary. This means that I understand my thesis is one of many theses and my interpretation is one of many interpretations, all of which are ideologically charged.

⁴⁹ Cf. E.D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 46.

⁵⁰ For instance, a Gothic version (dates ca. 4th century CE) unlike other versions of the LE lacks Mk 16.12-20. See J.K. Elliott, *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*, pp. 204-205; idem, 'The Text and Language of the Ending to Mark's Gospel', pp. 255-62. I will chose manuscript group No. (1) for the text of the LE, and No. (4) for the SE text in Elliott's classification.

⁵¹ As for the breif introduction and the reason for my selection of these texts, see the

In the next Chapter, I will conduct the extrinsic analysis for the study of the LE and the SE. The following two Chapters consist of the intrinsic analysis of these two texts. In these Chapters, I will examine them respectively as a final literary work by mainly adopting a literary critical approach.

CHAPTER THREE

EXTRINSIC ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction¹

To quote Ann G. Brock, 'The usage of the name of a particular disciple or apostle operated as a useful tool of persuasion in the polemics, apologetics, and self-description of early Christian groups.'² As she mentions, to include, exclude or replace one name for another is one of the author's scheming strategies to persuade his readers. Also the early Christian ideological groups employed this strategy in order to pursue their interests such as gaining the dominance over the competitors.

An example of inclusion/exclusion of a name as a strategy for holding hegemony is found in the name list of the Appearance event witnesses. The question whether one is included/excluded in/from the list of the witnesses of the Appearance event was one of the most sensitive issues among early Christian groups because it was directly related to his or her authority as a (apostolic)³ leader in the community.⁴ In this light, François Bovon correctly points out that whether the leader of a Christian community has experienced the Appearance event or not was important with regard to the identity of the community.⁵

¹ I am greatly indebted to Ann G. Brock, who has given me helpful guidance for this Chapter.

² A.G. Brock, 'What's in a Name: The Competition for Authority in Early Christian Texts', in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1998 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), pp. 106-24 (p. 106).

³ With regard to the terms related to apostle (e.g., apostolic, apostleship), I understand it as a kind of privileged status of a person in an early Christian community (i.e., an authoritative leadership) in this thesis. The question of whether he or she is an eyewitness of the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus is a crucial condition for a person to claim this status. Brock conducts an exhaustive research and understands this term in this light. I am adopting her definition of this term in this thesis. See A.G. Brock, *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle: the struggle for authority* (Harvard Theological Studies 51; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), pp. 1-19.

⁴ Cf. A.G. Brock, 'Peter, Paul, and Mary: Canonical vs. Non-Canonical Portrayals of Apostolic Witnesses', in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1999 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), pp. 173-202.

⁵ F. Bovon, 'Le Privilège Pascal de Marie-Madeleine', *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 50-62 (p. 51). 'chaque groupe trouva sa raison d'être et sa dignité de peuple de Dieu dans une apparition de Jésus

Whether one was a witness of the resurrection or not was an important criterion for the early Christians in choosing an authoritative leader,⁶ and Luke connects this apostolic leadership with witnessing to the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 1.22; 4.33). The dynamics of the relationship between the Appearance experience and authoritative apostolic leadership in the early Christian community is found in the Pauline epistles as well. Paul recognized that his apostolic authority was challenged in the community of first Corinthians (1 Cor. 9.1ff).⁷ In this situation, he claims his apostleship (apostolic authority) by arguing that he has seen the resurrected Jesus (1 Cor. 9.1-2; 15.3-11).⁸ Defence of his apostleship with reference to his Appearance experience is also found in his letter to Galatians (Gal. 1.11-2.10. esp., 1.12, 16).

Ernest Best points out that Paul did not claim his apostleship right after his Damascus experience, but when the relationship with some other church leaders was involved.⁹ That is, the claim of apostleship is political, which is closely related to the matter of authority in the early Christian community.¹⁰ If this is the case, the question whether one is included in the list of the Appearance witnesses must have been a sensitive issue in the early Christian community, as I mentioned above.

The close relationship between a person's experience of the Appearance event and his or her authority as an apostolic leader leads me to pay attention to the discrepancies in reporting the eyewitnesses in the New Testament writings. Matthew (28.1-10) tells us that Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (although we do not

ressuscité à son premier leader.'

⁶ B. Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 125-26. Cf. Acts 1.22-26.

⁷ P.W. Barnett, 'Apostle', in G.F. Hawthorne and R.P. Martin (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (Leicester and Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1993), pp. 45-51 (p. 49).

⁸ R.F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (D.J. Harrington [ed.]; Sacra Pagina Series vol. 7; Minnesota: the Liturgical Press, 1999), p. 329.

⁹ E. Best, 'Paul's Apostolic Authority – ?', *JSNT* 27 (1986), pp. 3-25 (p. 5).

¹⁰ Best, 'Paul's Apostolic Authority – ?', p. 22.

know which Mary he refers to) are the first eyewitnesses of the Appearance. According to Luke, two disciples, Simon (Peter?), the Eleven (Lk 24.13-49), and apostles (although we do not know what he means by apostles here; Acts. 1.3) are witnesses but we do not find the women in this list. John, however, describes Mary Magdalene as the first witness (20.11). Paul states that the first witness was Peter, then the Twelve, the five hundred, James, 'all apostles', and then Paul himself (1 Cor. 15.3ff). The author of the *Gospel of the Hebrews* also suggests James the brother of Jesus as an eyewitness of the Appearance. However, Mark does not suggest any of them as eyewitness, while the author of the LE suggests Mary Magdalene as the first witness.

Considering the importance of a person's inclusion in the Appearance witness list and its relationship with his or her authority on the one hand, and the diversion of the list of the Appearance witnesses depending on documents on the other, the political importance of the witness list is suggestive to my investigation into the ideological identity of the communities of the other Markan endings, because they are relating the Appearance story. In this Chapter, I will examine a few NT apocryphal and gnostic documents that reflect the struggle for authority, especially between Mary Magdalene and Peter. Through my examination, I will illuminate that these two characters had a competitive relationship with each other.¹¹ This argument will provide the basis of the hypothesis that the LE was the product of the Pro-Mary Magdalene community (Chapter Four), and the SE was of the Pro-Petrine (Chapter Five).

¹¹ We do not know whether Mary Magdalene and Peter, the flesh-and-blood and 'historical' figures, had this relationship in the historical reality or not, and I am not interested in that either. I will

3.2 The assumed conflict between Mary Magdalene and Peter

3.2.1 *Gospel of Mary*

The *Gospel of Mary* (BG, 1),¹² generally dated to the second century,¹³ is a good example of an early Christian text that reflects the conflict between Peter and Mary Magdalene.¹⁴ Although the first six pages are missing, they are probably about the dialogue between the risen Saviour and his disciples,¹⁵ as page seven describes the conclusion of this dialogue.¹⁶ After the exchange of the disciples' questions and Jesus' answers (7.3-8.11),¹⁷ Jesus leaves them and the disciples are perplexed (9.5-12). This is the context of the first section – we have two sections where Mary and Peter are presented (9.5-10.15; 17.10-19.2) in the *Gospel of Mary* – in which Mary is playing her role.

In the *Gospel of Mary*, Mary Magdalene is portrayed positively, while the disciples (esp. Andrew and Peter) are depicted negatively. The disciples are in grief

just deal with them as 'characters' represented in the text.

¹² We have three *Gospel of Mary (Magdalene)* manuscripts. One is Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (=BG), a Coptic version, and the others are Greek versions, each of which is P. Rylands 463 (P. Ryl. 463) and P. Oxyrhynchus 3525 (P. Oxy. 3525). Among the whole 19 pages, we have nine pages and pages 1-6 and 11-14 are missing. The Coptic version dates the 5th century CE, and the two Greek versions the 3rd century. The P. Ryl. 463 corresponds to the Coptic BG 17.4-22; 18.5-19.3, and P. Oxy. 3525 to 9.5-10.14 respectively. See Marjanen, *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), p. 96; K.L. King, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', in E.S. Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures Volume Two: A Feminist Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1995), pp. 601-34 (p. 625).

¹³ A. Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 98; King, 'Gospel of Mary Magdalene' p. 628.

¹⁴ It is a general consensus that the Mary in the *Gospel of Mary* is Mary Magdalene not Mary the mother of Jesus. See A. Marjanen, 'The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts', in F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition* (SBLSymS 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), pp. 31-41 (pp. 35-36); idem, *Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 94-95. For those who identify this Mary with the mother of Jesus, E. Lucchesi, 'Évangile selon Marie ou Évangile selon Marie-Madeleine?' *AnBoll* 103 (1985), p. 366; S.J. Shoemaker, 'A Case of Mistaken Identity? Naming the Gnostic Mary', in F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary?*, pp. 5-30. See also K.L. King, 'Why All the Controversy? Mary in the Gospel of Mary', in F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary?* pp. 53-74. Concerning the debates over the identity of Mary in the gnostic/apocryphal texts, see F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary?*

¹⁵ Most scholars place this narrative in the post-resurrection setting. See Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 99; King, 'Why All the Controversy?', p. 55; idem, 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', pp. 602, 607.

¹⁶ Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 99.

¹⁷ The first number indicates the page number and the second the line of the Papyrus Berolinensis.

and irresolute so that they are afraid of preaching (9.7-12).¹⁸ However, Mary encourages them (9.12-20) and she ‘turned their hearts to the Good (9.22)’.¹⁹ Unlike the other disciples, she ‘did not waver at the sight of me [Jesus] (10.14-15)’, and it portrays her as possessing ‘spiritual virtue’.²⁰ The author of the *Gospel of Mary* depicts Peter as inferior to Mary Magdalene by portraying him as asking her to tell the words of the Saviour that they do not know.²¹ As Karen King correctly noticed, Mary Magdalene takes the role of the Saviour after his departure by teaching and encouraging the disciples.²²

The second section (17.10-19.2) recounts the conflict between two groups of characters, Mary Magdalene and Levi, against Andrew and Peter. When Mary finishes her talk, Andrew discredits Mary (17.13-15), and Peter challenges her authority²³ by denigrating her: “‘Did he really speak with a woman without our knowledge (and) not openly? Are we to turn about and all listen to her? Did he prefer her to us?’” (17.18-22)’ Peter understands Mary merely as Jesus’ favourite woman (10.2-3),²⁴ but Levi rebukes Peter’s immaturity and misunderstanding. Mary is portrayed as taking the first place, not merely among women, but above all disciples.²⁵

¹⁸ As Marjanen (*Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 107) well notes, ‘being doubtful, irresolute (*Gos. Mary* 9.16)’ connotes the status of being ‘spiritually less advanced’.

¹⁹ The translation of the *Gospel of Mary* quoted in this section is from G.W. MacRae and R. McL. Wilson (trans.), ‘The Gospel of Mary (BG 8502, 1)’, in NHL, pp. 523-27.

²⁰ King, ‘Gospel of Mary Magdalene’, p. 612.

²¹ Many scholars have pointed out the contradiction between the first section and the second due to the change of Peter’s attitude. They suggest that it is because of two different sources (e.g., W.C. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955], pp. 25-26; R.McL. Wilson, ‘The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary’, *NTS* 3 [1956-57], pp. 236-43; A. Pasquier, *L’Évangile selon Maries* [Québec : Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 1983], pp. 7-10). However, Marjanen more persuasively explains it in light of the development of the plot within the narrative that presents the conflict between Mary Madgalene and the disciples (*Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 103-104).

²² King, ‘Why All the Controversy?’, p. 59.

²³ Cf. “‘...that I am lying about the Saviour?’ (18.5)’

²⁴ Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 111, 116.

²⁵ Compare Peter (‘Sister, we know that the Saviour loved you more than *the rest of women* [my italics].’ *Gos. Mary* 10.1-3) with Levi (‘That is why he loved her more than *us* [my italics].’ *Gos.*

The characterization of two groups of characters, Mary and Levi, and Peter and Andrew, alerts us to the assumed conflict between Mary and Peter. The author of this gospel portrays Mary Magdalene as the only legitimate authoritative leader.²⁶ As King rightly mentions, the author's selection of Peter and Mary is not a coincidence.²⁷ It is not merely a matter of gender but of individuals;²⁸ it alerts us to the existence of groups that accepted Mary Magdalene's authority and followed her as their leader, and opposing groups, i.e., the Pro-Mary Magdalene and Pro-Petrine groups.²⁹

3.2.2 *Gospel of Thomas*

The conflict between Peter and Mary Magdalene is reflected in the *Gospel of Thomas* (NHC II, 2), which is dated to the first century CE. We have five named characters in addition to Jesus in this document; Simon Peter (13, 114), Matthew (13), Thomas (13), Mary Magdalene (21, 114),³⁰ and Salome (61).³¹ Interestingly, both Peter and Mary appear twice. Furthermore, if we accept the hypothesis that considers logion 114 as the later addition of another author in the late second century,³² the characterization of these two characters in logion 114 is noteworthy.

Mary 18.14-15). Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 114.

²⁶ King, 'Why All the Controversy?', p. 63.

²⁷ King, 'Why All the Controversy?', p. 71.

²⁸ P. Perkins, *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (NY: Paulist, 1980), p. 136.

²⁹ E. De Boer, *Mary Magdalene: Beyond the Myth* (PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), pp. 116-17.

³⁰ It is general consensus that this Mary is identified with Mary Magdalene. See P. Thimmes, 'Memory and Re-Vision: Mary Magdalene Research Since 1975', *CR* 6 (1998), pp. 193-226 (pp. 206-207). Cf. M.W. Meyer, 'Make Mary Male: The Categories "Male" and "Female" in the Gospel of Thomas', *NTS* 31 (1985), pp. 554-70 (p. 562).

³¹ We have other named persons such as Adam (46), John the Baptist (46), James the Just (12). Thomas is also mentioned in the beginning of this document (1). However they are not characters but their names only are mentioned.

³² Most scholars believe as such. See S.L. Davis, *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom* (NY: The Seabury Press, 1983), pp. 152-55; R.J. Miller, *The Complete Gospel: Annotated Scholars Version* (NY: HarperCollins, 1994); A. Marjanen, 'Women disciples in the Gospel of Thomas', in R. Uro (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroad: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), pp. 89-106 (p. 103).

As Antti Marjanen rightly notes, the author of the *Gospel of Thomas* portrays Peter negatively.³³ Peter is depicted as misunderstanding Jesus (13). It is not Peter but James the Just whom Jesus appoints as a leader (12); it is Thomas who receives secret sayings from Jesus (13). However, Mary Magdalene is not portrayed negatively. Although she is not depicted as possessing a full understanding, she is not a person of misunderstanding either.³⁴

Furthermore, the contrast in characterization of Peter and Mary Magdalene is highlighted in logion 114. It recounts Peter's suggestion and Jesus' response to it, and it reflects the assumed conflict between Peter and Mary. Peter expresses his antipathy against Mary and denigrates her by saying, 'Let Mary leave us, for women are not worthy of life'.³⁵ However, Jesus rebuffs Peter's suggestion and defends Mary, and by so doing, the author of logion 114 depicts Peter negatively and sheds a positive light on Mary.³⁶

It is not easy to explain the meaning of the conflict between the Thomasian Peter and Mary, and it is more complicated if the meaning of 'to make her male' is considered.³⁷ Elaine H. Pagels interprets the conflict between Peter and Mary Magdalene as a sort of struggle between two opposite genders.³⁸ Richard Atwood explains that the conflict stems from the prominence that Mary Magdalene enjoyed

³³ Marjanen, 'Women Disciples', pp. 90-91.

³⁴ P. Perkins ('The Gospel of Thomas', in E.S. Fiorenza [ed.], *Searching the Scriptures Volume Two: A Feminist Commentary* [London: SCM Press, 1995], pp. 535-60) argues that Mary Magdalene is portrayed as possessing insight like Thomas by comparing logion 21 with 13. However, Marjanen ('Women Disciples', pp. 92-93) points out that she is 'not testing Jesus' understanding but seeking to be taught by him'. Agreeing with Marjanen, see Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, p. 78.

³⁵ English translation from T.O. Lambdin, 'The Gospel of Thomas (II, 2)', in NHL, pp. 124-38.

³⁶ Marjanen, 'Women Disciples', p. 91.

³⁷ It is also complicated if we compare logion 114 with logion 22. Many scholars have examined the contradiction between logions 22 and 114 ('make her male'). They are, for instance, A.D. De Conick, *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (VCSup 33; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), pp. 18-21; M. Meyer, 'Making Mary Male', pp. 554-70; S. Arai, "'To Make Her Male': an Interpretation of Logion 114 in the *Gospel of Thomas*", *StPatr* 24 (1993), pp. 373-76. For the brief summary of the arguments, see Thimmes, 'Memory and Re-Vision', pp. 206-208; Marjanen, 'Women Disciples', pp. 99-104.

in the early church.³⁹ Marjanen suggests that there were two groups, one of which was excluding female leadership based on the 'spiritual inferiority' of the female, and the other was accepting female leadership.⁴⁰

However, it is at least certain that Peter is portrayed as not wanting to share the leadership with Mary Magdalene, and that the author refuses the idea that excludes her from the Thomasian leadership. A suspicious question might be raised whether the author's characterization of Peter and Mary reflects a historical reality, viz. a conflict between historical Peter and Mary. Marjanen seems to be too cautious to follow this idea, so he generalizes the assumed conflict between them as a gender problem. However, I am not persuaded to understand them as representatives of each gender despite the presence of many other male and female characters. We need to ask why Mary and Peter? The author's *selection* of Peter and Mary and their characterization as such alerts us to the existence of groups that were in favour of Peter or Mary Magdalene. The ideological group of the *Gospel of Thomas* was not in favour of Peter but of Mary Magdalene.

3.2.3 *Pistis Sophia*

Pistis Sophia, dated to the third century CE,⁴¹ reflects the conflict between Peter and Mary Magdalene.⁴² This work consists of four books, and it is believed that the first three books and the fourth book are from different authors. The first book deals with

³⁸ E.H. Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels* (NY: Vintage Books, 1981), p. 58.

³⁹ R. Atwood, *Mary Magdalene in the New Testament Gospels and Early Tradition* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1993), p. 188.

⁴⁰ Marjanen, 'Women Disciples', pp. 105-106.

⁴¹ It is a general agreement that *Pistis Sophia I-III* are dated to the second half of the third century, while *Pistis Sophia IV* is to the first half of the third century (E.g., Harnack, C. Schmidt, W. Till). However, Marjanen questions this hypothesis of the priority of the Book IV to the Books I-III (*Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 171-72).

⁴² With regard to the identity of Mary, see A.G. Brock, 'Setting the Record Straight – The Politics of Identification: Mary Magdalene and Mary the Mother in *Pistis Sophia*', in S. Jones (ed.), *Which Mary*, pp. 43-52; Marjanen, 'Mother of Jesus', pp. 33-37.

topics such as repentance and deliverance, the second with Jesus' answers to the disciples' questions, and the third with the dialogue between Jesus and the disciples. The fourth book is about judgment and punishment.

Pistis Sophia portrays Mary Magdalene as a prominent figure. Among the eleven interlocutors of Jesus,⁴³ she is most active in exchanging dialogue with him.⁴⁴ Although characters other than Mary Magdalene are portrayed positively,⁴⁵ they do not surpass her superiority. It is only Mary who gives an answer to her colleague and receives praise from Salome and Jesus (4.132). She behaves as if she is a representative of the disciples.⁴⁶ She, along with John, takes the right/left side of Jesus, and her throne surpasses that of the other disciples (2.96).

The conflict between Mary Magdalene and Peter is well recognized in the first three books, and Peter is depicted as a rival of Mary Magdalene. Peter blames Mary that she speaks so much that they do not have a chance to talk, and he cannot endure her attitude anymore:

My Lord, we are not able to suffer this woman who takes the opportunity from us, and does not allow anyone of us to speak, but she speaks many times (*Pis. Soph.* 1.36).⁴⁷

Mary also complains to Jesus about Peter's coercion, and she claims her prominence:

My Lord, my mind is understanding at all times that I should come forward at any time and give the interpretation of the words which she [*Pistis Sophia*] spoke, but I am afraid of Peter, for he threatens me and hates our race (*Pis. Soph.* 2.72).

⁴³ They are: Mary Magdalene, Philip, Peter, Martha, John, Andrew, Thomas, Matthew, James, Salome, and Mary the mother of Jesus.

⁴⁴ Marjanen argues for the superiority of Mary Magdalene by counting the number of the dialogue of characters with Jesus, which he counts 67 occurrences out of total 115 questions and interpretations attributed to Mary Magdalene (*Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 174).

⁴⁵ E.g., Philip (1.22, 43), Peter (1.37, 53), Martha (1.56), John (1.40-41), Andrew (1.45), Thomas (1.46), Matthew (1.49-50), James (1.51-52), and Mary the mother of Jesus (1.59-62). The first number indicates Book number and the second chapter numbers. In these chapters, Jesus praises them for their successful answers.

⁴⁶ She explains the words of Jesus, and asks questions on behalf of her colleagues (4.132).

⁴⁷ This translation and the below one are from C. Schmidt (ed.), *Pistis Sophia* (V. MacDermot [trans.]; NHS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1978).

In Book four, Mary's prominence is not that noticeable and Peter's attack is not made as directly on Mary as in the first three books. However, the conflict between them is implied in the text.⁴⁸ For instance, Peter complains to Jesus: 'My Lord, let the women cease to question, that we also may question (4.146).'

According to the *Pistis Sophia*, Peter understands Mary as his threatening competitor, and Mary wants to secure her superior status. His hatred stems from jealousy of Mary's spiritual superiority.⁴⁹ Although it is not certain that the author portrays Peter negatively, the author surely wants to highlight Mary's prominence. Furthermore, the author *selects* Peter as Mary's opponent among many characters. Therefore, this document reflects the assumed conflict between Peter and Mary.

3.3 The prominence of Mary Magdalene

Beside these three documents that reflect the conflict between Mary Magdalene and Peter, each being in favour of the former, we have other works that present Mary Magdalene's prominence⁵⁰ such as the *Gospel of Philip* (NHC II, 3).⁵¹ The author portrays Mary Magdalene as having a close and special relationship with Jesus; she

⁴⁸ Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 185-87.

⁴⁹ As Marjanen correctly noticed, the author of *Pistis Sophia* understands that the spiritual superiority allows a person to have more access to the dialogue with Jesus than those whose spirit is less advanced (*Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 181-82).

⁵⁰ I did not include the *First Apocalypse of James* (NHC V, 3) in discussing the prominence of Mary Magdalene because the translation of the part that mentions Mary Magdalene is obscure. W.R. Schoedel translates ('The [First] Apocalypse of James [V, 3]', in NHL, pp. 260-68): 'When you [James; my insertion] speak these words of this [perception], encourage these [four]: Salome, and Mariam [and Martha and Arsinoe...] (*1 Apoc. Jas.* 40.22-26).' According to this translation, Mariam (Mary Magdalene) needs encouragement from James. However, Marjanen, through his grammatical examination of line 24, persuasively argues that it should be translated as either as '... be persuaded by the words of Salome and Mariam...' or '... be persuaded by this testimony: Salome and Mariam...' (*Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 132-35).' According to Schoedel's translation Mary Magdalene is not portrayed positively. But Marjanen's translation portrays her as an authoritative and prominent figure who 'provides guidance to James in the most important tasks the Lord entrusts to him (Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 135).'

⁵¹ It is dated between the second half of the second century and the early third century (Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 147).

is depicted as the 'companion' of Jesus.⁵² This shows Mary's elevated position as a 'spiritual consort' of Jesus.⁵³

According to the *Gospel of Philip*, the male disciples are without understanding while Mary Magdalene is not. They do not perceive the mystery of the virgin conception (55.23-32). They are depicted as the blind who remain in darkness (64.5-9). However, Mary Magdalene is portrayed as the 'companion' whom Jesus loved 'more than [all] the disciples [and used to] kiss'⁵⁴ (63.34-36; 64.2).' While the disciples get an understanding only after the post-resurrection revelation, Mary Magdalene is a person of understanding at any time throughout the narrative.⁵⁵ It is not certain whether the *Gospel of Philip* reflects the assumed conflict between Mary Magdalene and her opponents. However it is obvious that the author wants to highlight Mary's prominence, and he is in favour of Mary Magdalene.

The prominence of Mary Magdalene is found in the Greek version of the *Acts of Philip* (=Gk *Acts Phil.*),⁵⁶ dated to the fourth century.⁵⁷ It is a collection of the legendary mission stories of a group of disciples. It consists of two parts, *Act Phil.* I-VII and VIII-XV plus *Act Phil. Mart.*, and this text recounts the acts of Philip, Bartholomew and Mary Magdalene (Mariamne).⁵⁸ Especially, the author of the

⁵² As Marjanen notes (*Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 151), this attribution to Mary is unique that is found only in the *Gospel of Philip* (*Gos. Phil.* 59.9). The translation of the *Gospel of Philip* in this section is from W.W. Isenberg, 'The Gospel of Philip (II, 3)', in NHL, pp. 137-60.

⁵³ Literally, 'companion (koinonos)' means the marital relationship of 'spouse' or 'wife' (Thimmes, 'Memory and Re-Vision', p. 213). However, it is interpreted as bearing a symbolic meaning of 'spiritual consort' rather than sexual relationship. See Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 154.

⁵⁴ For the metaphorical significance of kissing, see Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 158-59.

⁵⁵ Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 167-68.

⁵⁶ The three main manuscripts are Vatican, Vaticanus graecus 824 (= V); Athos, Xenophontos 32 (= A); Athens, Atheniensis 346 (= G).

⁵⁷ Bovon, 'Privilège Pascal', p. 57.

⁵⁸ The text names her Mariamne, and scholars identify her as Mary Magdalene. See Bovon, 'Privilège Pascal', p. 57; F. Bovon, B. Bouvier, and F. Amsler (trans.), *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), p. 176, n. 339.

second part,⁵⁹ on which my discussion will be focused, portrays Mary Magdalene as a prominent character.

The second part (VIII/94 ff.) begins with the scene where Christ allocates missions to Philip (VIII.1/94). When Christ commissions Philip to go to the regions of the Hellenes, he weeps because he believes it will be very hard for him. Then Christ chooses Mary to accompany Philip so that she may console and encourage him during his mission trips (VIII.3/95). She is portrayed as 'good and brave in the soul and blessed among women (VIII.3/95 in G).'⁶⁰ Mary's spiritual and emotional maturity is so superior to Philip's that she is portrayed as a person who can guide him when he goes astray because of his defects.⁶¹ Throughout the mission trips, Mary performs her duty successfully.

Mary's prominence is also well noticed in the *Acts of Philip Martyrdom*. Sitting at the entrance of Stachys' house, she persuades people to listen to the apostles' preaching (*Acts Phil. Mart.* 3/109 in V). She heals Nicanora in front of Philip and Bartholomew and many other people (*Acts Phil. Mart.* 9/115 in V//A). She baptizes women when Philip baptizes men (*Acts Phil. Mart.* 2/108 in A; *Acts Phil.* 14.9 in A). When Tyrannos, Nicanora's husband, strips Mary naked to bring shame on her in front of the crowds, her decency is protected by a cloud of fire (*Acts Phil. Mart.* 19-20/125-26 in V//A). When Philip was about to revenge those who persecute him by cursing them, being unable to control his anger, Mary exhorts and restrains him (*Acts Phil. Mart.* 26/132 in A. Cf. *Acts Phil.* 8.3/95).

⁵⁹ Bovon ('Privilège Pascal', p. 57) argues that the origins of these two parts are independent of each other.

⁶⁰ The quotes in this section are my translation. The Greek text is from F. Bovon, B. Bouvier and F. Amsler (eds.), *Acta Philippi: Textus* (CCSA 11; Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 1999).

⁶¹ Christ says that 'for I know that [this] person is an impetuous and quick-tempered, and if we send him alone he will often return evil for evil to people (VIII.3/95 in V//G)'.

The prominence of Mary Magdalene is found in the *Dialogue of the Saviour* (NHC III, 5), dated to the early second century.⁶² The extant part of the *Dialogue of the Saviour* is the third codex, the fifth tractate, pages 120-147. It is about the conversation between the Lord (Saviour) and his disciples. Judas (Thomas),⁶³ Mary (Magdalene)⁶⁴ and Matthew are the only three named interlocutors in this document. The author of the *Dialogue of the Saviour* portrays Mary as the most prominent character. The narrator depicts Mary ‘as a woman who had understood completely (139.12-13)’.⁶⁵ Her prominence is highlighted when the narrator portrays her as a responsible revealer of the mystery:

Mary said, “Tell me, Lord, why I have come to this place to profit or to forfeit.”
The Lord said, “You make clear the abundance of the revealer!” (*Dial. Sav.*
140.14-19)

It is also noticeable that the author presents Mary, Matthew and Judas as kind of representative of the disciples. This presentation thus forms a clear contrast to the canonical presentation of the inner group of disciples, Peter, James, John (and Andrew). These three (four) canonical inner group members are replaced by Mary, Matthew and Judas (Thomas), and this group of three non-canonical disciples are presented as models for other disciples.⁶⁶ It is not certain whether the replacement is intentional or merely sharing the same (or similar) tradition that other Gnostic writings adopt.⁶⁷ However, it seems noteworthy that the prominence of Mary

⁶² H. Koester and E.H. Pagels, ‘Introduction’ to ‘The Dialogue of the Saviour (III, 5)’, in NHL, pp. 244-46 (p. 244).

⁶³ Judas is believed to be identified with Thomas. For the discussion of this idea, see Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 75, n. 2.

⁶⁴ For the identification of this Mary with Mary Magdalene, see Marjanen, ‘Identity of Mary’, pp. 39-40; idem, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 76, n. 7.

⁶⁵ The translation of the *Dialogue of the Saviour* in this section is from S. Emmel, ‘The Dialogue of the Saviour (III, 5)’, in NHL, pp. 243-55.

⁶⁶ Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, pp. 87-88; Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, p. 99.

⁶⁷ E.g., the *Sophia of Jesus Christ* (Mary, Matthew and Thomas [Judas]), the *Book of Thomas the Contender* (Thomas, Matthew), *Pistis Sophia* (Mary, Thomas, Matthew, Philip).

Magdalene is highlighted while Peter is removed from the important group of disciples.

The replacement of Peter by Mary Magdalene is also found in the *Sophia of Jesus Christ* (NHC III, 4).⁶⁸ This writing is about the dialogue between the risen Jesus, and his twelve disciples and seven women. Among a total of nineteen people, only five are singled out as named characters to talk with the risen Jesus.⁶⁹ As in the *Dialogue of the Saviour*, the canonical inner group of Jesus that gives Peter the prime position is replaced by another group that presents Mary Magdalene as a partner of the dialogue with Jesus and an 'authoritative receiver and transmitter of the Gnostic message'.⁷⁰

3.4 The prominence of Peter and downgrading Mary Magdalene

I have examined texts that reflect the assumed conflict between Mary and Peter, and texts that portray Mary Magdalene as a prominent figure. In this section, I will deal with the texts that downgrade Mary Magdalene and may reflect the same conflict between these two characters but from the opposite point of view. The texts to be discussed are the Coptic versions of the *Acts of Philip*, the Greek *Acta Thaddaei*, the Coptic *Revillout Fragment 14*, the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle*. As I have pointed out in the introduction of this Chapter, the inclusion, exclusion or replacement of a character's name reflects the dynamics

⁶⁸ The date of composition of this work is not certain. The Greek version (P. Oxy. 1081) is dated between the late third and early fourth century. Douglas M. Parrott, judging from *Eugnostos* (believed to be dated to the first century) that *Soph. Jes. Chr.* was based on, suggests its composition early second century. For further discussion on dating of this work, see D.M. Parrott, 'Gnostic and Orthodox Disciples in the Second and Third Centuries', in C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr. (eds.), *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1986), pp. 193-219 (pp. 194-96).

⁶⁹ They are: Philip (twice in 92.4-5; 95.19-20), Matthew (twice in 93.24-94.4; 100.16-18), Thomas (twice in 96.14-17; 108.16-19), Mary [Magdalene] (twice in 98.9-11; 114.8-12) and Bartholomew (once in 103.22-104.4).

⁷⁰ Marjanen, *Woman Jesus Loved*, p. 72.

of political power struggles among ideological groups. The examination of these texts will show the assumed conflict between Mary Magdalene and Peter (or, the existence of Pro-Mary Magdalene and Pro-Petrine groups).

3.4.1 *Acts of Philip*: discrepancy between the Greek and Coptic Version

In the previous part, I examined the Greek *Acts of Philip* to point out that it highlights the prominence of Mary Magdalene by portraying her positively. Besides this Greek version, we have the Coptic version of the *Acts of Philip* (= *Ct Acts Phil.*).

The Coptic version might look different from the Greek *Acts of Philip* at a glance. However, we can find lots of clear evidence that shows the relationship between them. Especially, the Coptic version exhibits common plot and motifs with the *Gr Acts Phil* 8-15 and *Acts Phil. Mart.* Bovon enumerates the parallel motifs between these two versions. For instance, the apostles are allocated a mission area. Philip is characterized initially as a person with flaw. The Saviour consoles and encourages the apostles. They encounter hindrances when entering the target village. They confront pagan cults (the worship of snake and the bird) and they win the victory. The miraculous divine help is asked for (e.g., earthquake, thunder, lights), which results in the destruction of many people. Survivors plead with them for God's mercy.⁷¹

Interestingly, the prominence of Mary Magdalene in the Greek version is replaced by Peter in the Coptic *Acts of Philip* as François Bovon correctly points out.⁷² It is Peter and not Mary who accompanies Philip, and by so doing takes over her role. Mary performs the miracle of healing in the *Gr Acts Phil.*, but it is Peter

⁷¹ See Bovon, 'Les Actes de Philippe', in *ANRW* 2:25/6 (1988), pp. 4432-4525 (pp. 4438-4440); Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, pp. 127-28.

⁷² F. Bovon, 'Les Actes de Philippe', p. 4439.

who performs exorcism in the *Ct Acts Phil.*⁷³ Peter plays a prominent role in producing the conversion of the townsmen. The pillar moves by his order, and his power eventually leads people to conversion and the apostles' victory over the pagan cult.

The substitution of Mary Magdalene with Peter alerts us to the hypothesis that there were certain ideological groups who supported Peter rather than Mary Magdalene as their authoritative leader, or who were standing on such a tradition. It can also be suggested that there might have been an assumed competition between two ideological groups who was in favour of Peter and of Mary Magdalene, and that the assumed ideological primary group of the *Ct Acts Phil.* was favouring Peter.

3.4.2 Downgrading Mary Magdalene by means of Mary the mother of Jesus⁷⁴

I have surveyed the downgrading of Mary Magdalene by replacing her for Peter. Some other writings downgrade her by substituting her with Mary the mother of Jesus. The Greek *Acta Thaddaei* (BHG 1702-1703) reports that the first eyewitness of the resurrection is Mary the mother of Jesus: 'He [Jesus] appeared *first to his mother* and to the other women, and *to Peter* and John the first of my co-disciples, then also to us the twelve, who ate and drank with him for many day after his resurrection from the dead (my italics for emphasis)'⁷⁵ Mary Magdalene loses her name in the witness list, not to mention her supreme place as the first witness.

⁷³ Both miracles (healing in the *Gr Acts Phil.* and exorcism in the *Ct Acts Phil.*) are important incidents that unfold the narrative.

⁷⁴ See also my Excursus about Mary the mother of Jesus at the end of this Chapter.

⁷⁵ 'καὶ ὤφθη πρῶτον τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλαις γυναιξίν, καὶ Πέτρῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ τοῖς πρῶτοις τῶν συμμαθητῶν μου, ἔπειτα καὶ ἡμῖν τοῖς δώδεκα, οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πολλάς.' The translation is by Brock (*Mary Magdalene*, pp. 129-30).

Furthermore, the author clearly highlights the prominence of Peter, as Brock well recognized.⁷⁶

The Coptic *Revillout Fragment 14* also replaces Mary Magdalene with Mary the mother of Jesus in recounting the first Easter scene.⁷⁷ The story of this manuscript is similar to that of the Gospel of John 20, where Mary Magdalene meets the risen Jesus in the garden. However, it is not Mary Magdalene but Mary the mother of Jesus who plays the role of the Johannine Mary Magdalene. The Virgin Mary is the first witness of the resurrection and she is commissioned to deliver the resurrection news to the disciples; Mary Magdalene has lost her place.

The *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle*⁷⁸ is another writing that replaces Mary Magdalene with Mary the mother of Jesus in the first Easter scene. The Easter scene in the narrative is fairly like those of the Synoptics, where female characters come to the tomb looking for the body of Jesus. In this text the narrator has Mary the mother of Jesus ask Philogenes for Jesus' body. Philogenes, like the angelic young man in Mark's Gospel (Mk 16.1-8), explains what happened to Jesus.

Interestingly, it is not Mary Magdalene who meets the risen Jesus but Mary the mother of Jesus. The risen Jesus calls her in a strange language, but she understands it and even responds to him in that language, each of which is interpreted for the reader respectively. She is commissioned to deliver the resurrection news to others. Furthermore, Peter is described as 'the great interpreter of Jesus', and he helps and encourages Philogenes when he is perplexed.

⁷⁶ Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, p. 130.

⁷⁷ For the information of the Coptic text and its English translation, see Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, pp. 134-35. For the outline of *Revillout Fragments* (no. 1-14), see also J.K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 161-63.

⁷⁸ The text is in E.A.W. Budge, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London: British Museum, 1913).

Brock also points out that additional Coptic fragments of the *Book of the Resurrection* highlight the supremacy of Peter.⁷⁹ God ordains Peter as the ‘Archbishop of the whole world’, and he becomes ‘the chief and head in my [God’s] kingdom’ and ‘over the whole world.’⁸⁰

Brock correctly observes that these texts exhibit a common theme in their portrayal of the three characters, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of Jesus and Peter.⁸¹ These texts divide them into two groups, one for Mary Magdalene and the other for Mary the mother of Jesus and Peter. They downgrade the prominence of Mary Magdalene by replacing her with Mary the mother of Jesus, viz., the Virgin Mary replaces Magdalene’s role. On the other hand, they elevate Peter’s position. Mary the mother of Jesus is cooperative in strengthening Peter’s prominence, as is seen in the *Book of Resurrection*.⁸²

3.4.3 Mary Magdalene: the Bride of Christ who became a whore

Hippolytus, the Bishop of Rome (ca. 170-235) referred to Mary Magdalene as ‘the Bride of Christ’, which was originally attributed to Mary the mother of Jesus in his commentary on *Song of Songs* (3.1-4; in chapters 24 and 25 of the commentary).⁸³ But we have another image of Mary Magdalene. She has often been identified as *magna peccatrix*, a weeping whore at the feet of Jesus in lots of Western art and literature.⁸⁴ In Martin Scorsese’s film *The Last Temptation of Christ* (1988), she is a prostitute by whom Jesus is seduced. The name Magdalene became a synonym for an

⁷⁹ Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, p. 137.

⁸⁰ Quoted again from Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, p. 137.

⁸¹ Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, pp. 138-42.

⁸² Brock supports this idea by examining the *Question of Bartholomew*. See Brock, *Mary Magdalene*, pp. 139-40.

⁸³ Haskins, *Mary Magdalene: Myth and Metaphor* (NY: Riverhead Books, 1993), pp. 60-64. For the study of Mary Magdalene in Hippolytus’ commentary, see Victor Saxer, ‘Marie Madeleine dans le commentaire d’Hippolyte sur le Cantique des Cantiques’, *RevB* 101 (1991), pp. 219-39.

⁸⁴ I have found an interesting web site that introduces Mary Magdalene in Western cultures

ex-prostitute in modern English, and has often been linked with sexual corruption and abuse, as in Peter Mullan's film *The Magdalene Sisters* (2003).

The process through which this great 'apostola apostolorum' and 'the Bride of Christ' became a whore does not seem to be that complicated. It is a result of a mixture of three different women: *magna peccatrix* (Lk. 7.36-50), Mary of Bethany (Jn 12.1-8), and Mary Magdalene a former seven-demon-possessed woman (Lk. 8.2).⁸⁵ The Johannine Mary of Bethany pours pure nard on the feet of Jesus and wipes them with her hair. This Mary has been identified with the sinful woman who is disgraced by guests at Simon's house (Lk. 7.36-50). The anonymous *magna peccatrix* gets a name, Mary. Mary Magdalene was possessed by demons (Lk. 8.2), and her possession was allegedly caused by unrestrained sexual indulgence.⁸⁶ Therefore, this Mary came to be identified with Mary Magdalene, and she became a whore.

No text above mentions that any of these three women committed sexual sins. None of the texts above identifies Mary Magdalene with the *magna peccatrix* or Mary of Bethany. They are three different characters. But they have been conflated into one woman, and she is Mary Magdalene, the whore. Making the Bride of Christ a prostitute cannot be excused merely as a mistake of ancient readers. As Jane Schaberg states, the conflation is to 'fulfill the desire – or the need – to downgrade the Magdalene'.⁸⁷ There were groups of people who elevated Mary Magdalene as the *apostola apostolorum* and the Bride of Christ by forfeiting Mary the mother of Jesus

throughout history. <http://www.magdalene.org> (accessed on 14th July, 2003).

⁸⁵ See E. Moltmann-Wendel, *The Women around Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1982); J. Schaberg, 'How Mary Magdalene Became a Whore', *BR* 8/October (1992), pp. 30-37, 51-52; Ingrid Maisch, *Mary Magdalene: the Image of a Woman through the Centuries* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Collegeville, Minnesota: the Liturgical Press, 1998), pp. 156-75.

⁸⁶ Moltmann-Wendel, *Women around Jesus*, pp. 65-66.

⁸⁷ Schaberg, 'How Mary Magdalene Became a Whore', p. 37.

of this title. On the other hand, there were other groups of people who downgraded her as a whore.

3.5 Conclusion: Mary Magdalene seesaws with Peter

I have surveyed the extracanonical writings that reflect the assumed conflict between Mary Magdalene and Peter. Some of them are in favour of Mary Magdalene, while others favour Peter. The writings of the former group sometimes elevate Mary Magdalene's position by portraying her as possessing spiritual superiority. They also highlight her prominence by depicting her as a leader among the disciples. In some writings, her prominence is indirectly given by negatively portraying those who challenge her.

Interestingly, it is Peter who challenges her. Peter is often depicted as opposing Mary Magdalene, trying to nullify Mary Magdalene's leadership by denigrating her. Some authors downgrade Mary Magdalene by elevating Peter's position. In some writings, Peter plays the positive role that Mary does in other writings. Mary Magdalene sometimes relinquishes her supreme position as the first witness of the resurrection of Jesus; Mary the mother of Jesus takes over Mary Magdalene's role in the first Easter scene, and Peter's prominence is highlighted.

The writings examined above from an ideological and literary-critical point of view show us that the two 'characters', Peter and Mary Magdalene, are at odds with each other.⁸⁸ They are described as competitors in early Christian writings. Their relationship represented in these texts looks like seesawing. When Mary Magdalene is elevated, Peter is downgraded; when he is elevated, she is downgraded; and Mary the mother of Jesus is seesawing by Peter's side. This also implies that

⁸⁸ It does not necessarily mean that they are historical figures with flesh-and-blood; rather, they are characters in literary works.

there were at least two opposing ideological groups in early Christianity. One was in favour of Mary Magdalene and the other of Peter (i.e., pro-Mary Magdalene/anti-Petrine ideological group and pro-Petrine/anti-Mary Magdalene group).

The assumed conflict between ideological groups embedded in the characterization of Mary Magdalene and Peter is significant in examining the LE and the SE, because this relationship is observed in these two writings, too. In the following two Chapters, I will examine the LE and the SE respectively and suggest their assumed portraits reconstructed through the literary analysis.

Excursus:

Mary the mother of Jesus and *the Protevangelium of James*

The divinization of Mary the mother of Jesus is easily found throughout the Western culture, but it began from the early stage of Christianity, and the *Protevangelium of James* is a good example of it.⁸⁹ This text narrates the story from Anna's conception of Mary to Mary's giving birth to Jesus (*Prot. Jas.* 1-20).⁹⁰

The author of the *Protevangelium* portrays Mary the mother of Jesus unlike a normal human being. Her birth is divine,⁹¹ and she is brought up in a special way.⁹² The author portrays Mary in a similar way that gospel authors portray Jesus.⁹³ Furthermore, her position is almost that of Jesus; she is praised so that she should be acknowledged by all generations forever; she is even described as the source of the redemption of Israel, through whom God saves the people of Israel.⁹⁴ During Mary's stay in the Jerusalem Temple, she eats not earthly, but heavenly food from the hand of an angel (*Prot. Jas.* 8.1), which reminds the reader of the angels' service to Jesus after his temptation. In this light, Harm R. Smid mentions: 'In the N.T. Mary is a

⁸⁹ The earliest copy of this document is Papyrus Bodmer 5, which is supposedly dated as early as the 3rd century CE (E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha vol. 1: Gospels and Related Writings* [W. Schneemelcher [ed.]; R. McL. Wilson [trans.]; London: Lutterworth Press, 1963], p. 370). It is, however, witnessed by the early Church Fathers such as Clement (*Stromata* 7.16) and Origen (*Against Celsus* 1.28, 32; *In Matthaeum* 10.17), which lead us to estimate it as no later than the end of second century CE (B.R. Gaventa, *Mary: Glimpses of the Mother of Jesus* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999], pp. 106-107).

⁹⁰ It is also followed by parts that do not originally belong to the *Protevangelium*: the flight of the Holy Family to Egypt, Herod's massacre, Zacharias' martyrdom, Symeon's oracle, and the author's (named James) epilogue (*Prot. Jas.* 21-25).

⁹¹ Her parents Joachim and Anna are individually (i.e., while they are away from each other for some time) told by an angel that Anna has conceived, which implies no sexual intercourse between them, just like the virgin birth of Jesus in the gospels.

⁹² Anna begins to feed baby Mary only after fulfilling the purification ritual (*Prot. Jas.* 5.2), and makes a sanctuary in Mary's bedchamber to protect her from all common and unclean things (*Prot. Jas.* 6.1); Mary is not permitted to walk on the ground before she is taken up to the Jerusalem Temple.

⁹³ Mary's parents bring her to the Temple and the priests bless her, which reminds the reader of Lk. 2.22-32 (*Prot. Jas.* 6.2-7.3).

⁹⁴ 'O God of our fathers, bless this child and give her a name renowned for ever among all generations (*Prot. Jas.* 6.2).' 'The Lord has magnified your name among all generations; because of you the Lord at the end of the days will manifest his redemption to the children of Israel (*Prot. Jas.* 7.2).'

figure of the second rank, here [*Prot. Jas. 7.2. my insertion*] she is brought into the foreground. She is already important before Christ becomes important.⁹⁵

The author of the *Protevangelium* wants to portray Mary as the purest character, and he tries to avoid all the potential misunderstandings that might damage Mary's sacred purity.⁹⁶ Mary's sacred virginity is well preserved not only during her giving birth to a baby but also after her delivery.⁹⁷ The purpose of the author's portrayal of Mary in the *Protevangelium* is to lead the reader to understand Mary as an exceptional figure: glorification of Mary.⁹⁸ She is not a normal human being, but a holy and sacred character. As Gaventa well points out, the reader concludes that the holiness of Jesus derives from Mary's.⁹⁹ She is depicted as no less figure than the Jesus of the gospel authors.

This second century document alerts us to the hypothesis that the position of Mary the mother of Jesus was highly elevated among some early Christians. Or at the very least, it tells us that there existed (a) communit(y)ies that maintained such an ideology concerning Mary the mother of Jesus.

⁹⁵ Smid, *Protevangelium Jacobi: A Commentary* (Assen: Royal VanGorcum Ltd., 1965), p. 60.

⁹⁶ Unlike the canonical reports, Mary is married to an old widower Joseph who already had sons: 'I already *have sons* and *am old*, but she is a *girl* [my italics] (*Prot. Jas. 9.2*)'. This means that Jesus' brothers and sisters are stepbrothers, which implies Mary's sexual purity. The discrepancy in age is highlighted, and it connotes no sexual involvement between them. Mary is married to him at the age of twelve, and is found to have conceived a baby as a virgin at the age of sixteen (*Prot. Jas. 8.2; 12.3*). This means that her marriage could not blemish her sacred purity. Cf. Luise Schottroff mentions that the Luke and Matthew do not understand Mary's virginity in terms of purity/impurity (*Let the Oppressed Go Free: Feminist Perspectives on the New Testament* [Louisville:W/JKP, 1992], p. 159). She finds the idea that connects virginity with purity at Hellenistic influence of the second century (p. 161).

⁹⁷ It is implied that she *had* sexual intercourse after giving birth to Jesus (Mt. 1.25), and gave birth to Jesus' brothers and sisters later (no longer a virgin!) in Matthew. However, it is not so in the *Protevangelium*. Having heard that a virgin gave birth to a baby from a midwife of Mary, Salome comes to the cave where Mary was laying her son, in order to examine her condition (*Prot. Jas. 19.3*). When she puts her finger on Mary to test whether she is a true virgin, her hand falls away being cursed by God (*Prot. Jas. 20.1*).

⁹⁸ Gaventa, *Mary*, p. 121; Smid, *Protevangelium Jacobi*, p. 14.

⁹⁹ Gaventa, *Mary*, p. 119. See also J. Kristeva, 'Stabat Mater', L.S. Roudiez (trans.), in T. Moi (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp. 160-86.

CHAPTER FOUR

INTRINSIC ANALYSIS OF THE LONGER ENDING

I am the coronis, guardian of letters. The reed pen wrote me, the right hand and the knee. If you should lend me to someone, take another in exchange. If you should erase me, I will slander you to Euripides. Keep off!

-Third century scribal colophon

4.1 Introduction: searching for the *sound of silence*

In ancient Korea, a general of the Post-Koguryo Dynasty, Wang-Gon, rebelled against his king, Mi-Reuck, who was also his close friend, and founded his own kingdom, the Koryo Dynasty in 918 CE. When Wang-Gon's *coup d'état* ended successfully, Mi-Reuck absconded from his palace and wandered around the country. According to the reports of two historians of the Koryo Dynasty, Boo-Sik Kim and Jong-Seo Kim, Mi-Reuck faced a miserable death; he was found in a barley field, plucking ears of grain to fill his hungry stomach, and was stoned to death by the farmers.¹

The story of these two kings was made into a TV drama, *Wang-Gon, The First King of the Koryo Dynasty*, in 2001 by KBS (Korean Broadcasting System). Interestingly, the director of this drama described the scene of Mi-Reuck's death in a totally different way from the description in the two documents above: when Mi-Reuck is arrested by Wang-Gon's men, Mi-Reuck asks Wang-Gon for an honourable death, and they talk and drink, sitting at table as friends, then Mi-Reuck faces an honourable death.

The director, when asked why he had portrayed Mi-Reuck's death in such a way, answered that the two historians were supporters of the Koryo Dynasty as

powerful bureaucrats, and accordingly they were speaking on behalf of the leaders of this Dynasty, denigrating the enemy, Mi-Reuck, the leader of the Post-Koguryo Dynasty. The director continued, saying that he could hardly accept the validity of these two historical documents, because the voice of the powerful is heard whereas that of the powerless is silenced and distorted.

Like these two ancient Korean historians, the powerful often (ab)use their political, economic, or educational (i.e., literacy over illiteracy) power by means of letters. Commercial documents are means of economic dominance, official and historical documents are used to hold power concerning the past, and prophetic documents are means of control over the present and the future.² The epigraph of a scribal colophon in the third century above shows literary violence:³ 'If you erase me, I will slander you to Euripides'. This is the author's violence to the reader in order to preserve his *authorial authority* from the challenge of the reader: authorial violence to the readership/editorship.⁴

As I mentioned in Chapter Two, all (literary) productions are ideological, and the text is a battlefield where two (or more) different ideologies confront each other in order to gain dominance. They compete with each other to make only their

¹ Boo-Sik Kim, *Samguk Sagi*, vol. 50 (The History of Three Dynasties, 1145 CE); Jong-Seo Kim, *The History of the Koryo Dynasty* (1451 CE)

² P. Davis (*In Search of Ancient Israel* [JSOTSup 148; Sheffield Academic Press, 1992], pp. 106-107) only mentions the control of the future. I, however, believe that prophetic texts are means of control not only of the future but also the present, because it promises the reward or punishment of the future under the condition of the reader's present life.

³ It was cited from K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literary, Power, and the Transmission of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 105. The information of the original manuscript is British Library, papyri inventory no. 136. See also B.M. Metzger, *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), p. 125.

⁴ Authorial control over the reader is found more easily in the print culture, as W.J. Ong mentions (*Orality and Literacy* [NY: Routledge, 1982], chapters 5, 6 and 7). For instance, contemporary English dictionary classifies 'hour', whose initial sound is [a], into H category not A. It shows the author exerts more control over the reader by means of visualization, i.e., text. Further examples that show the author's dominance over the reader is to CAPITALIZE letters, which the author often adopts to emphasize something, viz. author's control over the reader's reception of a meaning.

voices heard. The position or ideology of the powerful is recognized as natural, true, and acceptable; but that of the powerless is hidden, ignored and silenced in the (ideologically charged) text. That is, there is a close relationship between *discourse and power*, as is found in the anecdote above.

The intrinsic analysis of this Chapter is interested in catching this unheard voice of the powerless that is absent from/in the text.⁵ It pays attention to the loser's voice. It catches the *sound of silence* from the text by examining the literary elements of the text, such as 'characterization, plot, repetition, point of view, symbolism, irony, foreshadowing and framing.'⁶ Therefore, I will excavate the *sound of silence* from the text of the LE by examining the rhetorical techniques that the LE's author adopted to persuade his readers in this Chapter.

4.2 Presupposition for the text analysis:

Codex Alexandrinus and the LE

The Greek text⁷ for my examination of the LE is the Codex Alexandrinus, and it is read and translated as follows:

Ἀναστάς δὲ πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίας τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια ἐκείνη πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν· κάκεινοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἠπίστησαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερῶθη ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν· κάκεινοι ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς λοιποῖς· οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπίστευσαν. Ὑστερον ἀνακειμένοις αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἕνδεκα ἐφανερῶθη καὶ ὠνειδίσειεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν ὅτι τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγγεγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται. σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν, γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν καιναῖς, ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν καὶ θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψῃ, ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. ἐκείνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου συνεργούντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων.

⁵ G.A. Yee, 'Ideological Criticism: Judges 17-21 and the Dismembered Body', in G.A. Yee (ed.), *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 146-67 (p. 151).

⁶ Yee, 'Judges', p. 152.

⁷ Taken from *The Greek New Testament*, United Bible Societies 2nd edition.

And having risen early first of the week, he appeared first to Maria of Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. She, having gone, told those who had been with him mourning and weeping. And they, having heard that he was alive and was seen by her, disbelieved [it] (vv. 9-11). And after these, he was manifested in other form to two of them going into a country. And they, having gone, told to the rest, neither did they believe (vv. 12-13). And afterwards, as they were reclining, he was manifested to the eleven and reproached their unbelief and the hardness of heart, because they did not believe those having seen him had been raised out of the dead (v. 14); and he told them, 'Having gone into all the world, proclaim the good news to all the creation. The one that believes and is baptized will be saved, and the one that does not believe will be condemned. And these signs will follow those that believe: in my name shall they cast out demons, they shall speak in new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink anything deadly it shall not injure them, on the sick shall they lay hands and they shall be well (vv. 15-18). Then the Lord, after speaking to them, was taken up into the heaven, and he sat on the right hand of God. And they, having gone out, proclaimed everywhere; the Lord working together, and confirming the word through the signs following up (vv. 19-20).

This Greek text of Codex Alexandrinus is dated the fifth century CE.⁸ This ending, however, was composed no later than the second century CE, because it is witnessed by many Church Fathers such as Irenaeus (ca. 180 CE), Justin Martyr (ca. 155-161 CE), and Tatian (*Diatessaron* [ca. 172 CE]) who quoted the LE as a whole.⁹ Therefore, the original LE is believed to have been composed around 70 – 150 CE.¹⁰

We have many versions of the LE such as the Greek (e.g. Codex A), the Latin (e.g. *Diatessaron*), the Armenian,¹¹ the Ethiopic, and the Coptic. No one knows

⁸ Mann, *Mark*, p. 159.

⁹ See Chapter One of this thesis. Cf. Cox, *History and Critique*, pp. 13-51.

¹⁰ Kelhoffer (*Miracle and Mission*, p. 243) argues that the LE was composed between 120 – 150 CE. He on the one hand believes that the LE's author knew the four gospels, which supports the view that the LE was composed no earlier than 120 CE. On the other hand, he provides the Church Fathers' witness to the LE, which dates around the middle of the second century CE. For this reason, he argues that the LE was composed between 120-150 CE. However, I think it cannot be guaranteed whether the LE's author really knew the four gospels and composed the LE by using them; it is possible that he might have used other (oral) traditions that other gospel authors used in order to recount their Appearance story. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to approximate the composition of the LE between 70 – 150 CE. Cf. D.G. Palmer (*The Markan Matrix: A Literary-Structural Analysis of the Gospel of Mark* [Paisley, UK: Ceridwen Press, 1999], pp. 313-16) argues that the LE was composed earlier than Matthew and Luke, supposing that the LE gave inspiration to Matthew and Luke in composing their own the LE parallels. His argument is based on the hypothesis of the Markan authorship of some parts of the LE (16.9-16, 19-20a, which he names 'the original Epilogue' of Mark's Gospel), which is hardly supported by Markan scholars.

¹¹ The Armenian manuscript that was written in 989 CE has the so-called 'Aristion' ending. F.C. Conybeare ('Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark', *ExpTim*, 4th series, viii [1893], pp. 241-54; idem, 'On the Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark's Gospel', *ExpTim*, 5th series, ii [1895], pp. 401-21.) suggested that the presbyter Ariston who is found in the marginal note of that manuscript is identified as Aristion who is mentioned by Papias (Eusebius, *Church History*, III. xxxix.

exactly what the language of the original LE was. For the intrinsic analysis of the LE, however, I chose the Greek version (Codex A above) because I believe that Greek is most probably the original language of the LE.

Judging from the content of the LE (as well as the SE), I believe that its author intended to continue the story of MK, because MK ends with the Easter story and the LE recounts the post-Easter story.¹² It is hard to believe that the LE's author wrote in a language other than Greek, while he attached the LE to the Greek MK. However, I do not exclude the possibility that the original copy might have been written in another language, although it seems improbable. If the original LE was attached to a non-Greek version of MK, the LE might have been written in an other language than Greek. If it is the case, the LE in the Codex A might be a translation from the non-Greek (original) LE or a transcription of another Greek translation. Even so, however, I do not think that the main stream of the text is distorted or changed in a totally different way due to translation.¹³

4). C.R. Williams ('The Appendices to the Gospel According to Mark: A Study in Textual Transmission', *TCAAS* 18 [New Haven; 1915], pp. 347-447 [p. 383]) believed that Aristion was Aristo(n) the secretary of Mark. Regardless of their arguments, all of them support the early composition of the LE. Cf. Farmer (*Last Twelve Verses*, pp. 36-40) argues that the original Armenian version did not contain the LE.

¹² See my criticism on LaVerdiere's argument of the LE as an alternate ending that replaces the OE in Chapter One (1.3).

¹³ I admit that there may be some interruptions of meaning (some might call it corruption), occurring during the process of translation, that may affect the reading, because every language is unique. For instance, some effects such as the nuance, pronunciation, rhythm, and tone that are unique to a language may change when translated into another language. Furthermore, there may be some limits in translation, due to a translator's linguistic competence. I, however, believe that the translator tends to do his or her best to make the translation correspond as closely as possible to the original text. It is also contended that the scribes who copied Christian manuscripts in ancient times were free, more or less, to modify the text, as Haines-Eitzen argues (*Guardians of Letters*, p. 111). The existence of the curse phrase in many ancient and medieval texts proves that there has often been a challenge on the part of the readerly scribe to authorial control over the reader (Rev. 22.18-19 is a good example of curse phrases.), because the act of prohibition *pre*-supposes the act of commission. However, translation from one language into another is a different matter, because the purpose of translation is mainly focused not on delivering the translator's meaning or intention but on the author's. Furthermore, I believe that the LE in the Codex A is not that different from the original (Greek) text. If we suppose that the original LE was written in Greek, the LE in the Codex A should be a copy of the original Greek LE or a double (or more)-translation (e.g., from Greek into Latin then into Greek again). The main stream of the translated LE (e.g. *Diatessaron*, into Latin, 2nd century CE) from the (original, Greek) LE is concordant with the Greek LE in the Codex A. Seeing that these two translated (if we suppose that the LE in the Codex A was translated from a language other than Greek, and the

4.3 Text analysis

4.3.1 Structure of the LE

The LE consists of three main parts; (1) Jesus' appearance to Mary Magdalene (vv. 9-11); (2) Jesus' appearance to two people (vv. 12-13); (3) Jesus' appearance to the Eleven (vv. 14-18) and his ascension (vv. 19-20).¹⁴ The third part (vv. 14-20) is comprised of three subsections; v. 14, vv. 15-18, and vv. 19-20, which recount Jesus' appearance and rebuke of the Eleven, his commission, and the ascension respectively.

It is argued that it is difficult to regard each part as a narrative, except for the first two subsections of the third part (vv. 14, 15-18, i.e., Jesus' appearance to the Eleven), but rather as the 'mention or report of an appearance', as James A. Kelhoffer points out.¹⁵ However, the LE as a whole is a narrative. Parts one and two state the events that happened after the resurrection of Jesus. The last subsection of the third part (vv. 19-20) is a conclusion statement, whereas the first two parts (vv. 9-11, 12-13) function as preparatory stages towards a climax scene (the first two subsections of the third part).

The first two subsections of the third part are the narrative of Jesus' appearance and commission to the Eleven. The first subsection mentions that the resurrected Jesus is manifested to the Eleven and rebukes them (v. 14). The second subsection describes how Jesus commissions them, by promising signs, to proclaim the good news to the whole world (vv. 15-18).

original LE was in Greek) texts (i.e., the LE in the Codex A and *Diatessaron*) are concordant with each other, I believe that the original (Greek) text should be concordant with these two (translated) texts as well.

¹⁴ Cf. Hug, *La Finale*, pp. 33-37; LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark' (May), p. 232. They divide the LE into four parts as separating the third part into two (vv. 14-18 and vv. 19-20). Kelhoffer (*Miracle and Mission*, pp. 177ff) divides it into two large parts (vv. 9-14 and 15-20), each of which has three (vv. 9-11, 12-13, 14) and two (vv. 15-18, 19-20) subsections respectively. My distinction of the LE as such is mainly based on the shift of the topic and characters.

¹⁵ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 180.

The LE's narrator recounts the post-Easter events in chronological order. Each part begins with an indication of time: πρῶτος (v. 9), μετὰ (v. 12), and ὕστερον (v. 14).¹⁶ The first witness is Mary Magdalene; the second is 'two of them' (δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν); and the third, the Eleven. Even the events in the subsections of the last part happen in chronological order: Jesus' appearance to the Eleven first (v. 14, ὕστερον); his promise to them second (v. 15, καὶ); and his ascension third (v. 19, μετὰ).

These three parts follow the same pattern, with a small variation in the third one. In the first part (vv. 9-11), the resurrected Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene (ἐφάνη); she (ἐκείνη) goes to others and tells (πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλεν τοῖς...); the addressees (κάκεῖνοι) do not believe her (ἠπίστησαν). In the second part (vv. 12-13), the resurrected Jesus is manifested to the two of them (ἐφανερώθη); they (κάκεῖνοι) go to the others and tell (ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς...); the addressees (ἐκείνοις) do not believe them (οὐδὲ...ἐπίστευσαν).

The third part (vv. 14-20) follows a similar pattern to the first two parts, but with some differences. The resurrected Jesus is manifested to the Eleven (v. 14, ἐφανερώθη) as he was to those people above. These witnesses (ἐκείνοι) go and tell (v. 20, ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν). This time, however, the LE's narrator does not mention explicitly whether the addressees believed or not. Furthermore, the Eleven are no longer the addressees of the resurrection report; the addressees are the whole world (v. 15, κόσμον ἅπαντα). In addition, the scene where the Eleven are rebuked because they did not believe (οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν), unlike the two previous parts, is inserted.

The variation in structure of these three parts forms a 'type scene'.¹⁷ This variation draws the reader's attention to the changed part. In the following sections, I

¹⁶ Cf. Hug, *La Finale*, p. 33. He divides the LE into four, and suggests μετὰ (v. 19) as the time indication that distinguishes the last part.

¹⁷ A variation scene is often found in a series of scenes that exhibit a pattern. In the LE, the

will examine each part of the LE to illuminate both the spoken and silenced messages.

4.3.2 Part One – the first type-scene: vv. 9-11

The first scene of the LE is about the appearance of the resurrected Jesus to Mary Magdalene, and the reactions of characters to her testimony. This scene consists of three sections: (A) Jesus' appearance; (B) the reaction of the witness; and (C) the reaction of the addressees.

4.3.2.1 Characterization of Mary Magdalene

Characterization is one of the most important techniques that the narrator¹⁸ adopts to achieve his purpose in the narrative.¹⁹ He makes use of characters in order to have them serve his ideology.²⁰ For this reason, characters are apt to lose their subjectivity, and are accordingly impersonal;²¹ they are understood by asking 'how they are'

first two appearance scenes that form a pattern are 'type-scenes'. The 'type-scene' refers to 'similar episodes repeated with variation' (D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, p. 51). For further information of 'type-scenes', see R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (NY: Basic Books, 1981), pp. 47-62. D. Rhoads ('The Syrophenician Woman in Mark: A Narrative-Critical Study', *JAAR* 62 [1992], pp. 342-75) and C.D. Marshall (*Faith as a Theme in Mark's Gospel* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989]) show examples of type-scenes through healing scenes and miracle scenes respectively in Mark's Gospel. An example of this literary technique is also found in the post-Easter narrative of Luke's Gospel. For the exploration of 'type-scenes' in Lukan post-Easter narrative, see my 'How did Rembrandt Read the Emmaus Story?: A Literary Critical Reading of the Emmaus Story (Lk. 24.12-35)', in Y.B. Kim and D.H. Oh (eds.), *A Fresh Reading of Luke* (Seoul: Handle Press, 2001), pp. 209-31. See also, R.C. Culley, *Themes and Variations: A Study of Action in Biblical Narrative* (SBLSS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

¹⁸ For the understanding of terms such as the (reliable/unreliable) narrator, narratee, implied reader and implied author that literary criticism employs, and of their relationship, see S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978); W. Booth, *Rhetoric of Fiction*. For the relationship among those figures, see W. Gibson, 'Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers', in J.P. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism*, pp. 1-6; G. Prince, 'Introduction to the Study of the Naratee', in J.P. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism*, pp. 7-25.

¹⁹ For further information of the technique of characterization, see Williams, *Other Followers*, pp. 61-67, and the list of writings introduced in footnotes there; Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible* (JSNTSup 70; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 47-92.

²⁰ P. Merenlahti, 'Characters in Making: Individuality and Ideology in the Gospels', in D. Rhoads and K. Syroeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative-Criticism* (JSNTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 49-72 (pp. 49-50).

²¹ P. Merenlahti, 'Characters in Making', p. 51.

rather than 'what/who they are'. The characters are continuously reshaped by the ideology of the narrator (eventually of the implied author).²²

The narrator manipulates the reader's perception of characters by controlling the amount of information about them.²³ Accordingly, it is difficult to say that the character in the narrative is identical with the real-living person, because the narrator's presentation of a character's personality is selective in the narrative.²⁴ This shows that the narrator's (implied author's) ideology²⁵ is implied in the manner in which he characterizes them. Therefore, the information about the characters in the LE is important in that it reflects the narrator's (and eventually, author's) ideology.

There are three characters mentioned and implied in this section. They are Mary Magdalene, the resurrected Jesus, although his name is not mentioned explicitly, and those who had been with him. In this section and the following one, I will examine the characterization of Mary Magdalene and those who had been with Jesus respectively.

²² The author speaks through the mouth of the narrator, who is a storyteller (D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, p. 39).

²³ See B. Hochman, *Character in Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 61; W.S. Vorster, 'Characterization of Peter in the Gospel of Mark', *Neot* 21 (1987), pp. 57-76 (p. 61); R. Wilson, 'On Character: A Reply to Martin Price', *Critical Inquiry* 2 (1975), pp. 191-98 (p. 195).

²⁴ Williams, *Other Followers*, pp. 55-56.

²⁵ I think that the narrator and the implied author of the LE are generally identical with each other in their ideology. However, the narrator sometimes becomes an unreliable narrator that is not telling what the implied author really has in mind for the narrative strategy. Concerning the reliable/unreliable narrator, see Booth, *Rhetoric of Fiction*, chapters 7,8 and 10; P.J. Rabinowitz, "'What's Hecuba to Us?'" The Audience's Experience of Literary Borrowing', in S.R. Suleiman and I. Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text*, pp. 241-63 (p. 245); G. Prince, 'Notes on the Text as Reader', in S.R. Suleiman and I. Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text*, pp. 225-40 (p. 239); R. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, p. 34; Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 148ff; Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, pp. 100-103.

A. Mary Magdalene: the brighter the sun, the darker the shade

The Holy Spirit made Magdalene the apostle of the apostles

– Augustine

The mention of the name, Mary Magdalene is crucial in exploring the ideology of the LE's author, as I will show in the parts below. Mark recounts three important pericopae at the end of his narrative: the crucifixion (Mk 15.21-41), the burial (Mk 15.42-47), and the empty tomb (Mk 16.1-8). It is noticeable that each pericope mentions the names of some female characters, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of little James and Joses, and Salome. Mark finishes the first two pericopae and begins the third by mentioning their names.

Therefore it seems that the LE's author followed the pattern of the ending of MK, as he begins his narrative by mentioning the name of a female character, who is one of the three women in the OE. It cannot be argued for sure at this stage whether the LE's author did so in order to make his narrative look like Mark's work by mimicking Mark's literary style or not. The thing that appears plausible now is that the LE's author had the literary style of the ending of MK in mind when he made the narrator mention the name Mary Magdalene at the beginning of the LE.

Secondly, the previous three Markan pericopae recount events which are very distinctive in the whole Markan story of Jesus. Throughout these pericopae, Mark tells the reader how the protagonist Jesus died, how he was buried, and what happened at his tomb on the day that he had often mentioned (Mk 8.31; 9.9-12, 31; 10.33).²⁶ The LE's narrator, following Mark's accounts, tells another distinctive story: how the resurrected Jesus appeared after his resurrection. Furthermore, these four pericopae are laid out in chronological order: death – burial – empty tomb

²⁶ It has often been argued that Mark mentions Jesus' prediction of his suffering, death, and resurrection three times in his narrative (Mk 8.31; 9.31; 10.33). I, however, include Mk 9.9-12 as the

(implied resurrection) – appearance. Therefore, it is obvious that the LE's author noticed Mark's way of narration.

If so, a question is raised. Why did the LE's narrator not mention the names of female characters other than Mary Magdalene? I believe that the LE's author, as a reader of MK, surely noticed the names of the female characters at the end or beginning of the previous pericopae. It is difficult for the reader to miss their names while reading the previous three pericopae; these three pericopae are very well organized and woven, and accordingly, it is almost impossible that the reader fails to notice the names of these female characters.

Furthermore, the three women are the only named female characters that play as characters in the narrative. Most of the Markan characters identified by name are male. The named female characters, apart from the women in these three pericopae, are Mary the mother of Jesus (Mk 6.3) and Herodias (Mk 6.17-29).²⁷ However, Mary the mother of Jesus (Mk 6.3) does not play any role in the narrative; only her name is mentioned. When she is a character in a scene, she is not identified by name but only as a 'relative' or as 'the mother of Jesus' (Mk 3.21, 31).

It is the same with Herodias. The pericope of the execution of John the Baptist (Mk 6.17-29) is not the story of John and Herodias but of John and *her daughter or the girl*. When Herodias plays a role in the pericope, she is identified as 'the girl's mother', not as Herodias (Mk 6.24, 28). The dancer in Mk 6.22 is identified either as 'Herodias' or as 'the daughter of Herodias herself' in the manuscript tradition. The picture is further complicated if we include extra-Markan

narrator's mention of Jesus' destiny.

²⁷ Other female characters mentioned in MK are Peter's mother-in-law (Mk 1.29-31), Jairus' daughter (Mk 5.21-24a, 35b-43), A haemorrhaging woman (Mk 5.24b-35a), Syrophenician woman (Mk 7.24-30), a poor widow (Mk 12.42-44), an anointing woman (Mk 14.3-9), and one of the servant girls (Mk 14.66-72). It is noticeable that all the female characters above are anonymous. Furthermore, Peter's mother-in-law and Jairus' daughter are not characters in each pericope.

sources such as Josephus, as Janice C. Anderson points out.²⁸ However, if we consider only MK, the reading that identifies the dancer with Herodias does not seem appropriate, because Mark identifies Herodias as Herod's wife, not as her daughter in the beginning of this pericope (Mk 6.17-19).

It should also be noted that Mark sets these female characters on the stage when all the male characters disappear. When Jesus is arrested on the Mount of Olives, all the male disciples abandon their master (Mk 14.50). Only Peter follows Jesus, from a distance (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν), to the court of the high priest (Mk 14.66-72). However, it does not portray him positively because it is only to serve the narrator's narrative strategy that highlights Jesus, who faces his destiny with a brave and resolute attitude, in contrast Peter who is depicted as a coward.²⁹ When all the male disciples run away, the female disciples (followers)³⁰ appear until the end of Mark's story. Therefore, it is obvious that the LE's author, a reader of MK, noticed the

²⁸ J.C. Anderson, 'Feminist Criticism: The Dancing Daughter', in J.C. Anderson and S.D. Moore (eds.), *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 103-34 (pp. 120-21). Cf. C.S. Mann identifies the dancer with the daughter of Herodias, arguing that the reading which identifies the dancer as Herodias is 'plainly incorrect' (*Mark*, p. 297).

²⁹ van Iersel, *Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, p. 455; Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 51-52. For the full examination of the narrative function of pericopae, 'Peter's Denial and Jesus at the Court', see A. Borrell, *The Good News of Peter's Denial: A Narrative and Rhetorical Reading of Mark 14.54, 66-72* (trans. S. Conlon; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), chapters 4 and 5.

³⁰ The question of whether these female characters should be classified under the category of the 'disciple' is tricky. As E. Best (*Disciples and Discipleship: Studies in the Gospel according to Mark* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986], pp. 131-61) and Marshall (*Faith as a Theme*, pp. 152-53) mention, the term of the 'disciple' is inclusive in Mark's narrative; the 'Twelve' is understood as the 'disciples', but not necessarily *vice versa*. It is explained when we consider the narrative time of Mark's Gospel. The term of 'disciples (of Jesus)' is mentioned (Mk 2.15, 18, 23; 3.7) before Jesus calls the Twelve (Mk 3.14-19); Mark narrates several events that Jesus interacts with the 'disciples' not with the 'Twelve', and *then*, Mark describes the scene that Jesus selects the Twelve as his inner-circle followers. Therefore, the reader understands that the term, 'disciples' does not always refer to the 'Twelve'. As Marshall points out, if the 'disciple' indicates both the 'Twelve' and the group of committed followers of Jesus, then the female characters at the end of MK is classified as the female 'disciples'. Concerning the narrative time, see G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse* (trans. J.E. Lewin; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980); Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, pp. 143ff.; P. Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative* (trans. K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer; Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), pp. 81-88, 103-12; U.K. Heise, *Chronoschisms: Time, Narrative, and Postmodernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 148-53; M. Perry, 'Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates its Meanings', <http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/publications/poetics/art/lit4.html>. (accessed on 7th June, 2002; its print copy was published under the same title in *Poetics Today* 1/1 (1979), pp. 35-64, 311-61.); R. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, pp. 188-206; M.A. Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (London:

names of those female characters because his narrator began by mentioning the name Mary Magdalene, who is one of the three female characters.

The reference to Mary Magdalene draws the reader's attention, because she is described as the only female character in this part. The reader who has read the previous three pericopae expects the other female characters (at least the name of Mary the mother of little James and Joses) to appear in the beginning of the LE. The reader is however, surprised to find that the other female characters are not mentioned. The female characters witness the death, the burial, and the empty tomb (implied resurrection) of Jesus. The LE's narrator however, selects only one of them, Mary Magdalene, as a witness to the appearance of the resurrected Jesus; he deletes the others.

The argument that the LE's narrator followed the Markan pattern with regard to the manner of presenting the female characters in the beginning of the LE on the one hand, and the fact that he omitted other names of female characters on the other, lead me to a corollary that his mention of Mary Magdalene is obviously intentional: just as one says something by speaking, so does one by keeping silent.

The narrator of the LE leads the reader to believe that the first witness of the appearance of the resurrected Jesus is *only* Mary Magdalene. In other words, the reader is led to think that the other female characters fail to be witnesses of the appearance of the resurrected Jesus. When reading/hearing that the resurrected Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene, the reader is led to ask a question of 'what then about the other women?' Therefore, the presence of Mary Magdalene in this scene is foil for the absence of other female characters and *vice versa*.

The success of Mary Magdalene to see the resurrected Jesus sheds a positive light on her. The failure of other female characters to be witnesses to his resurrection and appearance by contrast, may become a fatal blow to them. The reader easily notices the effect of this contrast between the presence of Mary Magdalene and the absence of the other women.

The contrast between these two groups of female characters becomes clear when we examine the characterization of them in the previous Markan pericopae, each of which portrays them negatively. The first pericope where these named women are mentioned, is at the crucifixion of Jesus. The female characters suddenly appear at the end of Mark's narrative when all the male disciples ran away. Some may accordingly argue that their appearance at this stage gives a good impression of them.³¹

However, the presence of the female characters at the cross does not give a positive impression of them. Mark describes the female characters as having followed (ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ) and then as standing from a distance (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν). This phrase is found when Mark portrays Peter, who followed Jesus (ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ) from a distance (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν'; Mk 14.54). The portrayal of Peter in the framed pericope (Mk 14.53-15.5)³² is negative because his cowardly behaviour makes a vivid contrast with Jesus' brave attitude. Therefore, the reader is led to have a negative impression of the women at the cross, as these phrases remind the reader of the scene of Peter's denial.³³

³¹ E.g., Malbon, 'Text and Context', p. 93; Tolbert, *Mark*, p. 273; Boomershine, 'Apostolic Commission', pp. 231-33; Williams, *Other Followers*, p. 188; Lincoln, 'Promise and Failure', pp. 283-300; van Iersel, *Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, pp. 488-89.

³² Concerning the framing (sandwich) device, see D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 51-52.

³³ van Iersel (*Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, pp. 488-89) thinks that ἀπὸ μακρόθεν does not portray the women negatively, because the women are kept away from the cross by the mockers (negative characters) who surrounded it (n. 11). However, his argument cannot be substantiated, because the centurion who makes the most positive impression in the narrative is placed close to the cross (ἐξ ἐναντίας). Cf. J.P. Heil, 'The Progressive Narrative Pattern of Mark 14.53-16.8',

Furthermore, it is not the female characters but the centurion who is portrayed positively, because he confesses the divine sonship of Jesus, whereas they merely look at Jesus from afar (Mk 15.39-40). Just as the disciples relinquished their discipleship because of Simon of Cyrene, who took over their role by carrying the cross (cf. Mk 8.34; 10.28-31; 14.31), so were the female disciples because of the centurion, who takes over their role by confessing as he did.

The scene at the burial of Jesus (Mk 15.42-47) does not portray the women positively either. Some argue that their presence at the burial of the body gives a positive impression of them.³⁴ However, it is not the women, but Joseph of Arimathea who buries Jesus. The main character of this pericope is *Joseph*, not the women; he asks Pilate for Jesus' body; he prepares linen for Jesus; he lays the corpse in the tomb that he had prepared.³⁵ The women are portrayed simply as onlookers of the burial (ἐθεώρουν; Mk 15.47).³⁶ They only function as a connection that links the scene at the cross (θεωροῦσαι; 15.40) and the following empty tomb scene (θεωροῦσιν; 16.4).

p. 351. He thinks that the women at the cross are the counterpart of the centurion (Mk 15.39). He argues that the women as 'Jewish female disciples' are portrayed positively as is the 'gentile male centurion'. *Contra Heil*, see U. Luz, 'The Secrecy Motif and the Marcan Christology', in C. Tuckett (ed.), *The Messianic Secret* (London: SPCK, 1983), pp. 75-96 (p. 96). Munro ascribes women followers' inevitable distance from the cross to the contemporary social position of women ('Women Disciples in Mark?', p. 235). As a background of Munro's argument, see J. Foster, 'St. Paul and Women', *ExpTim* 62 (1950-51), pp. 376-79.

³⁴ E.g. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 132-33; Williams, *Other Followers*, pp. 188-91; Lincoln, 'Promise and Failure', p. 288.

³⁵ Cf. R.E. Brown, 'The Burial of Jesus (Mark 15.42-47)', *CBQ* 50 (1988), pp. 233-48. He argues that Joseph's burial was a dishonourable burial, because Jesus was not anointed. For an explanation of Joseph's alleged improper burial, see J.P. Keenan, *The Gospel of Mark: a Mahayana Reading* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995), p. 388. Although the request for the corpse of the crucified was possible (Josephus, *War* 4.5.2), it is believed very difficult to do so because relatives of the crucified were often punished to death merely due to their relationship with the criminals regardless of whether they are woman or children (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.5.4; 13.14.2). Furthermore, considering Jesus' crucifixion on a charge of political issue (at least in the eyes of some non-Jewish characters in the narrative; note that Pilate questions Jesus if he is the king of the Jews [cf. Mk 15.2, 9, 12, 18, 26, 32]; also note that Jesus is crucified along with two political criminals [Mk 15.7]), it would be dangerous to claim Jesus' body to be taken down from the cross, because this behaviour might be understood as showing his connection with the crucified.

³⁶ Cf. H.C. Waetjen, *A Reordering of Power: A Socio-Political Reading of Mark's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989), p. 239.

Therefore Mark portrays the women negatively at the second pericope of Markan ending, the burial scene. The female disciples fail to perform their role as faithful disciples; Joseph takes over the role of the male disciples (the Twelve) that the female disciples were supposed to do, just as Simon from Cyrene and the centurion did. This pericope reminds the reader of the death and burial of John the Baptist (Mk 6.29): the *disciples* of John buried their master.³⁷ That is, the burial of Jesus is understood as an indication that shows one's discipleship. In this light, it seems clear that Mark portrays the women negatively in the pericope of Jesus' burial.

Thirdly, Mark draws the female characters negatively in the pericope of the empty tomb (Mk 16.1-8) as well. The women visit the tomb to anoint the body of Jesus. This, however, merely proves that they misunderstood Jesus, just as the male disciples (the Twelve) do in the Markan narrative. An anonymous woman had already anointed Jesus, and it means that the anointment for his burial has already been completed (Mk 14.8).³⁸ Therefore, their visit to anoint Jesus shows that they did not understand what Jesus had told them at Simon's house in Bethany.³⁹ Their misunderstanding leads the reader to identify the female disciples with the Twelve, who are characterized by their misunderstanding.⁴⁰

That the women went to the empty tomb also portrays them negatively. Jesus had already mentioned that he would go to Galilee ahead of them (Mk 14.28).

³⁷ As Williams well points out, Mark wanted his readers to connect the burial of Jesus to that of John the Baptist by using the same word, *πῶμα*, only in these two places of the whole Mark's narrative (Mk 6.29 and 15.45). See Williams, *Other Followers*, pp. 188-91; Lincoln, 'The Promise and Failure', p. 288; F.J. Matera, *Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15* (SBLDS 66; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982), p. 54; Folwer, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), p. 245 (n. 39).

³⁸ For more discussion of this question, see V. Phillips, 'Full Disclosure: toward a complete characterization of the women who followed Jesus in the Gospel according to Mark', in I.G. Kitzberger (ed.), *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and women re-viewed* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 13-32 (pp. 22-24). Her overall argument that the three women at the end of Mark's Gospel should be understood as positively portrayed disciples of Jesus exhibits many logical blind points, and cannot be substantiated.

³⁹ R.M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand*, p. 245.

⁴⁰ Cf. Weedn, *Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 26-51; idem, 'The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's

Therefore, they should have gone to Galilee, not to the tomb; but they came to the tomb in search for the *dead* body of Jesus.⁴¹ This shows that they did not expect that Jesus would be raised as he had often predicted. Therefore, their visit to the empty tomb proves that they did not believe what Jesus told them: they did not believe in Jesus' resurrection.

Mark ends his narrative with a negative portrayal of the women. An angelic young man bids them go and tell the news. The young man's order might have been their last chance to restore their honour as faithful disciples of Jesus, but they fail to save their faces by being afraid and keeping silent. The women do not meet the resurrected Jesus, neither do they deliver the news. Therefore they are portrayed negatively at the scene of crucifixion, the burial, and the empty tomb.⁴²

Now it is the LE author's turn. Will he make his narrator portray them negatively as Mark did? Or will he save their face by portraying them positively? The LE's author can portray them in a favourable way, either positively or negatively, to his interests. Therefore the characterization of these female characters can be a noticeable indication of the ideology of the LE's author.

As I have shown in my reading of MK, Mark portrays the female disciples negatively. At the beginning of the LE however, the narrator portrays Mary Magdalene positively by depicting her as seeing the resurrected Jesus and delivering the news to the disciples. In contrast to Mark's portrayal of the female characters, the LE's narrator gives the reader a positive impression of Mary Magdalene. Although she was not a successful character in the previous Markan pericopae, she now recovers from her failure and gets rid of the negative label as a failure.

Gospel', pp. 145-58.

⁴¹ J.C. Pallares, *A Poor Man Called Jesus: Reflections on the Gospel of Mark* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1986), p. 125.

⁴² *Contra* my argument, see P. Danove, 'The Characterization and Narrative Function of the

Behind Mary Magdalene's success and the restoration of her honour in the LE, there is a dark shade of the other women's failure. The LE's narrator sets these two groups of women in contrast by mentioning one group and not mentioning the other.

The LE's elimination of the other women, Mary the mother of little James and Joses and Salome, from the list of characters is purposeful. They were excluded from being witnesses of the Appearance event in the LE, and the LE's author must have known how these women would be evaluated when they were portrayed as such. He knew what impression of these women his readers would have when they read the LE; his readers are left with the negative impression of these women that they gained from reading or hearing the MK.

The contrast between these two groups of women is narrowed down into two Marys, Mary the mother of little James and Joses and Mary Magdalene. Salome is not mentioned as a witness of the burial, whereas she is in other pericopae (Mk 15.47). The two Marys, however, are mentioned in all of the three pericopae in Mark's narrative (Mk 15.40, 47; 16.1). Therefore, the comparison between these two Marys is highlighted in the LE.

The literary strategy that the author of the LE adopts as above, implies that there were some reasons that necessitated such characterization of the women. The LE's author had to exclude two women other than Mary Magdalene (esp. Mary the mother of little James and Joses)⁴³ from the list of witnesses of the first Appearance event. His silence about these two women implies that he did not want to portray them positively. This possibly implies that there was an assumed conflict or disagreement concerning the portrayal of these two groups of women (esp. between

Women at the Tomb (Mark 15.40-41, 47; 16-1-8)', *Bib* 77/3 (1996), pp. 375-97.

⁴³ The question of inclusion/exclusion of names of these two Marys is found in some

the two Marys); some did not agree with the LE's author, claiming the positive image of the excluded women. Therefore, the LE's author, who was pro-Mary Magdalene, had to legitimize his ideology by depicting its positive aspects and by silencing the opponent's voice.

To sum up: with regard to the presence of Mary Magdalene and the absence of the other female characters in Mk 16.9, some Markan scholars have argued that this proves the different authorship of the LE from that of MK.⁴⁴ Others have explained it in light of the LE's sources. For instance, James A. Kelhoffer suggests that it is because the LE's author knew the Johannine report (Jn 20.11-18).⁴⁵ However, I read the LE from a different perspective and suggested as follows.

The LE's narrator portrays the other women negatively, especially Mary the mother of James and Joses, by mentioning the name of Mary Magdalene only in the beginning of the LE. This positive portrayal of Mary Magdalene serves a double purpose: it was designed to restore the honour of Mary Magdalene, whom the LE's author supports; and it is the narrator's rhetorical strategy to leave a lasting negative impression of Mary the mother of James and Joses.

Such characterization of Mary Magdalene implies that there was an assumed conflict concerning the two Marys. The LE's ideological community was pro-Mary Magdalene. There may have been different voices concerning this woman, and if Mary the mother of little James and Joses was portrayed positively it would not have served the ideology of the LE's dominant ideological primary group. Therefore, the author, who belongs to the ideological primary group of the LE, quietens the minor's voice and legitimates his ideology by means of his characterization of the women.

extracanonical writings. For my discussion in more detail, see Chapter Three.

⁴⁴ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark (April)', pp. 162-64. See Chapter One.

⁴⁵ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 69.

Mary Magdalene is the winner and the other Mary is a loser in the LE. The latter had to be sacrificed in service of the former's honour.

B. Mary Magdalene versus Mary the mother of little James and Joses

As I have surveyed in Chapter Three, Mary the mother of Jesus was often involved in the struggle between Mary Magdalene and Peter. In this part, I will argue that Mary, the mother of little James and Joses at the end of MK (15.40, 47; 16.1) is Mary the mother of Jesus (Mk 6.3. cf. 3.20-35) in the Markan narrative. This argument, along with the hypothesis that there was an assumed conflict among early Christian communities concerning Mary Magdalene and that the figure of Mary the mother of Jesus was often used in this struggle, will contribute to my hypothesis that the author of the LE belonged to the pro-Mary Magdalene group.

1. Jesus and οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ:

Mk 3.20-30 and 31-35 or Mk 3.20-21, 31-35 and 22-30

It has been debated among scholars whether the Greek phrase 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' in Mk 3.21 refers to Jesus' relatives or someone else. This phrase can be interpreted as referring to 'envoys', 'ambassadors', 'adherents', 'followers', 'relatives' and 'friends'.⁴⁶ Traditionally, 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' in Mk 3.21 has been translated as 'his [Jesus'] relatives' or 'his [Jesus'] family'.⁴⁷ Many of the modern English, French, German and Korean Bible translations follow this interpretation.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 236. He surveys the scholarly debates over how to translate this phrase in Mk 3.21.

⁴⁷ E.g., Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 133; R.H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), p. 171; R. Guelich, *Mark 1.1-8.26* (Word Biblical Commentary 34a; TX: Word Books, 1989), p. 172; Nineham, *St. Mark*, p. 123; Lane, *Mark*, pp. 138-39. Although Nineham and Lane translate this phrase as 'his friends', they mention that it eventually refers to Jesus' family.

⁴⁸ E.g., NIV (1984), NRSV (1989), BFC (Bible en Français Courant, 1997), NEG (Nouvelle Edition Geneve, 1979), ELB (Revidierte Elberfelder, 1993), EIN (Einheits Übersetzung, 1980), KRV

Some Markan scholars, however, have cautiously challenged this traditional translation, arguing that it does not refer to 'Jesus' family' but to others, such as 'disciples', 'neighbours' or 'crowds'. For instance, John Painter argues that 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' refers to the disciples of Jesus, and that they came *out of* Jesus' home to seize him having heard the crowd saying that he is beside himself.⁴⁹ Harold Riley translates this phrase as 'the neighbours', arguing that Mark would have written it as his brothers in Mk 3.21 if he had intended to mean his family.⁵⁰

I believe that this Greek phrase should be translated into 'his family', and that these pericopae portray them negatively. As is well acknowledged, the phrase 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' bears many meanings, and accordingly its meaning should be decided by means of literary analysis (i.e., the context in the narrative).⁵¹

In order to define the identity of 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ', a literary examination of the two current pericopae (Mk 3.20-30 and 31-35 or Mk 3.20-21, 31-35 and 22-30) is required. For convenience' sake, I will tentatively adopt the first distinction of pericopae (i.e., Mk 3.20-30 and 31-35). The first pericope (3.20-30) consists of two

(Korean Revised Version, 1990), and NKSJ (New Korean Standard Version, 1993). They read this phrase as 'relatives' or 'family'.

⁴⁹ J. Painter, *Just James: The Brothers of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), pp. 21-31. He argues that 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' are not Jesus' family but the disciples conjecturing as follows: the disciples went into Jesus' house with him; hearing the crowd saying Jesus is mad, he came out of his house and his disciples came out to seize him. He argues that these two groups of characters cannot be identified with each other since his family were standing outside while 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' came out of the house.

However, his argument is more or less based on his imagination. Firstly, concerning the word, 'ἐξῆλθον', Painter puts an emphasis on 'out of/ἐξ-' by translating it as 'came out of' rather than 'came'. However, Mark usually does not put an emphasis on the direction of 'in' or 'out' when he mentions the verb, 'ἐξέρχομαι' only. That is, he often adopts this verb meaning 'to come' rather than 'to come out of' (e.g., 8.11, where the Pharisees came to argue with Jesus; 14.48, where people from the Jewish authorities came to seize Jesus; 4.3, where a sower goes to sow). When he wants to clarify the direction, viz., to mean 'to come out of' rather than 'to come', he usually adds other words such as ἐξ (1.26), ἐκίθην (6.1) and εἰς (1.28, 35; 6.1; 8.27; 11.11; 14.16, 26, 68) to it. Therefore, the verb 'ἐξῆλθον' in Mk 3.21 should be translated as 'came' rather than 'came out of'. Secondly, seeing that the verb 'κρατῆσαι' conveys a negative meaning in the Markan narrative, the family of Jesus who are portrayed negatively, rather than the disciples, is more appropriate as for the subject of this verb. See below.

⁵⁰ Riley, *Making of Mark*, p. 41.

⁵¹ Cf. Crossan, 'Mark and the Relatives of Jesus', p. 84.

parts, 3.20-22 and 3.23-30. The first part tells the reader that 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' came to seize him, having heard that Jesus is beside himself. It also tells that the Jewish authorities came down from Jerusalem saying that he is possessed. The second part is about Jesus' response to the attack of these two groups of characters.

Those who are described as 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ', are classified as the same party with the Jewish authorities from Jerusalem, because all of them understand Jesus as being possessed. The Markan narrator's intention to portray 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' as belonging to the same group with the Jewish authorities, is also found in his manner of narration that places these two groups side by side under the same motif (vv. 21 and 22). Jesus rejects their understanding with a solemn warning in the following part (vv. 23-30). Furthermore, the act of seizing Jesus (κρατῆσαι) also gives the reader a negative impression of 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' because this Greek word has a negative connotation in Mark's Gospel as are found in Mk 12.12; 14.1, 44, 46, 49, 51.⁵² Therefore, 'οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ' are portrayed negatively along with the Jewish authorities from Jerusalem⁵³ in this pericope.

The second pericope (Mk 3.31-35) describes that Jesus' mother and brothers, standing outside,⁵⁴ ask for him, and that Jesus rebuffs their request, teaching a new definition of family. As Jan Lambrecht states, the purpose of this pericope might be focused on his teaching of true meaning of Christian kinship, rather than on denigrating Jesus' family.⁵⁵ It is however, undeniable that Jesus' family is portrayed

⁵² Cf. Painter, *Just James*, p. 27.

⁵³ The spatial setting of 'Jerusalem' plays a negative role in Mark's narrative. See D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, p. 68. Cf. E.S. Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp. 26-34, 40-49.

⁵⁴ Their position 'standing outside' may portray them negatively. As Gundry well points out, it implies that they do not belong to the 'insiders' (Mk 4.10-12) of Jesus followers (*Mark*, p. 177).

⁵⁵ J. Lambrecht, 'The Relatives of Jesus in Mark', *NovT* 16 (1974), pp. 241-58 (pp. 257-58); Best, *Disciples and Discipleship*, p. 61. Pace Lambrecht and Best, J.D. Crossan ('A Form for Absence: the Markan Creation of Gospel', *Semeia* 12 [1978], pp. 41-55) argues that it is improbable to teach Christians by denigrating the important figures of the early Christian Church.

negatively in this pericope – Lambrecht himself also admits it – regardless of whether it reflects the historical reality or not.

I have argued that ‘οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ’ and Jesus’ family are portrayed negatively in Mk 3.20-35. Then the question is whether those who are mentioned as ‘οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ’ are the same characters with Jesus’ family mentioned in the second pericope. The first pericope begins with the narrator’s introductory description of the setting: they [Jesus and his followers] go into a house and many people crowd around him; then ‘οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ’ come to seize him. The picture of the second pericope is of Jesus’ family standing outside asking for him. The narrator does not mention why they asked for Jesus. However, the answer is quite simple: because he has already mentioned why in Mk 3.21. That is, the story of Jesus’ confrontation with the Jewish authorities is interpolated (or *vice versa*)⁵⁶ into the story of Jesus and his family, which means ‘οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ’ are Jesus’ family mentioned in Mk 3.31. The parts Mk 3.20-21 and 3.31-35 exhibit continuity in both its characterization (‘οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ’ and Jesus’ family) and in its natural flow of storyline.⁵⁷

2. Jesus in his hometown: son of Mary, brother of James and Joses (Mk 6.1-6)

The second scene in which the Markan narrator mentions Jesus’ family, is the pericope of Jesus in his hometown. The narrator specifies the names of Jesus’ mother and brothers (v. 3): Mary, James, Joses, Jude and Simon (without mentioning Jesus’ father and the names of his sisters).⁵⁸ Jesus goes to his hometown and teaches in the

⁵⁶ In adopting the technical term of redaction criticism, ‘interpolation’, I do not mean to illuminate the redactional process of these two different pericopae. I am not interested in the question of which one is major or earlier than the other. The thing that I want to point out here is that Mk 3.20-21 and 3.31-35 consist of one pericope, functioning as a framing pericope that surrounds the pericope ‘Jesus and the Jewish authorities’.

⁵⁷ For its structural analysis that shows this continuity, see R.E. Brown, et als (eds.), *Mary in the New Testament* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1978), pp. 54-59.

⁵⁸ There have been many hypotheses concerning the narrator’s omission of their names. For

synagogue on the Sabbath. The townspeople are astonished at his wisdom and power, but they despise Jesus, understanding him in light of his human relationship. Jesus tells them a proverb; that a prophet is not without honour except in his 'πατρίδι', 'συγγενεῶσιν' and 'οἰκίᾳ'.

Some Markan scholars working on literary issues of characterization, discuss whether the family of Jesus is portrayed negatively or not. Painter argues that it is not Jesus' relatives, but the townspeople, who are portrayed negatively in this pericope.⁵⁹ He points out that Mark does not explicitly include Jesus' family among the townspeople who reject him.

His argument however, cannot be contended. Firstly, the narrator alludes to the unification of Jesus' family and his townspeople in Mk 6.3. The townspeople despise Jesus by mentioning a series of questions that emphasize his humanness (Mk 6.2-3). At the end of these questions, they describe Jesus' family as staying with them (οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς;). This leads the reader to reckon that these two groups (Jesus' family and townspeople) have intimacy with each other.⁶⁰

instance, it is because Mary and the brothers became important figures in the early church whereas others were not (Painter, *Just James*, p. 32); Mark was not interested in Joseph, which reflects his positive impression of Joseph (Crossan, 'Mark and the Relatives of Jesus', p. 102); silence about his father Joseph to hint the virginal conception of Jesus (M. Miguens, *The Virgin Birth: An Evaluation of Scriptural Evidence* [Westminster: Christian Classics, 1975], pp. 6-27); naming Jesus not by his father but by his mother is to insult him as an illegitimate child (Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 74); it is because Joseph was dead by that time (H.K. McArthur, 'Son of Mary', *NovT* 15[1973], pp. 38-58), which is also implied in *The Protevangelium of James* that describes Joseph as an old man and Mary as a young girl (*Prot. Jas.* 9.2). Pace Rawlinson, see V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 300 and *idem*, *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920), pp. 8-12; G. Parrinder, *Son of Joseph: the Parentage of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992), pp. 56-62.

⁵⁹ Painter, *Just James*, pp. 32-33.

⁶⁰ Dr. J. Økland gave me a good inspiration that supports my argument. She mentioned that the phrase 'his sisters are here with us' might imply that his sisters got married with the townspeople, and that accordingly alludes to the intimate relationship between the two groups of Jesus' family and townspeople.

Secondly, the intimacy between these two groups is highlighted by Jesus' mention of a proverb in Mk 6.4b, and it sheds a negative light upon the family of Jesus. Jesus mentions three groups of 'πατρίδι', 'συγγενέσιν' and 'οἰκίᾳ', and expresses his antipathy against them. As A.E.J. Rawlinson and Robert H. Gundry point out, Jesus' mention of these three implies that Jesus' family shared the attitude that the townspeople took.⁶¹ Jesus' mention of 'συγγενέσιν' especially, which is not known to Matthew, Luke and the author of Gospel of Thomas (*Gos. Thom.* logion 31) alludes to the Markan narrator's antipathy to Jesus' relatives.⁶²

The present pericope resumes the theme found in the previous pericopae that I examined above where Jesus' family rejects him (Mk 3.20-35).⁶³ The mention of Jesus' family in this pericope connects it with the previous one.⁶⁴ The motif of the present pericope is the rejection of Jesus by his townspeople. The previous pericopae are very similar in that Jesus is rejected by the Jewish authorities and his family. The present pericope alludes to a confrontation between Jesus and his opponents by showing Jesus' mention of a proverb, and the previous pericopae are the same. Jesus expresses his antipathy to his opponents in the proverb that includes his family in the present pericope. It is the same with the previous pericope, where it concludes with an aphorism that sheds a negative light on Jesus' family (Mk 3.33-35). Therefore, the family of Jesus in the present pericope is portrayed in a negative way.

⁶¹ Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 73; Gundry, *Mark*, p. 298.

⁶² J. Schaberg, *The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), pp. 160-64 (esp., pp. 162-63). Cf. Guelich, *Mark*, p. 311. He argues that Markan narrator, by adding 'συγγενέσιν' and 'οἰκίᾳ', emphasizes Jesus' rejection not only by his townspeople but also by his family and home.

⁶³ Best, *Disciples and Discipleship*, p. 59; E. Grässer, 'Jesus in Nazareth', *NTS* 16 (1969/70), pp. 1-23; van Iersel, *Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, p. 214.

⁶⁴ Brown et als., *Mary*, p. 60; W.T. Shiner, *Follow Me!: Disciples in Markan Rhetoric* (SBLDS 145; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), p. 237.

3. Mary the mother of little James and Joses and Mary the mother of Jesus.

I have examined two pericopae that mention the family of Jesus that includes the mother of Jesus. The question now is whether this Mary is the same figure who is mentioned in the three pericopae of the Markan ending (Mk 15.40, 47; 16.1). Scholars such as William L. Lane, A.E.J. Rawlinson, and D.E. Nineham take a suspicious, at least cautious, stance toward the hypothesis that identifies these two Marys with each other.⁶⁵ They state that little has been known about Mary the mother of little James and Joses. They believe that the named persons, James and Joses, must have been well-known figures in the early Church or in the early Christian tradition. They are however, not sure whether these two are the brothers of Jesus.

Many commentators believe that the Mary at the end of Mark's Gospel is not identified with Mary the mother of Jesus. For instance, M. Barnouin argues that if Mark intended to identify the Mary in Mk 15.40, 47 and 16.1 with Mary the mother of Jesus, he would have referred to her as 'sa mère' or 'la mère de Jésus' or 'Marie, sa mère'.⁶⁶ Vincent Taylor, C.S. Mann and Stephen H. Smith also contend that Mark would have made the reference to Mary more clearly if he designated her as the mother of Jesus.⁶⁷

These arguments, however, should be reconsidered. Those commentators build their arguments mostly based on the hypothetical genealogy of Jesus' family, which is reconstructed by means of the harmonization of four gospels and other early Christian documents. For instance, John W. Wenham examines and compares the passages such as Mt. 27.55-28.9, Mk 15.40-16.2, Lk. 23.49-24.10, Jn 19.25-27 with

⁶⁵ Lane, *Mark*, p. 577; Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, pp. 239-40; Nineham, *St. Mark*, p. 432.

⁶⁶ Barnouin, 'Marie, Mère de Jaques et de Josè', p. 474.

⁶⁷ V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 598; Mann, *Mark*, pp. 654-55; S.H. Smith, *A Lion with Wings: A Narrative-Critical Approach to Mark's Gospel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), p. 67.

each other. Based on his comparative examination of each passage, he makes a genealogical table that identifies Mary in Mk 15.40, 47 and 16.1 as the Mary the wife of Clopas, through a complicated process of jigsaw puzzle.⁶⁸

The thing that should be pointed out in identifying the Mary in dispute, is that she is *a character* in Mark's Gospel and that Mark's Gospel is an independent narrative that has its own literary wholeness and unity. That is, the reference to Mary of the Markan ending should be considered within the Markan text, from a literary point of view. The question whether Mary in the Markan ending is, for instance, the mother of Jesus or Mary of Clopas *in historical reality* does not interest me.⁶⁹ Rather, the question of with whom the Mary here is identified *in Mark's Gospel* matters. Therefore I do not believe that the identification of this Mary, by harmonizing Mark's Gospel with other documents, is meaningful as far as Mark's Gospel is concerned, regardless of whether it identifies this Mary with the mother of Jesus or not.

Mary in Mk 15.40 is referred to as 'Mary the mother of little James and Joses'. There are a few characters named James in Mark's narrative: James the son of Zebedee (Mk 1.19 *et alibi*), James the son of Alphaeus (Mk 3.18), James the brother of Jesus (Mk 6.3), and James the son of Mary (Mk 15.40; 16.1). Firstly, James the son of Zebedee is one of four fishermen whom Jesus called as his first four disciples

⁶⁸ J.W. Wenham, 'The Relatives of Jesus', *EvQ* 47 (1975), pp. 6-15. According to his reconstruction of the family tree of Jesus, Mary's sons (Jesus' brothers) and Mary of Clopas' sons have the same names and order (James, Joses, Simon and Judas), which is an improbable coincidence. C.A. Evans (*Mark 8.27-16.20* [Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001], p. 511) agrees with his hypothesis. Cf. J. McHugh, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (London: Longman & Todd Ltd., 1975), pp. 200-54. He, like Wenham, reconstructs a hypothetical picture of Jesus' family by comparative examination of the New Testament and some other early Church Fathers' documents. He suggests that James and Joses were Jesus' foster-brothers who lived in the same house under the care of Mary the mother of Jesus. See also A. Meyer and W. Bauer, 'The Relatives of Jesus', in B. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha vol. 1: Gospels and Related Writings* (W. Schneemelcher [ed.]; R.McL. Wilson [trans.]; London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), pp. 418-32.

⁶⁹ As R.E. Brown et al. mention (*Mary in the New Testament*, p. 72), the reconstruction of the *historical* identity of the assumed Jesus' relatives in the Markan ending is impossible when examined by considering all the extra-Markan sources. We do not know for sure whose (John? Matthew? Luke?

(Mk 1.19). He is always paired with his brother John in Mark's narrative (Mk 1.19, 29; 3.17; 5.37; 9.2; 10.35, 41; 13.3; 14.33): 'James the son of Zebedee and his brother John' or 'James and his brother John' or 'James and John'.

Therefore, James the son of Zebedee is not the brother of Jesus or James in the Markan ending. Had Mark wanted to present James the son of Zebedee in the Markan ending, he would have mentioned his father 'Zebedee' or at least 'his brother John' as well. Since the narrator has always referred to James the son of Zebedee along with his brother John, the reader is led to recognize the James in the Markan ending as a different character from James the son of Zebedee.

Secondly, James the son of Alphaeus is mentioned only once in Mark's narrative. He is introduced as a member of the Twelve (Mk 3.18). Some scholars identify him with James the little, and his mother with Mary the mother of little James and Joses (Mk 15.40).⁷⁰ The identification of James the son of Alphaeus with the little James however, is basically dependent on the early Christian legend, which is merely a coincidence that has nothing to do with the Markan narrative world.

Reading from a literary critical point of view, James the son of Alphaeus can be understood in two ways in Mark's narrative. Firstly, as is often pointed out, the modification of 'the son of Alphaeus' given to James, is the narrator's intention to distinguish him from another James who, too, is one of the Twelve. On the other

Or Mark?) account is reliable in reconstructing the exact family tree of Jesus Nazarene.

⁷⁰ Guelich, *Mark*, p. 163; V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 233. F.E. Wheeler, 'Alphaeus', in *ABD vol. 1* (D.N. Freedman [ed.]; NY: Doubleday, 1992), p. 162. Their argumentation is: (1) there are three – not four – women at the cross, who are Jesus' mother, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene (Jn 19.25) as in its parallel verses (Mt. 27.56; Mk 15.40); (2) therefore, Mary the wife of Clopas is the sister of Jesus' mother; (3) this Mary is the second Mary in Matthean and Markan parallels, which identify her with the mother of little James and Jose(ph); (4) James the son of Alphaeus is usually nicknamed as James the Less (in contrast to James the Great); (5) accordingly, James the son of Alphaeus is the little James whose mother is Mary the sister of Jesus' mother; (6) therefore, Alphaeus is identified with Clopas; (7) finally, the little James is the cousin of Jesus. Cf. Partly against this hypothesis, see D.A. Hagner, 'James', in *ABD vol. 3* (D.N. Freedman [ed.]; NY: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 616-18.

hand, James the son of Alphaeus is to be considered in relation to the pericope of Levi, who is also identified as the son of Alphaeus (Mk 2.13-14).

The Markan narrator presents two 'Calling and Following' pericopae in the beginning of his narrative.⁷¹ The first one is Jesus' calling of two pairs of brothers (Mk 1.16-18, 19-20), and the second is the calling of Levi, the son of Alphaeus (Mk 2.13-14). The Markan narrator sets each part of the two pericopae in parallel (Simon and Andrew; James and John; and Levi): Jesus calls each (group of) character(s) to follow; they give up their belongings; they follow him; their profession is noted (fishermen and tax collector).⁷²

The first two groups of pairs become the members of the Twelve respectively (Mk 3.16,18a and 3.17). The reader, accordingly, may expect to find Levi the son of Alphaeus among the twelve people when reading the list of names of the Twelve, because he is called and responds to the call just like the four fishermen. Surprisingly, the reader does not find Levi 'the son of Alphaeus' there but James, who is identified as 'the son of Alphaeus (Mk 3.18b)' instead.⁷³

Therefore, this leads the reader to conjecture as follows: (1) James is the brother of Levi, whose father is Alphaeus (in the narrative); (2) James is Levi who has been given a new name like the three characters, Simon (Peter) and James and John (Boanerges) who are found in the 'Calling and Following' pericope. In either case, James the son of Alphaeus has nothing to do with James the son of Mary in the Markan ending. The narrator wanted his reader to connect James one of the Twelve

⁷¹ Besides these two pericopae, there is a 'Calling and Following'-type pericope in Mark's narrative. It is about a young rich man (Mk 10.17-22), who is called by Jesus to follow but fails to do so. The 'Calling and Following' motif in Mark's narrative is characterized by Jesus' initiative calling *and* the follower's giving up everything *and* immediate responding to the call (Cf. Mk 8.34-35; 10.23-30). Therefore, the pericope of a young rich man, strictly speaking, does not belong to the category of 'Calling and Following' pericope. In this light, the following of Bartimaeus (Mk 10.46-52) and that of some women (Mk 15.41) do not also belong to this category of 'Calling and Following' motif. These in common lack the calling of Jesus (Cf. Mk 10.52a).

⁷² Cf. J. Painter, *Mark's Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 55-56.

with Levi by mentioning 'the son of Alphaeus' in both adjacent passages (Mk 2.14; 3.18) rather than with James the son of Mary in the Markan ending (Mk 15.40; 16.1).

Had the narrator wanted his readers to identify these two Jameses (Mk 3.18 and 15.40ff) with each other, he might have not mentioned 'son of Alphaeus' in either reference to Levi (Mk 2.14) or James (Mk 3.18), so that the reader might not understand any of them in light of the other. Or the narrator might also have referred to Mary in the Markan ending as 'Mary of (little) James and Levi (option 1 above)' or 'Mary (the mother) of James (option 2 above)', rather than as 'Mary of (little) James and Joses'.⁷⁴

Lastly, there is a James who is depicted in the Markan ending as the son of Mary and brother of Joses ('Mary of little James and Joses' and 'Mary of James'). We have three *series* of pericopae that mention names of a group of women in the Markan ending. The first pericope of the 'women at the cross' mentions Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of little James and Joses,⁷⁵ and Salome, along with some anonymous women (15.40-41). The second of the 'women at the burial' Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses (15.47). The third of the 'women at the empty tomb' Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome (16.1).

As I italicized above, these three pericopae consist of a *series* of events. In these pericopae, the narrator recounts events in chronological order as a stream flows. He also puts each of the pericopae as adjacent to each other. Furthermore, each

⁷³ Painter, *Mark's Gospel*, p. 56.

⁷⁴ Although the name of Joses is not mentioned in Mk 16.1, 'Mary the mother of James' of Mk 16.1 is the same character that is identified as 'Mary the mother of little James (Mk 15.40)' and 'Mary the mother of Joses (Mk 15.47)'. That is, this hypothetical phrase of 'Mary (the mother) of James (option 2 above)' is different from 'Mary the mother of James (Mk 16.1)'. See below.

⁷⁵ R. Pesch (*Das Markusevangelium, Teil 2: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap 8.27-16.20* [HTKNT/II; Freiburg: Herder, 1984], pp. 508-10; idem, 'Der Schluss der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte und des Markus-evangeliums: Mk 15.42-16.8', in M. Sabbe [ed.] *L'Évangile selon Marc* [BETL 34; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974], pp. 365-409) identifies Mary the mother of little James and Joses' mother as different figures arguing that there were four not three women mentioned. *Pace* Pesch, see Gundry's persuasive counter-argument (*Mark*, pp. 976-77).

pericope follows a pattern that begins with a list of some female characters that are found in each pericope as I pointed out above. Considering these, it is hard to believe that Mary the mother of little James and Joses (first pericope) is a different character from Mary the mother of Joses (second pericope) or Mary the mother of James (third pericope).

This means that the narrator's omission of one of the two sons (as are in Mk 15.47 and 16.1) or of the phrase, 'little', when referring to James (as is in Mk 16.1) does not make any difference in identifying these characters with each other in these three pericopae. In this light, Best's argument that Mary the mother of little James and Joses is not identified with Mary the mother of James and Joses (Mk 6.3) because of the narrator's omission/insertion of 'little' cannot be contended.⁷⁶

As I have examined, the Markan narrator introduces a few Jameses in his narrative. The reader is reminded of James the brother of Jesus (Mk 6.3) among the previously mentioned Jameses when he or she finds another James in the Markan ending: 'James and Joses'. The Markan narrator often sets brothers in pairs,⁷⁷ and by so doing, eliminates the possibility that the reader might identify James the brother of John with James the brother of Joses on the one hand. The narrator, on the other hand, leads the reader to connect James and Joses in Mk 15.40 with James and Joses in Mk 6.4.

Painter argues that to understand a 'coincidence of names of James and Joses' as a way of identifying them with the brothers of Jesus in Mk 6.3 is not appropriate because these were popular Jewish names at that time.⁷⁸ His argument however, is

⁷⁶ Best, *Disciples and Discipleship*, pp. 59-60. *Contra* Best, see Brown et als., *Mary*, p. 71 that contend the 'little' as describing James' statue.

⁷⁷ E.g., Simon and Andrew in Mk 1.16, 29; James and John in Mk 1.19, 29; 3.17; 5.37; 10.35, 41; James and Joses and Jude and Simon in Mk 6.3; James and Joses in Mk 15.40; Alexander and Rufus in Mk 15.21. Cf. Mk 6.7; 11.1; 14.13.

⁷⁸ Painter, *Mark's Gospel*, p. 208.

not convincing, because the Markan narrator does not mention any other family that consists of Mary the mother and James and Joses as brothers than Jesus' *in his narrative*.⁷⁹ It might be possible in contemporary Jewish society to find this 'coincidence', but not in Mark's narrative world.⁸⁰

One may question why the narrator does not identify the Mary in the Markan ending as 'Mary the mother of Jesus'. The answer is related to the narrator's narrative strategy. The narrator names her 'Mary the mother of (little) James and Joses' and not as 'Mary the mother of Jesus' in order to make it serve a double purpose. Jesus' mother Mary and his brothers are portrayed negatively as I have argued above. Here the narrator gives a negative impression of Mary and the brothers of James and Joses together by naming her as such. If she is named as 'Mary the mother of Jesus', it may not give sufficiently negative picture of her. Therefore, the narrator attacks both Mary and the brothers on the one hand, and avoids the possibility that she might be saved through association with Jesus by naming her as such on the other hand.⁸¹

I have argued that the Mary in the OE is the mother of Jesus. I have also pointed out that the LE's author removes this Mary from the list, and reports Mary Magdalene as the first eyewitness of the Appearance. My argument then, can be considered in light of my allegorical thesis that Mary Magdalene seesaws with Peter, and Mary the mother of Jesus is sitting on the side of Peter, as I have suggested in Chapter Three. The assumed anti-Mary Magdalene group/pro-Petrine group

⁷⁹ J. Fenton, 'The Mother of Jesus in Mark's Gospel and its Revisions', *Theology* 86 (1983), pp. 433-37 (p. 435).

⁸⁰ Those who identify Mary, the little James and Joses with Jesus' mother and brothers are, for instance, C. Myers (*Binding the Strong Man*, p. 396), Crossan ('Mark and the Relatives of Jesus', pp. 81-113), and Gundry (*Mark*, p. 977).

⁸¹ Then some may question why the narrator names Mary as 'the mother of Jesus' in Mk 3.31 whereas he does not in the Markan ending. In Mk 3.31-35, Jesus teaches the true meaning of kinship, and the narrator needed to mention Mary as such in order to highlight the contrast between earthly kinship and Christian kinship.

sometimes adopts the strategy that removes Mary Magdalene from the first witness list and replaces her with Mary the mother of Jesus in order to portray Mary Magdalene negatively.⁸² But in the LE, it is Mary the mother of Jesus who is removed, and Magdalene is a winner. This supports my hypothesis that the LE belongs to the pro-Mary Magdalene/anti-Petrine group.

C. Mary Magdalene: why casting out seven demons?

'[T]he future is encoded in the present... the narrative is not linear but turns back on itself in order to assist the memory to reach the end by having it anticipated somehow in the beginning.'

– E. Havelock⁸³

The LE's narrator describes Mary Magdalene as a person from whom Jesus has cast out seven demons (Mk 16.9). Concerning Mary Magdalene's exorcism in the LE, some feminist theologians argue that the narrator mentions it in order to suggest that she was not insane, and accordingly her testimony was trustworthy.⁸⁴ Some others, such as James A. Kelhoffer, ignore the narrator's mention of her exorcism, believing that it is not that meaningful in the context.⁸⁵ Many other scholars have understood her exorcism as an indication that proves the close relationship between the LE and other gospels.⁸⁶

⁸² See Chapter Three (3.4).

⁸³ E. Havelock, 'Oral Composition in the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles', *NLH* 16 (1984), pp. 175-97 (p. 182).

⁸⁴ J.L. Mitchell, *Beyond Fear and Silence: A Feminist-Literary Reading of Mark* (NY & London: Continuum, 2001), p. 34. Following R.N. Brock (*Journeys by Heart: A Christology of Erotic Power* [NY: Crossroad, 1995], p. 76), who understands exorcism stories in light of the loss of self-possession, she interprets Mary Magdalene's exorcism as an indication of her mental stability.

⁸⁵ He mentions that the description of Mary Magdalene is 'not an essential component of the LE's narrative' as is in Lk. 8.2b (*Miracle and Mission*, p. 181), which I do not agree with.

⁸⁶ Many scholars have dealt with the modifying clause, 'from whom he had cast out seven demons' in order to illuminate its origin. They have debated whether this phrase is authentic Markan or came from other passages such as Lk. 8.2b. For instance, Farmer (*The Last Twelve Verses*, p. 85) believes that Mk 16.9 is Markan. Hug, although he finds it a close parallel with Lukan passage contends that Mk 16.9-11, not to mention this phrase of Mary Magdalene, do not depend on other gospel passages such as Jn 20.14-18 and Mt. 28.9-10 (Hug, *La Finale*, pp. 164-65). Riley (*The Making of Mark*, p. 201) and Kelhoffer (*Miracle and Mission*, pp. 69-71), on the contrary, argue that

However, the exorcism of Mary Magdalene is the narrator's scheming strategy to achieve his purpose. The modification that is attributed to Mary Magdalene draws the reader's attention. No information about Mary Magdalene has been provided to the reader in MK; Mark mentions nothing but her name in his narrative. The LE's narrator, however, mentions her experience of exorcism in describing her. The narrator could have followed Mark by simply mentioning her name, but he does not.

Furthermore, at first glance the narrator's mention of her exorcism seems to have nothing to do with the context. Therefore, the reader is led to pay attention to the narrator's 'asides',⁸⁷ asking a question why the narrator mentions her exorcism at this point. Why should her exorcism be chosen of all other information about her? For what purpose does the narrator identify her by using the motif of exorcism? It is because he wants to place some meaning or value on exorcism.

The narrator controls the reader by controlling the quantity and quality of the information.⁸⁸ The narrator of the LE also does this by manipulating the information

this phrase is dependent on other gospel passages. However, what I am interested in is the question of how the LE's author uses this phrase for his purpose in the LE. The problem of what the origin of the passage is not my concern in an intrinsic analysis of the LE. The LE should be examined as a final form of a literary production, and accordingly I will not make any exploration of its origin. Rather, I focus on how this phrase functions in the LE, and what ideology is implied in the author's use of it.

⁸⁷ The narrator's 'asides' has several functions in the narrative. It draws reader's attention to the narrator, and entices the reader to follow the scheming way that the narrator has prepared for his purpose. An example of 'asides' that functions the same with the LE narrator's 'asides' of Mary Magdalene is Markan 'asides' of 'for she was twelve years old' (Mk 5.42b). The Markan narrator describes a haemorrhaging woman as 'having suffered for twelve years' (Mk 5.25), and through this narrative 'asides', he connects two pericopae of 'Jairus' daughter (Mk 5.21-24a, 35b-43) and 'A haemorrhaging woman (Mk 5.24b-35a)', which look having no relationship with each other at the first glance. When the reader reads Mk 5.25, she or he does not know for sure why the narrator provides such an information about a haemorrhaging woman. However, when the reader reads Mk 5.42b, she or he re-reads these two pericopae from a different perspective by relating them with each other. See Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 41-42.

⁸⁸ A noticeable example is found in the manner that the Markan narrator refers to Judas in his narrative. There are four pericopae in which the narrator mentions Judas (Mk 3.19; 14.10, 20, 43). He manipulates the reader's perception of the Twelve by arranging this scheming reference to Judas, the phrase 'one of the Twelve'. The narrator refers to Judas merely as the person who handed over Jesus in the early part of the narrative, while he introduces the Twelve (Mk 3.19). By mentioning as such, the narrator gives the reader a negative impression of Judas, but not much of the other disciples. The narrator, however, relates Judas with 'the Twelve' by referring him as 'one of the Twelve' at the end

about Mary Magdalene. He might have provided other information about her, but he *selects* her exorcism to introduce her to the reader. The act of selection is ideological, as I pointed out in Chapter Two. Therefore, the information about Mary Magdalene that the LE's narrator gives to the reader exhibits the narrator's (eventually the author's) ideology.

Mary Magdalene is depicted as a positive character in the LE, *and* she is a beneficiary of Jesus' miraculous performances. These two elements lead the reader to have a positive impression of the act of exorcism: Jesus has cast out demons from a woman, and she delivers the good news of resurrection. Although her exorcism does not seem to have anything to do with her delivering the news directly, this phrase in fact leads the reader to maintain a positive view on exorcism.

The purpose of the LE's narrator to lead the reader to have a positive attitude toward exorcism is found in Mk 16.17. The narrator often exerts influences on the reader's response to the future development of the narrative by arranging the narrative structure.⁸⁹ It is the same with the LE's narrator in that he adopts this rhetorical strategy in order to persuade the reader to accept his point of view as amenable. As Joseph Hug correctly points out, the exorcism of Mary Magdalene

of the narrative. Therefore, the Markan narrator presents his adversaries, theios-aner opponents who are believed as the Twelve (disciples), negatively in accordance with his narrative strategy that denigrates them. Cf. Weeden's theios-aner hypothesis. He argues that the Markan narrative develops three stages of its portrayal of the Twelve (disciples), culminating in a denigration of the theios-aner opponents. Mark's manner of naming Judas shows how it contributes to the integration of the Markan polemic against the Twelve (disciples). See my "One of the Twelve" and Mark's Narrative Strategy', *ExpTim* 115/8 (May 2004), pp. 253-57.

⁸⁹ M. Sternberg, 'The Bible's Art of Persuasion: Ideology, Rhetoric, and Poetics in Saul's Fall', *HUCA* 54 (Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institution of Religion; 1984), pp. 45-82 (p. 46). He gives an example of this literary strategy through the characterization of Amalek and Saul (1 Sam. 15). The narrator of the pericope, 'Saul and Amalek', wants to justify the condemnation of Saul. He, however, does not denigrate Saul directly; rather, he circumvents his target by focusing on Amalek's crime, and validating their punishment. The narrator, by so doing, leads readers to think as if he talks about Amalek; but he, in fact, prepares a full-attack on Saul by providing a certain criteria that the reader may apply to Saul later. The narrator's purpose of mentioning Amalek is not to judge these people but to condemn Saul: 'If Amalek's fate now appears to the reader well deserved, so will Saul's later' (p. 49).

should be related to the second subsection of the third part (esp. v. 17).⁹⁰ That is, the modification of Mary Magdalene in Mk 16.9b is understood as the ground the narrator lays for his future argument: the author legitimates his ideology by mentioning Mary Magdalene's exorcism.⁹¹

The narrator describes Jesus as promising five signs to those who believe (Mk 16.17-18). According to the LE's author, these signs mark that sign-performers are on Jesus' side, and prove that Jesus support them (v. 20). The LE's author maintains a very positive attitude toward performing miracles. Mary Magdalene is singled out as one of the beneficiaries of these signs. Therefore, the reader receives a positive impression of Mary Magdalene when he or she reads the second subsection of the third part (Mk 16.15-18).

Furthermore, the reader, when reading this third part (esp., vv. 16-20), learns that the assumed ideological primary group of the LE was a mission-oriented community, and that the miraculous signs such as exorcism and healing were understood as an indication that approves their success of mission tasks.⁹² Therefore, Mary Magdalene's experience of exorcism, being read retrospectively from the view point of the third part of the LE, may work in a favourable way to her by strengthening her position/status as an authoritative figure in such a community. This is what the narrator wanted to get from his readers by providing 'asides' about Mary Magdalene: the technique of retrospection.⁹³

To sum up, the exorcism of Mary Magdalene has two functions in the LE. Firstly, the LE's narrator gives the reader a positive impression of the act of exorcism

⁹⁰ Hug, *La Finale*, pp. 107, 164.

⁹¹ I will explore this in more detail later in the part that deals with v. 17.

⁹² See Chapter Four (4.3.4.2., D).

⁹³ Concerning 'anticipation' and 'retrospection', see Iser, *The Act of Reading* and idem, 'Interaction between Text and Reader', pp. 106-19. D. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 48-49; E.S. Malbon, 'Echoes and Foreshadowings in Mark 4-8: Reading and Rereading', *JBL* 112/2 (1993), pp.

by connecting it to Mary Magdalene, who is portrayed positively. It is the narrator's preparatory work to strengthen his idea on exorcism later in the third part. On the other hand, the exorcism of Mary Magdalene leads readers to have a positive impression of her when they read the third part and to reconsider the 'asides' given to her (retrospection). Therefore, the exorcism of Mary Magdalene supports that the ideological primary community of the LE (the LE's author as well) was pro-Mary Magdalene.

4.3.2.2 Characterization of 'τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις'

Mary Magdalene delivers the news that she met the resurrected Jesus to those who had been with him. Introducing them, the narrator provides the reader with two pieces of information about these unnamed characters: (1) they had been with him; (2) they were mourning and weeping. Having heard Mary's witness, they do not believe that Jesus is alive and has been seen by her. In this part, I will explore the ideology of the LE's author by his characterization of these characters.

A. To those who had been with him ('τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις')

The phrase of 'those who had been with him' must be referring to a group of male and female disciples of Jesus that includes the Eleven in the narrative (cf. Mk 3.14; 14.67; 15.41). The narrator recounts that Jesus rebukes the Eleven because they did not believe the witnesses (v. 14), which he alludes to the Eleven's responses to 'Mary Magdalene' in the first part (vv. 9-11) and to 'two of them' in the second (vv. 12-13). Therefore, 'those who had been with him' refers to a larger disciple group including the Eleven.⁹⁴

211-30.

⁹⁴ Cf. Elliott, *Language and Style*, p. 207. Elliott argues that this Greek phrase is not usually

Some commentators simply identify 'those who had been with him' only with the Eleven (apostles), without giving careful consideration to their identity within the context of the LE.⁹⁵ If this group of characters is identified as the Eleven, the context of the LE becomes contradictory. If they are identified as the Eleven, the characters whom the narrator refers to as 'them', as in 'two of them' in the second part (although the narrator does not specify who 'they' are), are understood as referring to the Eleven, which means two of the Eleven delivered the news. If this is so, the third part, where the narrator depicts the Eleven as having not believed the witness, becomes illogical.

The narrative strategy that the LE's narrator adopts by mentioning the male and female disciples as such is to lead his reader to connect this reference with Mk 3.14 and 15.41. Firstly, this phrase is understood in light of Mk 3.14. Two of the three motifs of Jesus' calling in Mk 3.14-15 (i.e., to be with him, proclamation and exorcism) are also found in the first two verses of the LE.⁹⁶ That is, the narrator's 'asides' about Mary Magdalene's exorcism in the previous verse and the phrase of 'those who had been with him' at verse 10. Therefore, the phrase 'those who had been with him' is to be understood in light of Mk 3.14, as most commentators argue.⁹⁷

used to refer to the disciples in the NT. According to the context of the LE, however, they are Jesus' disciples where the Eleven mentioned in verse 14 is included.

⁹⁵ They are, for instance, LaVerdiere ('The Gospel According to Mark' [May], p. 236), Hug (*La Finale*, p. 67), Riley (*The Making of Mark*, p. 201). Cf. C.A. Evans (*Mark*, pp. 547-48) mentions that they are disciples, without specifying the identity of the 'disciples'.

⁹⁶ Mary's delivering the news (Mk 16.10) is somewhat different from proclamation, one of the three motifs of the calling (Mk 3.14), because the content of former action is the news of Jesus' resurrection whereas the latter is the kingdom of God (Guelich, *Mark*, p. 159). Furthermore, Mary is not sent out in the LE whereas the disciples (apostles) are. The act of telling the good news to others *per se*, however, is found common in both Mk 3.14-15 and LE v. 10.

⁹⁷ E.g., Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 73; Hug, *La Finale*, p. 67; LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark (May)', p. 236; Riley, *The Making of Mark*, p. 201; C.A. Evan, *Mark*, pp. 547-48.

The male disciples of Jesus fled when Jesus was arrested, and never return in the Markan narrative (Mk 14.50). They remain forgotten characters until the Markan reader notices their existence when the narrator mentions them through the mouth of an angelic young man (Mk 16.7). When the Markan narrator sets them on the stage once again in the OE, he depicts the male disciples negatively by emphasizing Peter: 'his disciples and *Peter*'. He, who is a representative of the male disciples, has fled and denied Jesus (Mk 14.66-72) despite his vow (Mk 14.27-31), and the Markan narrator reminds the reader of this by mentioning Peter specifically.

The LE's narrator however, attacks the male disciples from a different direction. He describes them as 'those who had been with him' instead of saying 'his disciples and Peter' as the Markan narrator does. By doing so, the LE's narrator underscores a negative impression of the male disciples once again. This reference to them is a reminder of their *absence* in the end of the Markan narrative; they were supposed to be with him (Mk 3.14), but they have all fled and never came back (Mk 14.52).

It is the same with the female disciples mentioned in Mk 15.41. They have been with Jesus from the time of his ministry in Galilee. However, where are they now in the OE? Although they have followed Jesus to the place of the cross, they are not seen in the Markan narrative after Mk 15.41. Only two or three of them visited the site of burial and his tomb (Mk 15.47; 16.1), but they are also depicted as having fled and never returning in the Markan narrative. Therefore, the disciples of Jesus, regardless of whether they are the male disciples that include the Eleven or the female disciples, are portrayed negatively by the phrase of 'those who had been with him'.

Another thing that should be pointed out in exploring ‘τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ γενομένοις’ is the omission of the name of Peter. The Markan narrator tells the reader that an angelic young man ordered the women to deliver the news to ‘his disciples *and Peter*’ (Mk 16.7). Therefore, the LE’s reader expects to find Peter’s name among the list of recipients of the resurrection news. However, the LE’s narrator, when taking over the Markan narrative, changes the way of mentioning the recipients of the news. The Markan narrator pinpoints that Peter should be included among the recipients by explicitly mentioning his name, but the LE’s narrator deletes Peter’s name from the recipient list.

According to the OE, his disciples *and Peter* are supposed to hear the news. In the LE, however, the narrator obscures that Peter heard the news by *not* mentioning his name. The Markan narrator portrays Peter negatively by explicitly mentioning Peter’s name, which implies that his disciples, *especially Peter*, fail to hear the news because the women did not deliver it.⁹⁸ The LE’s narrator, on the other hand, portrays him negatively by not explicitly mentioning him among the recipient group; his disciples – *not particularly Peter* – heard the news. Peter is highlighted in a negative situation (the Markan narrator’s case), and he is obscured in a non-negative⁹⁹ situation (the LE narrator’s case). The literary effect of the inclusion/exclusion of the name of Peter is easily understood when the LE is compared with SE, which I will discuss in Chapter Five.

⁹⁸ For further understanding of this argument, see Chapter One (1.2.2.2 Markan ending for the polemics). For the summary of the debates concerning Markan ending, which includes this argument, see also J.F. Williams, ‘Literary Approaches to the End of Mark’s Gospel’, *JETS* 42/1 (1999), pp. 21-35.

⁹⁹ I use a compound of ‘non-negative’ to differentiate it from the word of ‘positive’, because I do not believe that the LE’s author understands the act of ‘hearing’ (e.g., v. 11; implied in v. 13. Cf. vv. 16, 17. I will discuss this later) as positive although at least not as negative. In this light, I think that the author of the LE does not agree with Mark, because it seems that Mark emphasizes the importance of hearing the news of the resurrection (Mk 16.8) whereas the author of the LE is not satisfied with ‘hearing’: for him, seeing the risen Jesus is more important than hearing about him. I will discuss this later as well.

Therefore, the deletion of the reference to Peter here is intentional and ideological. Since the deletion of Peter's name sheds a negative light on him, this is against Peter's interest or at least is not favourable to him or those who are in favour of him. This alerts us to the assumed ideological identity of the LE's community. It can be argued that the LE's author or the LE's community was at odds with Peter or the assumed pro-Petrine community.

B. Mourning and Weeping

The LE's narrator describes the disciples, in whose group the Eleven is included, as mourning and weeping during Jesus' absence (v. 10).¹⁰⁰ These two words are usually combined together in the NT as found in Lk. 6.25; Jas 4.9; Rev. 18.11, 15, 19, expressing a mood of lamentation.¹⁰¹ The motif of lamentation is related to the motif of fasting because 'the act of fasting is a part of lamentation' as Joseph Hug well points out.¹⁰² The Gospel of Matthew (Mt. 9.15) and the Easter morning narrative according to the *Gospel of Peter* show the connection between 'mourning and weeping' and 'fasting': 'In addition to all these things *we were fasting*, and we were sitting *mourning and weeping* night and day until the Sabbath. (*Gos. Pet.* 27)¹⁰³ Therefore, the phrase 'mourning and weeping' of those who had been with him reminds the reader of Mk 2.19-20, where Jesus predicts that the disciples will fast during his absence.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *Gos. Pet.* 59.

¹⁰¹ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel according to Mark (May)', p. 236; Hug, *La Finale*, p. 68.

¹⁰² Hug, *La Finale*, p. 68.

¹⁰³ Cf. See also a passage from the *Gospel of the Hebrews* that mentions fasting that James did at the absence of Jesus: 'James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein he had drunk the Lord's cup until he should see him risen again from among them that sleep. (*Gos. Heb. frg. 7*)'

¹⁰⁴ Note that the reader of the LE is (was) not the reader of only the LE but of Mark's Gospel plus the LE (i.e., Mk 1.1-16.20). This means that the reader reads the LE in relation to MK that he or she has read so far. This is why I try to interpret the LE in relation to MK like this.

The pericope about Jesus' confrontation with the Jewish authorities concerning fasting (Mk 2.18-22) foreshadows the absence (because of his death) of Jesus (cf. Mk 3.6). A close examination of the literary structure of the pericopae that sandwich this 'Fast Controversy' pericope (Mk 2.18-22) supports the relationship between this pericope and the absence of Jesus.¹⁰⁵ The pericope of 'Fast Confrontation' is surrounded by four pericopae, two preceding and two following (A-B-C-B' -A'). They consist of a concentric structure¹⁰⁶ that deals with the motifs of healing (pericope A; Mk 2.1-12) – eating (pericope B; Mk 2.13-17) – fasting (pericope C; Mk 2.18-22) – eating (pericope B'; Mk 2.23-28) – healing (pericope A'; Mk 3.1-6) respectively.

This unit of five pericopae is focusing on the central pericope of C (Mk 2.18-22). This pericope, however, is not all about the act of fasting itself but about the presence/absence of Jesus with/from the disciples, which is eventually related to the motif of the death – resurrection of Jesus, as Joanna Dewey correctly points out.¹⁰⁷ The argument that this pericope of 'Fasting Controversy' is alluding to the death – resurrection (presence/absence) of Jesus is supported by the final remark that concludes all the five pericopae, i.e., Mk 3.6: 'The Pharisees went out and immediately conspired with the Herodians against him, how to destroy him (NRSV)'.¹⁰⁸

Therefore, the LE narrator's description of the disciples as mourning and weeping corresponds to the pericope of 'Fasting Controversy (Mk 2.18-22)' through

¹⁰⁵ See J. Dewey, *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6* (SBLDS, 48; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980). For a summary of her argument, see idem, 'The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2.1-3.6', *JBL* 92 (1976), pp. 394-401. Cf. V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 211.

¹⁰⁶ For further information of various literary structural patterns, see K.E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

¹⁰⁷ Dewey, 'Literary Structure of Mark 2.1-3.6', p. 398.

¹⁰⁸ In this light, Guelich points out that Mk 2.20 is the first passion prediction in Mark's narrative (*Mark 1-8.26*, p. 112).

the motif of fasting/lamentation on the surface and through the motif of the prophecy and fulfilment of presence and absence beneath the surface. The prophecy at Mk 2.19-20 is focused on the presence of Jesus with the disciples. The fulfilment in LE v. 10, on the other hand, is focused on the absence of Jesus. The former emphasizes the joy for the bridegroom's presence,¹⁰⁹ whereas the latter emphasizes the grief of loss/absence.

As a correspondence to and a fulfilment of Mk 2.19-20, the phrase of 'mourning and weeping' of those who had been with Jesus in the LE refreshes the reader with the current situation of the disciples: they *are not* with Jesus, nor *have seen* him yet. Therefore, the importance of the experience of the resurrected Jesus in any kind of visual way such as seeing or meeting him (Mary Magdalene at v. 9; two of them at v. 12) is underlined in this section: Mary delivers the news after she has seen the risen Jesus; but the disciples are in sorrow because they have not met him yet.

The importance of the visual experience of the risen Jesus is implied in the contrast between Mary Magdalene and the disciples. Mary delivered the news (v. 10) but the disciples did not believe (v. 11). Mark describes Mary Magdalene negatively as she fled, but the LE's narrator restores her by depicting her as delivering the news. It is interesting that Mary Magdalene in the OE has never met the risen Jesus, whereas she has in the LE. That is to say, Mary Magdalene delivers the news after she *has seen* the risen Jesus. The disciples do not believe when only *hearing* from her.

¹⁰⁹ Dewey, 'Literary Structure of Mark 2.1-3.6', p. 397.

4.3.2.3 Summary of Part One

The LE's narrator, as a reader of MK, takes over the ending of Mark's Gospel from a different perspective. Mark depicts all the three women, including Mary Magdalene, negatively. The LE's narrator, however, restores Mary Magdalene only and leaves the other women – especially Mary the mother of Jesus – negative by mentioning Mary Magdalene and not mentioning the others. The narrator also highlights the negative aspects of Peter (like MK's narrator) by keeping silent about him among the recipient list (unlike MK's narrator). This reveals that the ideological primary groups of the LE takes a pro-Magdalene/anti-Petrine stance.

The LE's narrator also maintains a negative view of the disciples of Jesus in this part. He highlights that they are not with Jesus now by mentioning that they 'had been with Jesus', which reminds the reader of their flight and absence from the Markan ending. He also implies that they have not seen him yet by pointing out that Jesus is absent from them through the phrase of 'mourning and weeping' which is related to Mk 2.18-20. However, when the author portrays the disciples negatively in this part, his emphasis lies more on the importance of the visual experience of the resurrected Jesus rather than on the polemics against them. That is, the negative portrayal of the disciples is a kind of narrative strategy to highlight the theme, the importance of the visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus.

The contrast between the portrayal of Mary Magdalene and the disciples in this section shows the reader the ideology of the LE's author. For him, to see the risen Jesus is more important than to hear about him. Mary Magdalene did not see the risen Jesus in MK, but she does in the LE. She delivers the news when *having seen* him (v. 9) not *having heard about* him (cf. Mk 16.6-8). The disciples of Jesus, having not yet seen him, do not believe Mary Magdalene.

Another ideology of the LE's author is reflected in his depiction of the exorcism of Mary Magdalene. The LE's narrator leads the reader to have a positive impression of exorcism by connecting it with Mary Magdalene, a positive character. It is the narrator's strategy to prepare his readers to accept the ideology he develops later in the third section of the LE (v. 17), which I will discuss later.

4.3.3 Part Two – the second type-scene: vv.12-13

The second type-scene covers only two verses of 12 and 13. It briefly reports another story of the appearance of the resurrected Jesus: he [the resurrected Jesus] was manifested in another form to 'two of them', who were going to a country, and they report [what happened to them] to the rest; but they do not believe.

All commentators, as far as I know, read this part in relation to the Emmaus narrative of Luke's Gospel, the appearance narrative in John's Gospel, or some other passages in the writings of the NT.¹¹⁰ However, I am not interested in what source the LE's author used in order to compose this part or how this part is related to other writings. What is important in a study of characterization and ideology is how this part functions within the LE as a whole. I will explore the ideology of the LE's author by examining the structure and some passages of the second type-scene, the 'appearance to two of them'.

¹¹⁰ E.g., LaVerdiere 'The Gospel According to Mark (May)', pp. 237-39; Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, pp. 84-92; C.A. Evans, *Mark*, p. 548; Reiley, *The Making of Mark*, pp. 202-203; Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 247; Mann, *Mark*, p. 675; Nineham, *St. Mark*, p. 451. Cf. Hug, *La Finale*, pp. 61-67.

4.3.3.1 Structure

The second type-scene exhibits a very similar structure to that of the first one (vv. 9-11), as is found in the following table:

The first type-scene (vv. 9-11)	The second type-scene (vv.12-13)
<p>A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωτὶ πρώτη σαββάτου ● Μαρία τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ ● ἐφάνη ● ● πρῶτον, παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια <p>B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ἐκείνη ● πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλεν ● τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ ● γενομένοις πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν <p>C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● κάκεῖνοι ● ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθαάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς ● ἠπίστησαν 	<p>A'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ● δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ● ἐφανερῶθη ● ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ ● περιπατοῦσιν πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρὸν <p>B'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● κάκεῖνοι ● ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν ● τοῖς λοιποῖς ● <p>C'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ἐκείνοις ● ● οὐδὲ ἐπίστευσαν

<table 4.1>

These two parts consist of three major actions of the characters. They are (1) A-A' : he (the resurrected Jesus) appears to the witnesses (ἐφάνη; ἐφανερῶθη); (2) B-B' : the witnesses deliver the news (πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλεν; ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν); (3) C-C' : the recipients do not believe the witnesses (ἠπίστησαν; οὐδὲ ἐπίστευσαν). These actions are narrated in the same order, comprising a structural pattern of A-B-C and A' -B' -C' . Each type-scene uses a few of the same or similar words or expressions, as are found in the table above. Each phrase of a type-scene – except for some – has its own equivalent, even if they may not be using the same word.

Each scene also exhibits differences. The second one mentions something about the resurrected Jesus, the equivalent of which is not mentioned in the first one:

‘έν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ’. The second does not describe the recipients of the news in detail, while the first does (‘γενομένοις πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν’). Finally, the content of what the recipients hear is not mentioned in the second: ‘ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ’ αὐτῆς’. The differences, however, are so minor in light of the whole framework of these two episodes that they do not damage the parallelism of these two scenes.¹¹¹

The second type-scene accounts another episode of the appearance of the resurrected Jesus. It follows the same structural pattern and repeats the same motif that is found in the first one. Therefore, the narrator emphasizes the motifs and the theme that are repeated in the second part. These recurrent motifs are the witnesses’ visual experiences of the resurrected Jesus, their response to it that turns out as delivering the news, and the disciples’ disbelief.¹¹² These emphasized motifs and the theme show the reader the ideology of the LE’s author, which I will discuss in more detail by examining some passages below.

4.3.3.2 Text analysis

A. εἰς ἀγρόν: Jesus’ appearance on their way to a country

The LE’s narrator recounts that the resurrected Jesus was manifested to ‘two of them’ while they were going to a country. Whereas the narrator does not mention anything about the place where Mary Magdalene met Jesus in the first type-scene, he tells the reader more about the place of meeting in the second one. It is on the way to a country. However, he does not specify what country he means to locate. Therefore, his mention of the country might not look that meaningful in understanding this part at a glance.

¹¹¹ Cf. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 85.

¹¹² I will discuss the theme, which is found common both in the first and the second parts, later when examining the passages in this part.

However, the narrator's mention of the place as such in the second type-scene, as well as his silence about the meeting place in the first (v. 9) and the third type-scene (v. 14), shows the reader something important. The meeting point is not necessarily Galilee. For the author of MK, Galilee is an important place where the disciples shall see their Jesus (Mk 14.28; 16.7). The Markan narrator underlines, twice in his narrative, the importance of Galilee as a meeting point by locating the place through the mouths of reliable characters such as Jesus and an angelic man. Furthermore, he mentions the name of 'Galilee' very clearly.

However, the LE's narrator, unlike the Markan narrator (Mk 16.7), does not adhere to Galilee as the place where people shall see the resurrected Jesus.¹¹³ Had the narrator wanted to locate the meeting point in Galilee, he would have mentioned it explicitly like the Markan narrator does.

That the author of the LE does not adhere to Galilee tells us something about his ideology, which is clarified by examining the significance of Galilee in Mark's Gospel. In the Markan narrative, the spatial setting plays an important role, as has often been pointed out by many Markan scholars.¹¹⁴ Among the various spatial settings in the Markan narrative, Galilee and Jerusalem have been argued as the two

¹¹³ It has been debated whether Mk 14.28 and 16.7 indicate the post-Easter appearance of the resurrected Jesus to his disciples or the parousia. The scholars who support the former idea are for instance V. Taylor (*St. Mark*, pp. 607-608), van Iersel (*Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, pp. 430, 496-99, 505), Gundry (*Mark*, pp. 1006-1008), Brown (*Death of Messiah*, p. 132), and Collins ('Empty Tomb', p. 122). The latter is supported by E. Lohmeyer (*Galiläa und Jerusalem* [Göttingen: Vandenhæck & Ruprecht, 1936], p. 355), R.H. Lightfoot (*Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938], pp. 52-65), W. Marxen (*The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth* [trans. M. Kohl; London: SCM, 1970], pp. 162-64), Weeden (*Traditions in Conflict*, pp. 111f.), and Perrin (*Resurrection*, pp. 25-34; idem, *Resurrection Narratives*, p. 30). Cf. C.F. Evans ('I will go before you into Galilee', pp. 3-18) understands Mk. 14.28 and 16.8 in light of gentile mission. van Iersel also interprets these verses, especially the phrase of 'going into/in Galilee' in terms of Jesus' leadership in Galilee (*Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, pp. 497-98; "'To Galilee" or "in Galilee" in Mark 14.28 and 16.7?', *ETL* 58 (1982), pp. 365-70).

¹¹⁴ For the study of the spatial settings in Mark's Gospel, see Malbon, *Narrative Space*; Smith, *A Lion with Wings*, pp. 124-65; Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 63-72.

confronting axes of spatial settings that contribute to the development of the plot as the story unfolds.¹¹⁵

In Mark's Gospel, Galilee is portrayed as the place where Jesus enjoys popularity. Jesus' campaign for the Kingdom of God succeeds in Galilee. He heals many people suffering from various kinds of diseases.¹¹⁶ He frees the demoniac people from the power of Satan, and restores them to a normal social life.¹¹⁷ In Galilee, his unprecedented authority is acknowledged (Mk 2.12), and his opponents are silenced.¹¹⁸ His proclaiming, teaching, healing, exorcism, and many other miraculous works have spread his name wide, and enabled him to win many followers from various backgrounds.¹¹⁹ Galilee is portrayed as a place where the Kingdom of God is realized.

Galilee is also the place where Jesus proclaimed the good news of the Kingdom of God for the first time (Mk 1.14-15). In Galilee the four representatives of Jesus' disciples met him and were called to work for the Kingdom of God (Mk 1.16-20). For Mark, Galilee is the starting point of the Jesus movement. This movement develops as Jesus and his company moves toward Jerusalem, where extreme conflicts between Jesus and his opponents take place, where his ministry for the Kingdom of God culminates. Just before and after the climax of the culmination

¹¹⁵ The earliest scholars who have argued this designation of Galilee and Jerusalem are Lohmeyer (*Galiläa und Jerusalem*), Lightfoot (*Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*) and Marxen (*Mark the Evangelist*). They are followed by many Markan scholars who read Mark's Gospel from a literary critical or socio-critical point of view such as Kelber (*The Kingdom in Mark*), E.S. Malbon ('Galilee and Jerusalem: History and Literature in Marcan Interpretation', *CBQ* 44 [1982], pp. 242-55), and S. Freyne (*Galilee Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988]). See also E.S. Malbon, 'The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee', *JBL* 103/3 (1984), pp. 363-77; E.L. Schnellbacher, 'The Temple as Focus of Mark's Theology', *HBT* 5/2 (1983), pp. 95-112.

¹¹⁶ E.g., Mk 1.29-31, 40-45; 2.1-12; 3.1-5; 5.21-43; 7.31-37; 8.22-26. Cf. Mk 1.32-34, 39; 3.10; 6.54-56.

¹¹⁷ E.g., Mk 1.21-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29. Cf. Mk 3.32-34, 39; 3.11-12.

¹¹⁸ In confrontations with the authorities in Galilee, Jesus always has the final word (e.g., Mk 2.8-11, 17, 19-22, 25-28; 3.4, 23-29; 7.6-13).

¹¹⁹ For the metaphorical meaning of Jesus' boat movement in this light, see Kelber, *Mark's Story of Jesus*, Chapter Two.

of his ministry, the disciples are directed to Galilee, the starting point of the Jesus movement (Mk 14.28 and 16.7).

Therefore in Mark's Gospel, Galilee is portrayed as the place where the Jesus movement is supposed to resume. It is depicted as the place where the shepherd will gather his scattered flock (Mk 14.27-28). In Mark's Gospel, Galilee is suggested as the heart of the post-Easter Jesus movement, because it is the birthplace of the ministry for the Kingdom of God. This is why the author of MK mentions Galilee as a gathering point at the end of the narrative. After the prelude (Mk 1.1-13), the Markan narrator begins his main story from Galilee and closes it in Jerusalem. But he does not stop at the empty tomb in Jerusalem but points to Galilee. In this light, the Markan narrative begins and ends in Galilee.

That the LE's author does not locate the meeting point in Galilee, therefore, alerts us to his understanding of Galilee. He does not believe that the post-Easter movement necessarily has to begin in Galilee. The resurrected Jesus may be manifested to his disciples while they are walking to a country (v. 12) or reclining at the table (v. 14). Or he may appear at a place the reader does not know (v. 9). The place does not matter with the LE's author. The post-Easter Jesus movement, therefore can begin at any place – not only Galilee but also Jerusalem or elsewhere.

B. Characterization of the two disciples and 'the rest'

The equivalent characters to Mary Magdalene are two people believed to be disciples of Jesus. They were walking into a country, when the resurrected Jesus appeared to them. The narrator does not tell the reader who they are. As most commentators argue, they *might be* the two disciples who saw the resurrected Jesus on their way to Emmaus, if the author used the Lukan sources (Lk. 24.13-35). However, judging

only from the context of the LE, they were among the disciples who heard and did not believe Mary Magdalene (vv. 10-11).¹²⁰

These two disciples, formerly unbelievers of what Mary Magdalene delivered, take over her role as the second witnesses of the resurrection. They see the resurrected Jesus just as Mary Magdalene did. As she went to other people, they do the same. They deliver the news to the other disciples as Mary Magdalene did. This shows that the author of the LE wants to characterize the two disciples in the same way he characterized Mary Magdalene.

It is then to be argued that the author wants the reader to notice the common theme found in both groups of characters. It is the importance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus. They were portrayed negatively for they did not believe Mary Magdalene. However, they are now depicted positively as delivering the news. They have changed, and it happened when they *saw* the resurrected Jesus. Therefore, through his characterization of these three characters in these two parallel episodes, the author wants to emphasize that to see the resurrected Jesus is more important than merely hearing about him.

The importance of the visual experience of the resurrected Jesus is reiterated in the narrator's depiction of the recipients' responses to the witnesses (v. 13), and this motif is also found in the previous episode (v. 11). Just as the disciples did not believe Mary Magdalene when only hearing about the resurrection and appearance of the resurrected Jesus, the rest of the disciples exhibit the same attitude to the report of the two witnesses when only hearing them. The author emphasizes that visual

¹²⁰ The Greek μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα is designed to connect the second episode naturally to the first. As Hug argues, it does not necessarily indicate a temporal sequence. That is, it does not have to imply that the appearance event in the second episode happened only *after* the first one had happened (*La Finale*, p. 52), because the order of events in a narrative, like the story-time in comparison with the text-time, does not always have to be linearly. Rather, it is for making a pattern that forms a second type-scene (See the section 4.3.3.1 Structure above). However, the reader is led to understand ταῦτα as

experience makes one change by showing two disciples' reaction to their visual experience on the one hand, and the other disciples' reactions to their aural experience on the other. Therefore the author of the LE shows that to see is more significant than to hear about him.

Another important thing that is implied in the characterization of the two and the rest of the disciples is that the author of the LE is not mainly interested in denigrating the disciples like Mark. Just glancing at this part, the negative characterization of the rest of the disciples leads the reader to think that the primary purpose of the composition of the LE is to denigrate the disciples. However this is not so because the portrayal of the disciples changes in a positive direction – two characters were among the disciples of disbelief in the previous part!¹²¹ Therefore I believe that the LE's author portrays the disciples as such for his narrative strategy to highlight the theme; the significance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus, unlike the author of MK who depicts the disciples for the purpose of polemics, as Weeden and his followers argue.¹²²

4.3.3.3 Summary of Part Two

The second type-scene (vv. 12-13) follows the same structural pattern that the first one exhibits (vv. 9-11). These two episodes are paralleling each other, and accordingly the repeated elements draw the reader's attention, which is one of the effects of the technique of repetition. The author is not interested in telling the full story of what happened to the two disciples and the rest of disciples.¹²³ Rather the

referring to the event that mentioned in the previous episode because of the order of these two episodes. For the further information of time in a narrative, see Smith, *Lion with Wings*, pp. 136-50.

¹²¹ It is also found in the third part (vv. 14-20), which I will discuss later.

¹²² See Chapter One (1.2.2.2).

¹²³ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 85.

author wants to emphasize the theme by reiterating the motifs and the theme found in the previous type-scene.

The theme emphasized is that to see the resurrected Jesus is more important than to hear about him. The contrast between the positively portrayed act of seeing, and the portrayal of the act of hearing as ineffective, is made by means of the characterization of the two disciples. They did not believe Mary Magdalene, a witness (v. 11), but they have changed so that they play the role as witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus (v. 13a). Beneath their radical change of attitude lies the act of seeing the resurrected Jesus.

The LE's author, unlike the author of MK, does not adhere to Galilee. In Mark's Gospel, Galilee is depicted as the heart of the post-Easter Jesus movement; Galilee is the birthplace of the Jesus movement, and the disciples are directed to Galilee after the promised resurrection event; it is where people will see the resurrected Jesus (Mk 14.28; 16.7). In the LE, however, it does not necessarily have to be Galilee, but any place can replace Galilee. Therefore if the hypothesis that MK was produced by the Galilean community is granted, the LE's community is probably not identical with this assumed community.

4.3.4 Part Three – the third type-scene: vv. 14-20

As I have examined in the beginning of this Chapter (the analysis of the structure of the LE), this part forms the third type-scene that exhibits a similar (but not identical) pattern to that of the two preceding episodes. As those episodes (to Mary Magdalene and two disciples respectively), also this one begins with the appearance of the resurrected Jesus to the Eleven (v. 14). It moves on to the description of their

reaction to the encounter with him, which is their delivering the news (v. 20). This is also found in the previous parts (vv. 10, 13).

However, this part is also different compared with the other two episodes. Unlike Mary and the two disciples, the Eleven are rebuked for their disbelief of the two groups of witnesses. Between the parts about their encounter with the resurrected Jesus (v. 14) and their reaction to it (v. 20), the commission and the promise of five signs are inserted (section two). Whereas the two preceding episodes conclude by describing the recipients' response of disbelief (vv. 11, 13), the third part does not explicitly mention anything about the recipients' response to the message of the Eleven; did people believe the Eleven or not?

Rather, the narrator shifts the focus off the recipients (part one and two) to the messenger (part three). He talks about the messengers, not the recipients, stating that the Eleven's witness was affirmed by the Lord with many signs (v. 20). That is, the narrator is interested in the Eleven, not the recipients of the third part, and he wants to make it clear that the Eleven *did believe* by concluding such, as he explicitly mentions that signs will follow to those who believe (v. 17). I will analyse each section of this part, and I will illuminate the author's ideology as implied in the text.

4.3.4.1 Text analysis (1): section one (v. 14)

A. Jesus' appearance to the Eleven at table: v. 14a

The narrator, just as he did in the two preceding parts, begins the third part with the appearance of the resurrected Jesus to the characters. He also opens the episode with a chronological indication, ὕστερον, marking that the third type-scene begins here. It is the first appearance of the resurrected Jesus to the Eleven (formerly the Twelve)

since this group scattered just before Jesus' arrest (Mk 14.50). They fled and never came back in MK, but now they are gathered again in the LE.

The LE's narrator refers to this group as the Eleven, whereas the Markan narrator names this specific group the Twelve. The LE's narrator may use this reference, 'the Eleven', presupposing his readers know something happened to Judas Iscariot after his defection. However, the Markan narrator does not tell the reader anything about Judas' absence from the Twelve in his narrative. Rather, the Markan narrator, unlike the LE's narrator, adheres to the Twelve even after his defection.¹²⁴ Therefore, the reference of the LE's narrator to the Eleven may reflect the LE author's understanding of the Markan Twelve.¹²⁵

The Twelve in Mark's narrative is a specially designed group. The Markan narrator describes this group of disciples as sharing the most intimate relationship with Jesus. They were called by Jesus to be with him, to perform miraculous works, and to proclaim (Mk 3.14-15). They receive instructions from Jesus secretly, which are not given to outsiders (Mk 4.10). They are sent out for missionary works (Mk 6.7), and they succeed (Mk 6.30).

Despite the positive portrayal of the Twelve in the early stage of Mark's narrative, this group is depicted negatively as the story unfolds. They are portrayed as failing in the later part of the narrative. Jesus teaches them the meaning of servanthood, but they argue with each other as to who is the greatest, which is opposite to his instruction (Mk 9.35). He tells them his imminent suffering, death and resurrection (Mk 10.32), which shows his willingness to be a servant (Mk 10.45).

¹²⁴ LaVerdine, 'The Gospel According to Mark' (June), p. 284. He compares Mk 14.10, 20, 43 with Mt. 28.16; Lk. 24.9, 33, pointing out that Mark adheres to the Twelve while others change it into the Eleven.

¹²⁵ LaVerdine interprets the Twelve in Mark's Gospel as exhibiting a symbolic meaning of the twelve tribe of Israel, which implies the 'universality of the Church' ('The Gospel According to Mark' [June], p. 284). However, it is doubtful if Mark designed this specific term of the Twelve

But they struggle against each other to rule over others (Mk 10.35-41). The most negative portrait of the Twelve is in the scene when the name 'the Twelve' is connected to Judas Iscariot: 'Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve' (Mk 14.10, 20, 43. Cf. Mk 3.19).

Therefore, the Markan narrator, with regard to the term of the Twelve, ends his narrative by portraying them negatively. The final image of the Twelve in the Markan narrative is of a group of people, one of whom is the betrayer of Jesus. That is, the Markan narrator ends by associating Judas Iscariot with this group of characters. This is one of the most negative and shameful moments with the Twelve. The Markan narrative ends without restoring their honour.

Interestingly, one of the final pictures of the Twelve is the scene in which they are at the table (Mk 14.17-21).¹²⁶ The Twelve (δώδεκα) recline at the table with Jesus just before he is arrested and put to death in Mark's narrative (ἀνακειμένων; Mk 14.18). The Eleven (ένδεκα) also recline at the table after Jesus is raised from death and appears to them (ἀνακειμένοις; Mk 16.14). Therefore, the present section of the LE can be considered in light of the Last Supper in Mark's Gospel.

The LE's narrator changes the reference to this group of disciples from the Twelve to the Eleven (Mk 16.14). By doing so, he eliminates the negative connotation the Twelve carries. Judas Iscariot, the betrayer, is one of the Twelve, but

keeping this theological notion in his mind, because I do not find any passage where the narrator understands the Twelve in terms of restoration of Israel in Mark's narrative.

¹²⁶ Cf. J.I.H. McDonald, *The Resurrection: Narrative and Belief* (London: SPCK, 1989), p. 74. He understands the appearance of the resurrected Jesus to the Eleven at the table as reflecting the ritual of early Christian community. W.J. Lunny (*The Sociology of the Resurrection* [London: SCM Press, 1989], p. 129) argues that the meal of the resurrected Jesus with his disciples shows the restoration of the table-fellowship, and he interprets Mk 16.14 in this way. However, as John E. Alsup correctly points out (*The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel-Traditions* [London: SPCK, 1975], p. 120), the LE depicts the post-Easter table-fellowship somewhat differently. The resurrected Jesus does not preside at the table-fellowship but he merely interrupts their meal in the LE. Therefore, it is not certain whether the present verse exhibits the restoration of the relationship between Jesus and his disciples. However, it is not impossible to reckon that the LE's author entices his readers to recall Mk 14.17-21 here.

he does not belong to this new group, the Eleven. That is, there is no betrayer anymore in this group of disciples.¹²⁷ The dissociation of Judas Iscariot from the Twelve, by naming them the Eleven, shows that the LE's author wanted to renew the image of this group of disciples in the LE. This group of disciples has been described as accomplices of Judas Iscariot in MK, but they are not anymore in the LE.

This portrait of the Eleven is somewhat different from that in the two preceding episodes. In the two previous episodes, they were negative figures, although the narrator's rendering of the negative impression of them was not the main focus in each part. The portrait of the Eleven that is reflected in the term of 'the Eleven' is not necessarily negative. That is, the characterization of the Eleven in the present section is a *foreshadowing* of their imminent positive change, which I will also discuss in the last section of the third part (vv. 19-20).

Therefore, the portraits of the Eleven described both in the two preceding parts and the present section point to the question; what is the purpose of such a characterization of the Eleven? As I have argued above, the negative portraits of the Eleven do not lie in the author's direct opposition to this group, but in emphasizing the theme and motifs that are implied within such characterizations; that is the motif of disbelief and the theme of the importance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus.

The characterization of the eleven disciples of Jesus embedded in the term of the Eleven therefore, is not *directly* related to their positive or negative portrait, as is the same in the two previous parts. The main focus of such characterization lies in the theme, the importance of seeing the resurrected Jesus, which the LE's author has adhered to so far.

¹²⁷ Mark nor LE's author do not mention directly who secedes from the Twelve and how the Twelve has become the Eleven in the narrative. It is, however, implied in Mark's passion narrative

B. 'ὠνείδισεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν': v. 14b

The resurrected Jesus appears to the Eleven while they are reclining at the table and he rebukes them severely. The reason of Jesus' reproach is 'their unbelief and hardness of heart'. The narrator explains what has led them to be accused as such; it is because they did not believe the witnesses to whom Jesus was manifested. I will discuss Jesus' reproach in this subsection, and the reason of reproach (v. 14c) in the next subsection.

The resurrected Jesus, having appeared to the Eleven at table, rebukes their *ἀπιστίαν* and *σκληροκαρδίαν*. Firstly, concerning faith or the act of having faith/believing, we find 17 verses that mention the word 'faith' or 'to believe' in Mark's Gospel. Twelve of them are understood either directly or indirectly with regard to miracles.¹²⁸ Faith/to believe is understood as a condition of making a miracle happen. It is because of faith that the paralysed man (Mk 2.5) and the haemorrhaging woman (Mk 5.34) are healed; Bartimaeus recovers his sight thanks to his faith (Mk 10.52). Jairus' faith makes it possible for his daughter to be resuscitated (Mk 5.36, 42). Faith can make everything possible (Mk 9.23); but without faith, nothing happens (Mk 9.19), and even Jesus – although it is not Jesus but the Nazarene who does not have faith – can hardly do miraculous works (Mk 6.6). Therefore, faith or the act of having faith/believing is strongly recommended in Mark's Gospel.¹²⁹

that it is Judas Iscariot, and the LE's author presupposes that his readers acknowledge these things.

¹²⁸ They are Mk 2.5; 4.40; 5.34, 36; 6.6; 9.19, 23, 24; 10.52; 11.22, 23, 24.

¹²⁹ Note that faith is not a kind of thing to be forced to have but to be encouraged and strongly recommended in Mark's narrative. Mark understands that no one – even Jesus as is implied in Mk 6.6 – can force someone else to have faith or to believe.

Furthermore, Mark understands that exhibiting no faith or lack of faith is not to be reproached.¹³⁰ Rather, if a suppliant does not have faith, Jesus encourages him or her to have faith rather than rebuking his or her unbelief. For example, when the father of an epileptic boy does not have faith, Jesus helps him have faith (Mk 9.23-24). When Jairus is in a difficult situation because of the bad news that messengers from his house brought, Jesus encourages him to have faith (Mk 5.35-36).

Therefore, the LE's understanding of faith or believing exhibits something different from that of MK. Jesus severely reproaches the Eleven for their unbelief in the LE, whereas MK exhibits a generous attitude to it. As James A. Kelhoffer rightly points out, the Jesus in Mark's Gospel shows only a passive response to people's unbelief by being amazed (Mk 6.6), showing sympathy (Mk 9.24), expressing lamentation (Mk 9.19), and merely pointing out people's unbelief (Mk 4.40).¹³¹ However, Jesus takes a stern stance against those exhibiting unbelief in the LE. The LE author's understanding of faith or believing reflected in v. 14b is also alerting us to his ideology as implied in v. 16, which I will discuss later.

Secondly, Jesus rebukes the hardness of heart of the Eleven. The LE author's negative attitude against the response of unbelief is further strengthened because of the phrase, 'the hardness of heart'. From a literary perspective, these phrases of 'unbelief and the hardness of heart' form a two-step parallelism.¹³² The second motif is closely related to the first one, and is understood in light of the first. More precisely, the second motif adds precision to the first one, specifying the first one. Therefore, the hardness of heart of the Eleven shows that their unbelief is not merely a lack of faith, but 'their resistance and refusal to believe'.¹³³

¹³⁰ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, pp. 95-96.

¹³¹ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, pp. 95-96.

¹³² See Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, pp. 49-51.

¹³³ LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark' (June), p. 286.

The extremely negative attitude of the LE's author towards unbelief is bolstered through the phrase 'the hardness of heart', and should be understood in relation to verse 16, where the narrator mentions 'the one who does not believe', as well.¹³⁴ It functions as a warning to them. The Eleven did not believe the resurrection witnesses and their reactions are reproached, proving that their heart is hardened. If even the Eleven cannot escape Jesus' wrathful reproach, then how much more other ordinary people who refuse to believe? Jesus' reproach of the Eleven is an object lesson to those who will be recipients of the Eleven's proclamation.

C. Because they did not believe...: v. 14c

The last part of verse 14 explains why Jesus reproaches the Eleven; they did not believe those who had seen him raised from the dead. Here the narrator is referring to the two previous episodes. Therefore, this specified statement of the reason why they are reproached draws the reader's attention back to the two episodes. Furthermore the narrator uses the phrase 'οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν', which follows the pattern adopted in the two previous type-scenes (ἠπίστησαν; οὐδὲ ἐπίστευσαν), and leads the reader to connect this phrase with the corresponding parts, which depict their responses to Mary Magdalene and two disciples.

Here I want to point out a few things. Firstly, the Eleven did not believe those who *had seen* the resurrected Jesus. Secondly, they are reproached *because* they did *not believe*. Thirdly, the Eleven now *see* the resurrected Jesus. Fourthly, unlike Mary Magdalene, two disciples, and the Eleven, the people who are baptized and believe (vv. 15b-16) are not eye witnesses but *audiences*, alerting us to the author's idea on apostleship or apostolic authority.

¹³⁴ Cf. Hug, *La Finale*, p. 80.

Firstly, the LE's narrator reiterates that the Eleven did not believe those who *had seen* the resurrected Jesus. Mary Magdalene was an *eyewitness* who *saw* the resurrected Jesus, and the two disciples too were *eyewitnesses*. That is, he emphasizes the importance of visual experience once again. He points out again that they did see him by saying 'θεασαμένοις', and this supports that he is interested in the act of seeing.

Secondly, the narrator's emphasis on the importance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus is connected with the Eleven's reproach. They are rebuked *because they did not believe* the eyewitnesses. This becomes a warning to those who do not believe the Eleven (v. 16), who saw the resurrected Jesus like Mary Magdalene and the two disciples. The Eleven see him now, and they behave like the two groups of eyewitnesses from whom they heard the news. If people do not believe the Eleven, the eyewitnesses, they will be severely reproached like the Eleven (v. 16b).

Thirdly, the narrator recounts that the Eleven, who have only heard from the eyewitnesses so far, now see the resurrected Jesus with their own eyes (ἐφανερώθη). This Greek word shows that this part follows the same pattern used in the two previous type-scenes (ἐφάνη; ἐφανερώθη). It implies that the Eleven's visual encounter corresponds to that of Mary Magdalene and the two disciples. The equality of the Eleven's experience in its value with those of two groups of eyewitnesses is proved by the description of the Eleven's reaction to their visual experience, which parallels those of their predecessors (vv. 10b, 13a, 20a). The Eleven therefore, are no longer audiences of news, but eyewitnesses. They are now under the same category of eyewitnesses along with Mary Magdalene and the two disciples.

Finally the Eleven's visual encounter, along with that of the two groups of predecessors and in contrast to the implied positive responses of audiences (v. 20c), alerts us to the LE author's understanding of apostleship. As I have pointed out in my examination of parts one and two, the eyewitnesses' messages do not always gain positive results, because the Eleven do not believe when only hearing from them. Interestingly, the narrator tells the reader that audiences (not eyewitnesses) showed a positive reaction to the Eleven's proclamation (v. 20c).

This proves that the LE's author does not believe that hearing is useless or inferior to seeing the resurrected Jesus. Although hearing did not work for the Eleven, it works for others. Then we are led to raise the question of why the narrator describes the act of seeing as not working in the first two episodes? Why do the Eleven change their attitude only after their seeing the resurrected Jesus? The answer is in the fact that the author sets a criterion for apostleship.¹³⁵

As I have mentioned earlier, all three groups of eyewitnesses above belong to a special group in Mark's Gospel; they were the disciples who had been with Jesus (Mk 14.41 as for Mary Magdalene; Mk 3.14 and 16.10 as for the Eleven and other disciples). However, the LE's author now suggests a new criterion for the membership of this assumed special group within the community. It is whether they saw the resurrected Jesus; hearing about him is not enough. Of course it is enough for other ordinary people as is implied in verses 15b-16 and 20. But it is not enough for this assumed special group of disciples, if they are to have apostolic authority.

The narrator highlights the importance of the condition (to see the resurrected Jesus) for apostolic authority, and it is found not only in the episode of the Eleven but also in that of Mary Magdalene (part one) and the other disciples (part two). That

¹³⁵ See Chapter Three.

is, for an apostolic leading member of the LE's community to hear about the resurrected Jesus is not enough. The LE's narrator tells the reader that Mary Magdalene, who fled away in MK, delivers the news when she saw the resurrected Jesus. The two disciples, who did not believe Mary Magdalene when only hearing from her, do the same as Mary Magdalene when they see him. The Eleven who stubbornly did not believe these eyewitnesses, suddenly change and do the same as them when they saw him.

It is important to note that the LE's author, while suggesting the condition of apostolic authority, puts Mary Magdalene in the first place among all those groups of people above. He clearly states that the resurrected Jesus appeared *first* (πρώτον) to Mary Magdalene (v. 9). The Eleven or the two disciples may have their apostolic authority in the LE's community. But it is Mary Magdalene who holds the supreme apostolic authority because she is the first eyewitness of the Appearance event.¹³⁶

4.3.4.2 Text analysis (2): section two (vv. 15-18)

A. Jesus' commission: re-authentication of the apostleship

The second section is about the commission of the Eleven. After the severe reproach, the resurrected Jesus tells the Eleven to proclaim the good news (εὐαγγέλιον) to all creation, going into the whole world. Considering the three consecutive episodes above dealing with the resurrection appearance (parts one and two, and the first section of part three), a sudden change of topic is made in this subsection.¹³⁷ This shows that the story enters a new phase at this point.

As I have argued above, the three episodes of Mary Magdalene, two disciples and the Eleven are dealing with the problems of qualification for being an apostolic

¹³⁶ I will discuss this in more detail in comparison with the SE in Chapter Five.

¹³⁷ Cf. V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 612.

or authoritative witness. The present section is about what the Eleven apostolic witnesses are supposed to do, and what results the recipients of the good news will get depending on their responses. The last section (vv. 19-20) is an epilogue, which summarises the afterwards-story in the form of conclusion. In this sense, these three preceding episodes function as developing steps for the commission of the Eleven, and the last section as an epilogue, forming the present section as the culmination in the LE.

First of all, I will explore this section within the framework of the whole third part (vv. 14-20), in which it is narrated. The third part, centred by the section of the commission of the Eleven, leads the reader to recall Mark 6.7-13 and 6.30, because it shares with this Markan pericope in many similar motifs, as found in the table below.¹³⁸

	Mk 6.7-13, 30	LE vv. 14-20
● Naming characters	'the Twelve' (v. 7a)	'the Eleven' (v. 14a)
● Gathering of characters	calling them together (v. 7a)	they gathering to recline (v. 14a)
● Sending	sending them (v. 7b) cf. vv. 8-9	commissioning them (v. 15)
● Motif of miracles	exorcism, healing (v. 7c) cf. vv. 13, 30	five miracle signs (vv. 17-18)
● Responses of Acceptance Rejection	v. 10 (implied) v. 11	v. 16a v. 16b
● Proclamation of characters	they proclaimed (v. 12)	they proclaimed (v. 20a) cf. v. 15b
● The characters' successful missionary achievements in visual (miracles) and oral works (verbal/ teaching)	exorcism and healing (v. 13) what they did... (v. 30) what they taught... (v. 30)	signs following (v. 20b) confirming the word (v. 20b, [20a])

<table 4.2>

Furthermore, the Markan narrator leads the reader to find a close relationship between the pericope of the apostles' mission (Mk 6.7-13, 30) and the third part of

¹³⁸ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 97. He only mentions Mk 6.6b-13, but 6.30 is a

the LE by inserting the pericope of the death of John the Baptist (Mk 6.14-29) within this Markan pericope. John's death foreshadows the passion and death of Jesus.¹³⁹ The narrator begins the pericope of John's death with a series of rumours about Jesus (Mk 6.14-16). These verses are explicitly repeated in Mk 8.27-30, which presents Jesus' first prediction of his passion, death and resurrection (Mk 8.31-38).

These rumours are about the identity of Jesus, and the narrator identifies Jesus with John through the mouth of Herod (Mk 6.16), whose talk also foreshadows Jesus' resurrection. Therefore the Markan narrator puts the first commission pericope in the context of Jesus' passion, death and implied resurrection. Seeing that the LE part above is situated in the context of the post-resurrection, the close relationship between these two corresponding parts (Mk 6.7-13, 30 and LE vv. 14-20) is assured. The context of the pericope of the apostles' mission (Mk 6.7-13, 30), along with the comparative table above, shows that the author of the LE had this Markan pericope in mind, inducing his readers to understand the third part of the LE in the light of this Markan pericope.

The relationship between the immediate Markan pericope and its corresponding LE passage above is noteworthy in a few aspects. Firstly, the Markan pericope is the *first* commission of the Twelve apostles of Jesus. Jesus called four people to make them fishermen of men in the beginning of the Markan narrative (Mk 1.16-20). The Twelve were called in Mk 3.13-19. Since their calling, they have witnessed what Jesus has done and taught. *But* until Mk 6.7, they have not yet been directly involved in Jesus' ministry; they merely have been observers.¹⁴⁰

concluding verse of this pericope and it should be included.

¹³⁹ For the relationship between John and Jesus, see also Mk 1.2-8.

¹⁴⁰ Jesus' ministry is characterized by exorcism, healing, doing wonders (Mk 4.35-41) and teaching/preaching. The summary of these works are mentioned in Mk 1.32-34, 39; 3.7-12; 4.33-34. Note that all these works are from Jesus alone not from his disciples.

However, they are *now* sent as Jesus' representatives doing the same work as he has been doing. Jesus has cast out many demons.¹⁴¹ Now, the twelve apostles are also receiving¹⁴² the power (or authority) over the unclean spirits (Mk 6.7), so that they perform exorcism (Mk 6.13). He has healed many people,¹⁴³ and the apostles do the same (Mk 6.13). Jesus has proclaimed (Mk 1.14-15) and taught many people,¹⁴⁴ and they too proclaim (Mk 6.12) and teach (Mk 6.30). Therefore, this Markan pericope of the apostles' mission is meaningful in that it depicts their *first* commission.

Of course, the archetype of this first commission of the Twelve (Mk 6.7-13, 30) is found in Mk 3.13-19. Just as Jesus calls them before he sends them out (Mk 6.7), he summons them to him (Mk 3.13). The Markan narrator mentions 'the Twelve', as he does in Mk 6.7. The motifs of exorcism and preaching in the immediate pericope (Mk 6.7, 12, 13, 30) are also found in this archetypal passage (Mk 3.14, 15).¹⁴⁵ It is certain that the narrator presents Jesus' commission of the apostles in accordance with Mk 3.13-19.

However, it should be noted that Mk 3.13-19 does not state the *commission* of the Twelve but the *calling*. This scene merely describes their calling, not Jesus' sending them out. As mentioned above, the motif of commission is present explicitly in this passage. But Jesus' commissioning the apostles is deferred until Mk 6.7-13,

¹⁴¹ E.g., Mk 1.21-28; 5.1-20. See also the Markan narrator's summary in Mk 1.32-34, 39; 3.7-12; 4.33-34.

¹⁴² The imperfect tense of 'ἐδίδου', translated as 'he was giving' describes a repeating action. So it is believed to imply that Jesus gave the authority to each pair of disciples (V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 303; Gundry, *Mark*, p. 301; Guelich, *Mark*, p. 321).

¹⁴³ E.g., Mk 1.29-31, 40-45; 2.1-12; 3.1-6; 5.21-24a and 35b-43, 24b-35a.

¹⁴⁴ E.g., Mk 3.20-30, 31-35; 4.1-20, 21-25, 26-29, 30-32.

¹⁴⁵ The role of Mk 3.13-19 as a basic framework for Mk 6.7-13, 30 has been noted by many commentators (Guelich introduces some of them in *Mark*, p. 319). Guelich notes that the motif of 'being with him', which is one of the purpose of calling in Mk 3.14, is also embedded implicitly and explicitly throughout stories (p. 319).

30, and they remain observers of Jesus' works and audiences of his teaching until then. Therefore, the pericope of Mk 6.7-13, 30 is the first commission of the Twelve.

The Markan narrator understands Jesus' commission of the apostles in Mk 6.7-13, 30 as an authentication of the mission of the Twelve. The Greek word of ἀποστέλλειν that he employed to depict Jesus' sending them (Mk 6.7) is a technical term, meaning 'sending an authorized representative or agent'.¹⁴⁶ William L. Lane points out that this word, along with sending them in pairs (δύο δύο; Mk 6.7)¹⁴⁷ and their report of their accomplishment of the task (Mk 6.30),¹⁴⁸ is understood against its legal backdrop, highlighting the authority of the sent.¹⁴⁹

Karl H. Rengstorf furthermore, argues for the identical relationship between the sender and the sent.¹⁵⁰ That is, Mark understands their commission as an extension of Jesus' authority, meaning that the apostles have the same authority Jesus bears. Gundry argues that the detailed instructions in Mk 6.8-11 highlight their bearing the 'extended authority' from Jesus.¹⁵¹ Therefore, the Markan pericope of the first commission depicts that the Twelve apostles are given the authentication as authoritative missionaries who work with great authority.

The relationship between Mk 6.7-13, 30 and the third part of the LE thus leads us to the corollary that the LE's author *renews* the authentication of the apostles by presenting a second commission. As I have previously argued, the disciples of Jesus are portrayed as failing after Mk 6.30, and the Markan narrative

¹⁴⁶ Guelich, *Mark*, p. 321.

¹⁴⁷ See Deut. 17.6; 19.15; Num. 35.30.

¹⁴⁸ With regard to verse 30 in this light, see also Gundry, *Mark*, p. 300.

¹⁴⁹ Lane, *Mark*, p. 207.

¹⁵⁰ K.H. Rengstorf, 'ἀπόστολος', in *TDNT vol. 1* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 407-447.

¹⁵¹ Gundry, *Mark*, pp. 301-302. He argues that they do not need to carry their own provisions because they will get what they need as Jesus does; they can stay in a place as long as they want because they will be welcomed as Jesus is; if they are refused, it is a danger to those who reject them. All these instructions, according to Gundry, show that the apostles have the 'extended authority' that stems from Jesus.

ends with a negative portrayal of them. They are commissioned with great authority as I argued above, but they eventually fail to fulfil what they are commissioned to do.¹⁵²

However, the LE's author gives the disciples one more chance by describing the second commission given to them by the resurrected Jesus. The Markan author portrayed the disciples negatively by depicting them as failing in accomplishing their tasks. But the LE's author does not agree with Mark's attitude to them. Rather he turns Mark's attitude upside down by giving them the second commission. He renews their authentication as deputies and missionaries, which was once nullified according to Mark.

Secondly, it should be noted that the pericope of the apostles' commission (Mk 6.7-13, 30) depicts the Twelve at their zenith of positive portrayal. Until this pericope, the disciples are portrayed positively. They followed Jesus immediately, leaving their possessions and families behind (Mk 1.16-20); Jesus protected them when the Jewish authorities accused them of not fasting (Mk 2.18-22) and breaking the Sabbath law (Mk 2.23-28); they were among those whom Jesus considered his new family (Mk 3.34-35); they were insiders (Mk 4.11, 33-34); some of them were treated as having a special relationship with Jesus (Mk 5.37). No severe reproach of them has been stated.¹⁵³ In the immediate pericope, their positive portrayal reaches its

¹⁵² For instance, to their embarrassment, they fail to perform miracle (Mk 9.14-29), and even worse, they prohibit those who perform miracles in Jesus' name (Mk 9.38-41).

¹⁵³ Some might bring forth Mk 3.19, 35; 4.13b, 40 as exhibiting negative portrayal of the disciples. However, they cannot damage the positive portrayal of them. Concerning mentioning the name of Judas Iscariot (Mk 3.19), see the section 4.3.4.1 above. That Markan narrator does not mention the disciples as Jesus' new family in Mk 3.35 may not depict them positively. But it does not portray them negatively either; rather, considering the scene where they are situated around him, the positive portrayal is implied because he calls those who are around him his mother and brothers. Jesus rebukes them in Mk 4.13b; but it is not depicted as what Jesus intends; he sympathetically and patiently explains the riddle to them, which, on the contrary, shows the special and intimate relationship (cf. Mk 4.11, 34) between them. Jesus' talk to them in Mk 4.40 is not a reproach but merely a talk; the reproach (or order) is made against the wind (ἐπιτίμησεν).

climax throughout the whole Markan narrative, because they are almost identified with Jesus.

Therefore, the close relationship between the first and the second commission of the disciples gives the second commission in the LE positive atmosphere. That is, the author of the LE restores the disciples, bringing them back to their best times, which is the first commission of them. While the Markan narrator tells the story of their downfall, the LE's narrator tells of their rise. This is where MK and the LE diverge from each other.

B. 'the one who believes...the one who does not believe' (v. 16)

Despite the LE author's restoration of the disciples in a positive way as above, it should not be overlooked that their restoration is not unconditional. The five promised signs stated in verses 17 and 18 are not given directly to the Eleven. That is, the narrator does not say that the Eleven will be saved or that the signs will follow them. Those who believe and are baptized will be saved, and the signs will follow those who believe (v. 16). This means that if the Eleven do not believe, they will not be saved and the signs will not follow them either. The question of who they are does not matter; whether they *believe or not* matters.

Therefore the LE author's theme to which he has adhered throughout the LE is reiterated here.¹⁵⁴ Although the Eleven is commissioned with authority once again by the resurrected Jesus himself, it is meaningless if they do not believe. Although the LE's narrator restores them back to their best time, it is nothing if they do not believe. They cannot perform their mission task successfully if they do not believe. All the promises of wonders and salvation are under the condition of their belief.

¹⁵⁴ See previous parts.

The importance of believing is highlighted by the narrator's technique of repetition and chiasmic structure of verse 16 as well. The narrator mentions the word believing three times in short consecutive verses: πιστεύσας; ἀπιστήσας; πιστεύσασιν. The word of believing/not believing occurs seven times in twelve verses of the LE, which shows that the LE's author regards this word as key to understanding the LE. Furthermore, three out of the seven occurrences are gathered in these two verses, where the consequences of believing/not believing are well contrasted against each other.

The contrast between believing and not believing is also made through the chiasmic structure of verse 16:

ὁ πιστεύσας	καὶ βαπτισθεὶς	σωθήσεται
↓		↓
ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας	... ¹⁵⁵	κατακριθήσεται

Contrast is made not only between believing/not believing, but also between each consequence of salvation and judgement as above. This parallelism between verses 16a and 16b shows that the audience's response of believing and not believing is a crucial condition that produces opposite results. Therefore, the LE's narrator highlights the importance of believing in these verses, and he tells the reader that even the Eleven are not exceptional with regard to the question of believing.

C. 'and be baptized...' (16a): extrinsic and intrinsic examination of baptism

The narrator of the LE has been focusing on the issue of having faith/believing so far. The author of Mark's Gospel likewise understands faith as essential. However the

¹⁵⁵ Concerning the problem of missing counterpart of 'καὶ βαπτισθεὶς', see LaVerdiere, 'Gospel According to Mark (June)', p. 290; P.A. Mirecki, 'The Antithetic Saying in Mark 16:16: Formal and Redactional Features', in B.A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 229-41.

LE's narrator suggests baptism, besides faith, as another crucial theme of the LE in verse 16.¹⁵⁶ It is proposed as one of two conditions for salvation; no baptism, no salvation. I will discuss the issue of baptism in this subsection by employing extrinsic and intrinsic examination.

1. Extrinsic examination of baptism:

the practice of baptism as an inter-communal boundary-marker

My discussion of baptism in the LE begins with the extrinsic consideration of baptismal rites. This examination will show that the different attitudes to the practice of baptismal ritual often produce borderlines between a group and the others. Some groups adhere to performing the baptismal ritual, believing it for instance, as a condition for initiation into the group whereas others do not. This will show that the different attitude to the practice of baptismal rite has often functioned as a mark that distinguishes one group from another. That is, the practice of baptismal rites may function as a boundary-marker.

¹⁵⁶ The Markan narrator mentions baptism three times throughout his narrative. First one is found in the context of John the Baptist's eschatological proclamation (Mk 1.4-8), second in Jesus' debate with Jewish leaders (Mk 7.4), and the third in his teaching of servanthood. (Mk 10.35-45). The first one simply refers to the practice of ablution rite, whereas the second to the ritual purification and the third metaphorically to suffering or death, although the narrator does not explicate its meaning (See C.A. Evans, *Mark*, p. 117; Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, p. 101). Therefore, Markan use of baptism does not exhibit any coherence in its meaning and usage in the narrative.

Thus the LE's reader, although he has read through Mark's narrative, experiences difficulty in figuring out the meaning of baptism in verse sixteen because there is no coherence of the meaning of baptism in the Markan narrative. Furthermore, the LE's narrator employs the word, baptism, only once here in such a manner that it suddenly interrupts the sentence, and he does not explain what he means by baptism here.

The best choice in understanding the meaning of baptism in the LE would be the baptism as a normal practice of ablution rite. The present context that the LE's narrator adopts the word, baptism, is proclamation of the Eleven. The most close context that the Markan narrator uses this word is John the Baptist pericope (Mk 1.4-8). In the beginning of Mark's narrative, John the Baptist proclaims (κηρύσσων) the eschatological message before Jesus starts his earthly ministry. Likewise, the Eleven is asked to proclaim (κηρύξατε) the good news, which is also eschatological (Hug, *La Finale*, p. 102), after Jesus completes his earthly ministry. The eschatological proclamations of John the Baptist and the LE's Eleven are followed by baptismal practice. Therefore, as long as the baptism in the LE does not exhibit any significant metaphorical meaning like that of Mk 10.38-39, it would appropriate to understand it as referring to the normal baptismal rite practice. See also LaVerdiere, 'The Gospel According to Mark (June)', p. 290.

The practice of baptism or rite of immersion was a widespread phenomenon covering a wide range of time and space.¹⁵⁷ However, I will discuss the rite of ablution/immersion/baptism of the LE's contemporaries such as in first century Judaism and other early Christian writers. I selected them because they are fairly close to the LE in their temporal and spatial setting.

The practice of Jewish proselyte baptism¹⁵⁸ functioned as a boundary-marker in the inter-communal sense. That is, the understanding of this ritual was different depending on people or groups. A noticeable example is the discussion between two Jewish leaders, Rabbi Eliezer (a Shammaite) and Rabbi Joshua (a Hillelite).

If a proselyte was circumcised but had not performed the prescribed ritual ablution, R. Eliezer said, 'Behold he is a proper proselyte; for so we find that our forefathers were circumcised and had not performed ritual ablution'. If he performed the prescribed ablution but had not been circumcised, R. Joshua said, 'Behold he is a proper proselyte; for so we find that the mothers had performed

¹⁵⁷ E.g. Hindu rituals in the Ganges river, purification ritual in the Babylonian cult of Enki, the Egyptian baby purification ritual (D.S. Dockery, 'Baptism', in J.B. Green and S. McKnight [eds.], *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* [Leicester, Downers Grove; IVP, 1992], pp. 55-58 [p. 55]). Those practices are also found in the cults of Eleusis, Mithras and Isis, and even appear in Syrian areas (L. Hartman, 'Baptism', in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 583-94 (p. 583). Cf. B.W.R. Pearson has noted the importance of baptism as an initiatory ritual even in the ancient mystery cults such as Isis and Sarapis. See Pearson, 'Baptism and Initiation in the Cult of Isis and Sarapis', in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 42-62.

¹⁵⁸ It is not certain how the ritual of ablution for the Jewish proselyte was done; if it was a full-immersion ritual like the ancient Christian baptism or a simple-style one like that of most modern Christian churches. I understand that Christian baptism, the ablution rite for the Jewish proselyte, and other ablutionary rites in many cults may be different from each other in the strict sense. However, I just want to understand 'baptism/baptismal rites' in the general sense, focusing on similarities that those rites share. For this reason, I refer to the ablution rite for the Jewish proselyte as 'Jewish proselyte baptism', which is usually referred to.

Some date the practice of Jewish proselyte baptism before 70 CE whereas others after 65-70 CE. Those who suggest earlier date of this practice, for example, provide the text of *Testament of Levi*, which is dated as early as the late second century BCE. The author of this text mentions purification of the Gentiles (*TLevi*, 14.6), and accordingly J. Jeremias dates Jewish proselyte baptism earlier than Christian baptism (*Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962], pp. 29-40.). But no clear requirement of baptism is prescribed in this text, and majority of scholars believes that it is hardly dated earlier than the first century CE. See S. McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 82-85; Hartman, 'Baptism', p. 583; Dockery, 'Baptism', p. 56. See also, T.M. Taylor, 'The Beginning of Jewish Proselyte Baptism', *NTS* 2 (1955/56), pp. 193-98; K. Pusey, 'Jewish Proselyte Baptism' *ExpTim* 95 (1984), pp. 141-45; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd., 1962), pp. 18-31. The indisputable evidence of proselyte baptism practice is found in the first century CE such as *Sibylline Oracle* (ca. 80 CE) and Epictetus (ca. 55-135 CE), *Dissertationes*.

ritual ablution but had not been circumcised'. The Sages, however, said, 'Whether he had performed ritual ablution but had not been circumcised or whether he had been circumcised but had not performed the prescribed ritual ablution, he is not a proper proselyte, unless he has been circumcised and has also performed the prescribed ritual ablution.' (*Yeb. 46a*)¹⁵⁹

According to the text above, baptismal rite did not exert a crucial influence in accepting a person as a proper proselyte for R. Eliezer, but it did for R. Joshua. For some others (i.e., 'the Sages' or/and the author of this document) however, both baptismal rite and circumcision were essential for a person to be a proper proselyte. The debate between these two rabbis shows that a group or sect may hold their own attitude toward ritual practices such as baptismal rite and circumcision, and the disagreement in these matters may function as a boundary-marker that distinguishes a group from another.¹⁶⁰

This is found not only in the rabbinic sources but also in early Christianity. According to the Acts of Apostles, baptism proves for some people that a baptized person belongs to the new community of the people of God. The episodes of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8.26-40) and Cornelius (Acts 10.1-11.18) support this argument. The eunuch and Cornelius have been pious God-fearers, but they are baptized into the name of Jesus regardless of their faith or religious maturity. In this light, Joel B. Green correctly puts it that 'the community of God's people embraces the baptizand as a member integral to this growing kin group. To be baptized is to be accepted.'¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁹ This English translation is from I. Epstein (trans.), *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nashim, vol. 1* (London: The Soncino Press, 1936).

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Epictetus, a pagan 'outsider' of Judaism believed baptism an indispensable element of conversion into Judaism (*Dissertationes*, II.9.9-21).

¹⁶¹ J.B. Green, 'From "John's Baptism" to "Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus": the Significance of Baptism in Luke-Acts', in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 157-72 (p. 166).

Baptism as a boundary-marker that draws a line between a certain group and another is found in the episode of 'ana-baptism'¹⁶² in Acts 19.1-7. Paul meets some disciples in Ephesus who have experienced the baptism of John. Having learned that they had been baptized into John's baptism, he performs another baptism for them into the name of the Lord Jesus (19.5). Regardless of the reason for this other baptism, it is certain that he could not accept John's baptism as valid enough.

Luke's account of Apollos also supports the existence of *other Christian groups* who have not undergone the baptism of the Lord Jesus (Acts 18.24-28). According to Luke, Apollos had great knowledge in scriptures and taught many things about Jesus accurately and with enthusiasm, but he was not baptized into the name of the Lord (18.25). Interestingly, he does not ask Priscilla and Aquila to baptize him nor do they ask him to be baptized. Judging from the two Lukan episodes above, it can be argued that some Christian groups adhered to baptism as a condition for initiation into a group, whereas others did not.¹⁶³

According to the *Didache*, those who have not been baptized into the name of the Lord are strictly prohibited from partaking of the Eucharistic thanksgiving (*Did.* 9.5; 10.6).¹⁶⁴ Justin Martyr also suggested baptism as one condition for sharing the Eucharist (*Apol.* 1. 66). However, for some early Christians such as Corinthians, according to Hickling, the 'outsiders' might have participated in the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11), and thus baptism did not seem to be a critical condition for membership to this group.¹⁶⁵ Luke T. Johnson also argues that there were some groups who

¹⁶² I adopt 'ana-baptism' to avoid the reader's confusion with 'anabaptism' and merely to emphasize the repetition of baptismal ritual.

¹⁶³ C.J.A. Hickling, 'Baptism in the First-Century Churches: A Case for Caution', in D.J.A. Clines, S.E. Fowl and S.E. Porter (eds.), *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in celebration of forty years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* (JSOTSup 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), pp. 249-67 (p. 251). Cf. *Contra* Hickling, H.C. Kee, *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1980), p. 112.

¹⁶⁴ It is scholarly consensus that *Didache* was produced around the first century CE.

¹⁶⁵ Hickling, 'Baptism in the First Century Churches', p. 267.

suggested other conditions than baptism for initiation, by providing the epistles of Galatians and Colossians.¹⁶⁶

For Paul, baptism does not seem to have been an essential requirement either. He deals with the topic of baptism seriously in Romans (6.3ff.) and Galatians (3.26-29).¹⁶⁷ He believes that baptism is a gateway through which Christians are unified with Christ (Rom. 6.3-11) and enter the community of Christians (Gal. 3.28-29). However, he does not take baptism seriously as an essential ritual in his first letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 1.12-17). He believes that he was not sent to perform baptism (1 Cor. 1.17) and he does not remember whom he baptized (1 Cor. 1.16). Furthermore, he even thanks God that he did not baptize, except for two people (1 Cor. 1.14)! Therefore, it seems that Paul was not coherent in his thoughts on baptism, and it shows that he did not necessarily consider the baptism indispensable as far as the issue of membership/initiation into a certain group was concerned.

Paul's first letter to the Corinthians sheds light on my argument concerning the division of groups due to the issue of baptism. One of the problems of the

¹⁶⁶ L.T. Johnson, *Religious Experience in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), pp. 78ff. He also provides the examples of multiple initiations (in addition to the baptismal rite) in many ancient mystery cults.

¹⁶⁷ Many early Christians understood the baptism in a metaphorical sense. For instance, authors of Mark and Luke used this term to allude to the passion of Jesus (Mk 10.35-40; Lk. 12.50). Justin Martyr makes the baptism of the physical sense abstract (*Dial.* 14. Cf. Deut. 10.16; Jer. 4.4; 9.25-26; Ezek. 44.9; 1QpHab 11.13; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1.305). Paul likewise often used baptism in a metaphorical sense. But I will only discuss his idea about the physical practice of baptism. For the discussion of metaphorical meaning of Markan passage above, see A.R. Cross, 'The Meaning of "Baptisms" in Hebrews 6.2', in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (JSNTSup 234; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 163-180 (pp. 167-80). For the interpretation of baptism in the Lukan passage as meaning Jesus' suffering, see J.D.M. Derrett, 'Christ's Second Baptism (Lk 12.50; Mk 10.38-40)', *ExpTim* 100 (1989), pp. 294-95; J. Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35b; Dallas: Wordbooks, 1993), pp. 708-709. Cf. R. Scroggs and K.I. Groff ('Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ', *JBL* 92/4 [1977], pp. 531-48 [p. 537]) argue that this Markan passage shows that the baptism as signifying 'dying and rising with Christ' had already been known to the Markan author. A.R. Cross also suggests that the origin of metaphorical understanding of baptism (i.e. 'the second baptism') as signifying martyrdom is traced back not merely to the Christians of the second century CE such as Tertullian but as early as to Jesus ('The Meaning of "Baptisms" in Hebrews 6.2', pp. 163-80). For the recent studies of metaphorical use of baptism, see J.D.G. Dunn, ' "Baptized" as Metaphor', in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 294-310.

Corinthian Christians, according to this letter, was disunity because of baptism. Some believed that they belonged to Paul, some others to Apollos, to Cephas, and to Christ (1 Cor. 1.12). This alludes to the hypothesis that baptism was a sort of boundary-marker among groups.¹⁶⁸ As I have discussed so far, the practice of baptism did not matter for some people, while it did for some others. It was often a culprit of disunity and division among Christians.

I have briefly surveyed the function of baptism/the rite of immersion, and have pointed out that this ritual has a function of a boundary-marker that draws a line between those who adhere to it and those who do not. For some early Christians, baptism was 'serving a community-defining role' and it was a threshold through which a baptized person was 'incorporated' into the community.¹⁶⁹ But it was not as such for some others. It was also the case with first century Judaism, as I have dealt with above.

Let me conclude the extrinsic examination of baptism with my experience. On one Sunday last year, I was distributing Eucharist with another minister whom I invited for this ritual in my church. A young man came and knelt down before him along with others to receive Eucharist. But the minister passed by him refusing to serve the Eucharist to him, and it was because he was not baptized. I was embarrassed because I was distributing the Eucharist to another person who was not baptized either. It happened because we were from different denominational backgrounds. Each of us acted according to the protocol of our denomination.¹⁷⁰ As

¹⁶⁸ Not to mention baptism itself (e.g., whether a person is baptized or not), but also the type of baptism is concerned (e.g., into whose name a person is baptized).

¹⁶⁹ Green, 'Baptism in Luke-Acts', p. 167.

¹⁷⁰ Similarly with my story, P. Beasley-Murray discusses the function of baptism with regard to the question of congregation membership, telling us interesting anecdotes about the baptism for the initiated (i.e., those who have been sincere Christians and even church leaders but have not yet been baptized) in 'Baptism for the Initiated', in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 467-76.

Keith A. Roberts well points out, differences in religious practices often function as boundary-markers among sects or denominations, because those practices are sometimes closely associated with dogma or the religious (sometimes political, I believe) ideology of the sect or denomination.¹⁷¹

2. Intrinsic examination of baptism in the LE

Verse 16, where the LE's narrator mentions baptism, draws the reader's attention because the structure of this verse contains a double motif (i.e., belief and baptism lead to salvation and the opposite to condemnation), and as Joseph Hug has shrewdly noticed, is unique unlike other apparition-mission stories of the NT.¹⁷² The narrator's abrupt mention of baptism evokes the reader's curiosity.

The LE's narrator has been focusing on the issue of faith, and accordingly it is quite natural that he suggests it as an important element that leads one to his salvation. However, the sudden mention of baptism is unexpected, because the authors of MK and the LE have not been interested in it so far. Thus, the narrator's mention of baptism looks inappropriate to the context. Therefore his mention of baptism alerts us to its significance in detecting the ideology of the LE.

As I have examined above, the parallel of this LE's part is Mk 6.7-13, 30, where Jesus commissions the Twelve (see table 4.2). In this first commission, the Twelve proclaim and perform wonders, but no practice of baptism is required; the desirable response of the audience to their proclamation is simply listening to them,

¹⁷¹ K.A. Roberts, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (CA: Wadsworth, 1990), p. 83. The *Epistle of Barnabas* (esp. chapter 15) is a good example of religious practices as playing a role of boundary-markers. The author of this document, for instance, reinterprets the Sabbath from the Christian perspective (*Barn.* 15.9). This shows that a rite may function as a departure point between two religious parties. See E. Ferguson, 'Christians and Jewish Baptism According to the *Epistle of Barnabas*', in S.E. Porter and A.R. Cross (eds.), *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (JSNTSup 234; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 207-23.

¹⁷² Hug, *La Finale*, p. 94. Cf. *Pr. Pet.* 6.6, where similar antithetical structure is found: 'οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν οἱ δὲ μὴ πιστεύσαντες ἀκούσαντες μαρτυρήσωσιν'.

accepting and repenting (Mk 6.11-12). That is, the Markan narrator does not suggest the practice of baptism as an essential requirement. However the LE's narrator believes that the audience of the Eleven's proclamation should be baptized to secure his or her salvation.¹⁷³

The employment of the word baptism, as exhibiting salvific significance is new to the Markan narrator. The Markan narrator uses 'to save/ salvation' thirteen times. Each of them means 'being well from disease (Mk 3.4; 5.23, 28, 34; 6.56; 10.52)', 'to survive (twice in Mk 8.35; 13.20)', 'to rescue (Mk 15.30, 31)', 'to enter the heavenly kingdom (Mk 10.26)', and 'to be delivered (eschatological salvation; Mk 13.13)' respectively.¹⁷⁴ He never connects salvation with baptism. Rather, the idea of salvation is related to faith in six out of thirteen occurrences, and its meaning (salvation as physical healing) in this case also differs from that in LE. Therefore, that the LE's narrator mentions baptism in this context is noticeable.

Paul A. Mirecki's redaction critical analysis of verse 16 also supports the hypothesis that the LE's author reckons the motif of baptism important. According to Mirecki, this verse belongs to the 'antithetical prophetic sayings'.¹⁷⁵ This formulation is composed of two parallel lines, each of which forms a prophecy of salvation and judgement in the form of cause and effect: belief leads to salvation, unbelief to condemnation. Each line consists of the subject, the middle element, and verb in its structure. The subject part is the participle or subjunctive and the verb in the future passive form.

¹⁷³ Cf. The Pseudo-Clement believes baptism as a crucial condition for salvation (*Hom.* 8.22; 13.21. Cf. *Rec.* 9.12), whereas it does not guarantee the baptizand's salvation for the author of *Epistula Apostolorum* (*EpApos.* 27).

¹⁷⁴ See Gundry, *Mark*, p. 777; C.A. Evans, *Mark*, p. 322. Cf. Guelich, *Mark*, p. 296.

¹⁷⁵ Mirecki, 'Antithetic Saying', pp. 229-41.

Interestingly, the middle element varies according to each antithetical prophetic saying, while each of the subject and verb parts are similar to each other.¹⁷⁶

Mirecki gives some examples of this as below:

	subject	middle element	Verb
<i>Asc. Is.</i> 3.18	οἱ πιστεύσαντες	τῷ σταυρῷ αὐτοῦ	σωθήσονται
<i>Isa</i> 28.16 LXX	ὁ πιστεύων	ἐπ' αὐτῷ	οὐ καταισχυθήσεται
<i>Rom.</i> 10.9	καὶ πιστεύσης	ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου	σωθήσῃ
<i>Mk</i> 16.16	ὁ πιστεύσας	καὶ βαπτισθεὶς	σωθήσεται

<table 4.3>

Each of the middle elements, according to Mirecki, reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of the author's community.¹⁷⁷ He suggests that the middle element of *Mk* 16.16 indicates that this prophetic saying was used in a 'baptismal catechism or baptismal ritual'.¹⁷⁸ Although his suggestion is farfetched,¹⁷⁹ it can at least be argued that the author believed baptismal ritual an important element for salvation.

In the previous subsection, I examined the attributes of baptism. According to the examination, baptism often functions as a sort of boundary-marker that distinguishes a group from others. That is, there were some groups of people who adhered to baptism while others did not, and the boundary could be laid among them depending on the issue of baptism. In the present subsection, I have examined that the LE's author believed that the proclamation of the good news should be followed by baptism, and that it is a critical requirement for a person to be saved.

Therefore, it may be suggested that the ideological community of the LE adhered to baptism, and it was one of the characteristics of the LE's community that distinguished it from other communities. The LE's community believed that the salvation of the audience of the good news is completed when he or she goes through

¹⁷⁶ Mirecki, 'Antithetic Saying', p. 231.

¹⁷⁷ Mirecki, 'Antithetic Saying', pp. 240-41.

¹⁷⁸ Mirecki, 'Antithetic Saying', p. 241.

the community's baptismal rite. In other groups, the response of believing the good news might have been enough for a person to be saved, but it was not the case with the LE's community. This is what makes this community different from others.

D. Signs and the LE (vv. 17-18, 20)

The Eleven are commissioned to proclaim the good news (v. 15), and the audience of their message is urged to believe and be baptized in order to be saved (v. 16). Their missionary commission is followed by the resurrected Jesus' promise of five signs (vv. 17-18). This section will discuss how the narrator understands the promise of these signs, and what their functions are in the LE. This will shed light on our understanding of the identity of the LE's community.

Signs (σημεῖα) in MK and the LE

The LE's resurrected Jesus promises the Eleven five signs (σημεῖα), and the Markan narrator also uses this word five times in Mk 8.11-12 (three occurrences), 13.4 and 13.22. Firstly, Mk 8.11-12. The context of this pericope is a confrontation between Jesus and the Jewish authorities. The Markan reader often finds that they challenge Jesus by questioning his authority in the narrative. Many times Jesus behaves against their traditions and laws, and this leads them to raise the question of by what authority he does as such.¹⁸⁰ The present Markan pericope is set in a similar situation, viz., they are questioning Jesus' authority.

In the present Markan pericope, the Jewish authorities are wondering by what authority Jesus does his ministry. Therefore, they are asking him for the divine sign

¹⁷⁹ He simply asserts as such without any explanation.

¹⁸⁰ E.g., Mk 2.1-12 (esp. vv. 7, 10), 15-17, 23-28; 3.1-6; 7.1-13. Cf. Mk 3.20-30. See Guelich, *Mark*, p. 413.

that proves the authenticity of his ministry.¹⁸¹ As Robert A. Guelich well notes, the divine passive form of *δοθήσεται* also implies that they want to see God's intervention in approving Jesus' authority.¹⁸² Therefore, the Markan narrator uses the word *sign*, as signifying the divine authentication of a person's ministry in this pericope.

Secondly, Mk 13.4. The sign here is simply referring to a 'warning of impending events', rather than the evidence that proves the divine authentication of a person's (e.g., a prophet) ministry.¹⁸³ The third one is Mk 13.22. The Markan Jesus predicts that false prophets will appear and offer 'signs and wonders' to deceive people. The Markan narrator interprets the word *sign*, as a way of authentication of a person's position or behaviour that enables him or her to be accepted in this passage.

In four out of five cases above, the Markan narrator uses the word *sign*, in connection with the concept of authentication of a person's behaviour, and he employs this word in a negative context in all of these cases. The Pharisees ask for signs, and their request is turned down (Mk 8.11-12). He takes a negative stance against behaviour that requests signs as proof of the authenticity of a person's works. Offering signs of the false prophets and pseudo-messiahs that seduce people to credit their authenticity is also depicted negatively (Mk 13.22). No one is encouraged to offer or request signs in the Markan narrative. Even when Jesus commissions the Twelve, there is no mention of offering or receiving signs (Mk 6.7-13, 30). Therefore, the reader hardly receives a positive impression of the term, *sign*, in the Markan narrative.

In the LE the resurrected Jesus promises five signs to the Eleven. Firstly, the LE's narrator agrees with the Markan narrator in understanding the term *sign*, as

¹⁸¹ Guelich, *Mark*, p. 414.

¹⁸² Guelich, *Mark*, p. 414.

exhibiting the function of authentication of a person's works. He believes that signs prove that the Eleven's ministry (i.e., proclamation of the good news) is authenticated by God (v.20). The signs, accompanying the audience who believed what the Eleven proclaimed and was baptized, prove that God is working with them (v. 20b) and confirming their word (v. 20c). Therefore as in MK, the signs function as a divine authentication of the Eleven's work in the LE.

However the LE's narrator does not agree with the Markan narrator in his attitude toward the act of offering or requesting signs. As I examined above, the Markan narrator understands the behaviour of offering or requesting signs as negative, and he does not encourage nor promise the Twelve such things in the first commission (Mk 6.7-13, 30). However in the second commission (LE vv. 15-18), the signs are promised and even encouraged implicitly. If a person is not accompanied by any of these signs, it means that he or she did not believe and was not baptized (v. 17a). These signs are suggested as proof of Jesus' presence among the Eleven (v. 20b, c).

Thirdly, the LE's narrator identifies signs with wonders or miracles, which is different from Mark. The Markan narrator distinguishes wonders or miracles (*δυνάμεις*) from signs (*σημεία*).¹⁸⁴ The Markan narrator employs *δύναμις*, not *σημείον*, to refer to miraculous phenomena such as exorcism and healing.¹⁸⁵ However, the LE's narrator equates signs with wonders by enumerating the five signs as exorcism, speaking in new tongues, picking up serpents (without harm?), drinking deadly things without harm, and healing (vv. 17-18). That is, he understands that these wonders are signs.

¹⁸³ C.A. Evans, *Mark*, p. 305.

¹⁸⁴ Guelich, *Mark*, p. 413.

¹⁸⁵ E.g., Mk 5.30; 6.2, 5, 14; 9.39 and *passim*.

The Markan narrator takes a positive stance on performing miracles or wonders. He portrays Jesus as a miracle worker by providing numerous miracle pericopae and narrator's summaries. He especially portrays Jesus as an exorcist and healer,¹⁸⁶ although he also does other miracles such as feeding crowds (Mk 6.31-44; 8.1-9) and exerts his power over nature (Mk 4.35-41; 6.45-52; 11.12-14, 20-21). Jesus deplores the Twelve's failure when they could not cast out a demon from an epileptic boy (Mk 9.19). Even those who are not accompanying Jesus are encouraged to perform miracles, as long as they are not against Jesus (Mk 9.38-40).

The LE's narrator agrees with the Markan narrator in that he is very interested in miracles, and takes a positive stance on them. The LE's narrator lists five signs, beginning with exorcism and ending with healing.¹⁸⁷ These two signs are what the Markan narrator highlights in depicting Jesus as a miracle-maker as I pointed out above. Furthermore, it is noticeable that the LE's narrator employs the same expression that the Markan narrator used to mention exorcism, by saying 'in my name' which echoes Mk 9.38-39. It is also noteworthy that the fifth sign connects the act of healing with hands or the act of touching, which also resembles the Markan narrator's image of healing.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ E.g., For exorcism, Mk 1.21-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29 and for healing, Mk 1.39-31; 1.40-44; 2.1-12; 3.1-5; 5.25-34a; 5.21-24, 34b-43; 7.31-37; 8.22-26; 10.46-52. He also mentions exorcism and healing in the narrator's summary such as Mk 1.32-34, 39; 3.10-11; 6.53-56. Cf. Mk 6.13.

¹⁸⁷ The LE's narrator inserts three examples of signs between these two signs: speaking in new languages, picking up serpents, and drinking poisonous thing without harm. The reader encounters difficulty in finding a specific significance in each of these three signs in their relation to the Markan narrative, because they are new to the Markan narrator. Some scholars find the source or literary influence of these signs from Lukan or Johanne literature (e.g., Acts 2.1ff; 28.3-5; Jn 14.12). James A. Kelhoffer examines these signs and finds their relationship with extra-canonical documents (See Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, chapters 5, 6 and 7). However, I am not interested in what the sources of these signs in the LE are, but in the literary function of these signs in the LE. It can be suggested that the LE's author understands these phenomena in light of the other two miracles that parenthesize them.

¹⁸⁸ Six out of nine healing scenes in Mark's narrative, the Markan narrator connects the act of touching with healing by depicting Jesus as touching or laying hands on the patient or the patient touching Jesus (e.g., Mk 1.31; 1.41; 5.23, 41; 5.27-31; 7.32-33; 8.22).

The LE's narrator sets these signs in the context of the Eleven's commission, and in this light, both the Markan and LE's narrator agree in that they regard miracles as an important element in mission. However, they are different in their emphasis. In the first commission, the Markan Jesus gives the Twelve the authority to cast out unclean spirits (Mk 6.7b), and they perform exorcisms and healings (Mk 6.13). However the Markan narrator does not tell the reader the function or meaning of these miracles. His interest seems to be in how they are supposed to perform their mission task, viz., what to wear, what to bring, where to stay, how to respond to acceptance or rejection of them (Mk 6.8-12), rather than in the significance of exorcism and healing.¹⁸⁹

The LE's author, on the contrary, seems to be more interested in the function of these miracles. These miraculous signs serve two purposes, one for the audiences of the proclamation of the good news and the other for those who proclaim. These miraculous phenomena guarantee that the audience who believed and baptized is saved (vv. 16-17a). On the other hand, they mark that the resurrected Jesus approves of the works of the commissioned people (v. 20).¹⁹⁰ The LE's narrator does not tell the reader how the Eleven proclaimed the good news, but how the miracles (signs) worked in their mission.

Finally and most importantly, the LE's Jesus does not give this promise directly and only to the Eleven, but to those who believe and are baptized. In verse 17a, the LE's narrator states that these signs will accompany those who believe, rather than the Eleven. Of course, he clearly mentions that these signs accompanied the Eleven as well. However, the Eleven cannot make a monopoly of these

¹⁸⁹ This does not mean that the Markan author did not think miracles as an important element in the Twelve's mission.

¹⁹⁰ Note that the Markan narrator does not tell the reader what the miracle functions in the disciples' mission.

miraculous signs. Rather, it is open to all those who believe and are baptized. Therefore the LE's narrator once again highlights the theme; the importance of believing/having belief, which he has adhered to so far.

To sum up, the LE narrator's mention of these signs alerts us to the assumption that the LE's community was a mission-oriented group, and regarded the miraculous phenomena as very important elements that approve the success of their mission tasks. He understood that the signs authenticate the commission of the Eleven and confirm the salvation of those who believed and baptized. He emphasized the theme, believing/having faith, by describing that these signs would accompany those who believe (17a).

4.3.4.3 Text analysis (3): section three (vv. 19-20)

The last two verses of the LE are the conclusion of part three and the LE. The first part of this section states the Lord's ascension and session (v. 19), and the second the Lord's confirmation of the Eleven's mission (v. 20).

A. ὁ κύριος (vv. 19a, 20b)

The LE's narrator refers to Jesus as the Lord. It is noticeable that the narrator mentions a title attributed to Jesus in an absolute subjective form, because he has never mentioned any reference to Jesus until now. Before this conclusion of the LE (vv. 9-18), we have ten verbs whose subject is believed to be Jesus.¹⁹¹ However, the narrator mentions these verbs without clarifying their subjects; he does not call Jesus

¹⁹¹ The are ἀναστὰς, ἐφάνη, ἐκβεβλήκει, ζῆ, ἐθεάθη (Part one); ἐφανερώθη (Part two); ἐφανερώθη, ὠνειδίσειν, ἐγγεγερμένον, εἶπεν (Part three).

by any name, title or personal pronoun. In contrast, he clarifies other characters when they are the subject of a verb.¹⁹²

The LE's narrator emphasizes the significance of the reference to Jesus, κύριος through the technique of repetition. He repeats this reference in the two consecutive verses in verses 19a and 20b; he could have omitted this referential word in the following verse (20b) or have used other references, but he does not. This reference, κύριος, is the *only* title attributed to Jesus, and is repeated in the concluding part of the LE. Therefore his reference to Jesus as the Lord is not unintended, and the reader is led to pay attention to this word, the Lord, when he or she reads this part.

With regard to the narrator's use of this title, two questions are raised. Firstly, what has made the narrator wait to mention this reference to Jesus until this point? Secondly, why did he select 'the Lord' amongst many titles referring to Jesus, such as Jesus, the Son of Man, the Son of God, Rabbi or teacher, Christ or Messiah? This question is also related to the meaning or function of this word. That the LE's narrator refers to Jesus as the Lord alerts the reader to his thoughts on the identity of Jesus, which is also related to his ideology. In order to answer these questions, I will firstly discuss the Markan understanding of Jesus' identity.

The Markan reader finds many titles referring to Jesus. For instance, the Son of God,¹⁹³ the one sent from God,¹⁹⁴ the Christ (Messiah),¹⁹⁵ the Son of Man¹⁹⁶, teacher,¹⁹⁷ the Son of David,¹⁹⁸ and 'κύριε',¹⁹⁹ which should be translated as 'sir!'

¹⁹² E.g., Μαρια τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἐκείνη, δυσίιν ἐξ αὐτῶν, κάκενοι, ἐκεῖνοις, ἕνδεκα.

¹⁹³ Mk 1.1, 11; 3.11; 5.7; 9.7; 12.1-12 (implicitly); 15.39.

¹⁹⁴ Mk 1.24.

¹⁹⁵ Mk 8.29; 14.61-62.

¹⁹⁶ Mk 2.10, 28; 8.31, 38; 9.9, 12, 31; 10.33, 45; 13.26; 14.21, 41, 62.

¹⁹⁷ Mk 4.38; 5.35; 9.17, 38; 10.17, 20, 35; 12.14, 19, 31; 13.1. Cf. Mk 10.51 (rabbi).

¹⁹⁸ Mk 10.47-48. Cf. Mk 11.7-10; 12.35-37.

¹⁹⁹ Mk 7.28. Some scholars such as K. Stendahl (*The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968], p. 48) and R. Pesch (*Das Markusevangelium, Teil*

rather than 'the Lord!' as far as Jesus is concerned.²⁰⁰ Among these titular references to Jesus, Mark seems to want to identify Jesus as the Son of God.²⁰¹ This identity of Jesus is confessed or implicitly stated by the reliable characters such as the centurion (Mk 15.39) and Jesus (Mk 12.1-12), acknowledged by spiritual powers (Mk 3.11; 5.7), declared by God (Mk 1.11; 9.7), and decisively, asserted by the narrator himself (Mk 1.1). Furthermore, this reference to Jesus as the Son of God, is the first (Mk 1.1) and the last (Mk 15.39) reference to him with regard to his identity in the narrative.²⁰²

The Markan narrator unambiguously names Jesus κύριος twice ('sir' at Mk 7.28 and 'owner' or 'master' at Mk 11.3),²⁰³ but never entitles him κύριος as a christological title.²⁰⁴ Rather, this title is clearly attributed to God in the Markan narrative (e.g., Mk 12.29-30; 13.20), and Jesus is portrayed as subordinate to God. A rich man calls Jesus a good teacher, but Jesus ascribes the recommendation only to God (Mk 10.18); it is not Jesus but God who makes a decision (Mk 10.40); only God knows 'the day and the time (Mk 13.32)'; Jesus surrenders to God's will (Mk 14.36), and is helpless before God (Mk 15.34). The Lord is God, not Jesus in the Markan narrative.

1, p. 77) argue that Mark refers to Jesus as κύριος. However, it is a general consensus that Mark does not identify Jesus with κύριος. J. Marcus (*The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* [Louisville: WJKP, 1992], pp. 37-41) discusses this problem and suggests that Mark does not identify κύριος as Jesus but portrays God (κύριος) as working within Jesus. For further study of κύριος and Jesus, see J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), pp. 115-42.

²⁰⁰ Some scholars argue that this κύριε means more than 'sir' (Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 248; Guelich, *Mark*, p. 388; T.A. Burkill, 'The Syrophoenician Woman: the congruence of Mark 7:24-31', *ZNW* 57 (1966), pp. 23-37 [pp. 33-35]). But many scholars understand it just as 'sir' (e.g., Lane, *Mark*, p. 259; Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 100; V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 351; van Iersel, *Mark: Reader-Response Commentary*, p. 248). Cf. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean*, p. 127.

²⁰¹ See Kingsbury, *Christology*, idem, *Conflict in Mark*, pp. 31-61. He especially discusses the references of Jesus, Son of God, the Son of David, and the Son of Man.

²⁰² The last modification attributed to Jesus is 'Nazarene' (Mk 16.6). However, this reference is the Markan narrator's literary strategy that he employs to lead his readers to Galilee where Jesus' ministry began (see Mk 16.7) rather than a confessional and christological designation. Concerning Mk 16.6 and the Son of God, see Kingsbury, *Christology*, pp. 153-55.

²⁰³ For the scholarly discussion on the κύριος at Mk 11.3, see C.A. Evans, *Mark*, p. 143. As is found in the views of scholars that C.A. Evans introduces to us, it is a general consensus that Mark does not designate Jesus as the Lord in his narrative. Cf. Hug, *La Finale*, p. 129.

Therefore the LE's reader is surprised when he or she finds κύριος²⁰⁵ as referring to Jesus in these verses. It is because the LE's reader, who has read MK, found that this title is not for Jesus but for God in MK. Accordingly, the reader is led to have a new portrait of Jesus in the LE. The Lord is God, and Jesus is the Son of God in MK. But now, Jesus is not the Son of God (i.e., the Son of the Lord) but the Lord (God) himself!

The LE's narrator, by referring to Jesus using the word 'the Lord' that refers to God in MK, elevates Jesus to as high as God's throne. The Markan Jesus was merely the Son of God, but the LE's Jesus is the Lord, who is no less than God. In the LE, divinity is attributed to Jesus. By referring to Jesus as the Lord, the LE's narrator highlights the divinity of Jesus.²⁰⁶

B. Ascension and session (19b, c), and the Lord's συνεργούτος (20b)

Some scholars have discussed the ascension and session of Jesus in the LE. Henry B. Swete and Ernst Lohmeyer pointed out that the language employed here is credal.²⁰⁷ A.E.J. Rawlinson argues that session on the right hand is from Psalm 110.1.²⁰⁸ C.E.B. Cranfield and William R. Farmer find the origin of the motif of ascension from the Hebrew Bible.²⁰⁹ James A. Kelhoffer and Craig A. Evans discuss its dependance on Luke and Acts.²¹⁰ Vincent Taylor points out that the ascension and session of Jesus

²⁰⁴ See Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, pp. 37-41.

²⁰⁵ As I have noted above, the vocative κύριε in MK (Mk 7.28) is 'sir' rather than the christological reference, 'the Lord'. The LE's absolute subjective κύριος is not merely 'sir' but 'the Lord'. See further argument below.

²⁰⁶ For the function of κύριος as exaltation in light of Ps. 110.1, see W.R.G. Loader, 'Christ at the Right Hand: Ps. CX.1 in the New Testament', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 199-217 (pp. 213-16).

²⁰⁷ Swete, *St. Mark*, p. 407; Lohmeyer, *Marcus*, p. 363.

²⁰⁸ Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, p. 248. For the study on the use of Ps. 110.1 in the NT, see Loader, 'Christ at the Right Hand', pp. 199-217.

²⁰⁹ Cranfield in 2 Kings 2.11 (*St. Mark*, pp. 474-75) and Farmer (*The Last Twelve Verses*, p. 100) in 2 Kings 2.11 and Ps. 110.1.

²¹⁰ Kelhoffer, *Mission and Miracle*, pp. 111ff; C.A. Evans, *Mark*, p. 549.

were prominent themes in early Christianity²¹¹ and that they are found in many NT writings.²¹²

The author of the LE might have been influenced and have borrowed these motifs from other sources, as many scholars above suggest. He might also have redacted his sources to develop his own theology.²¹³ However, I will not discuss its origins that these motifs might have stemmed from in this thesis. The LE author's compounding of two motifs, the ascension and session, is unique in the NT, and accordingly a redaction-critical examination might be meaningful in a sense. However, I will not compare this pair of motifs with other writings that mention these motifs either. My interest here is in how the author of the LE read MK and responded to it as a reader. Therefore I will discuss how he understood these motifs in comparison with Mark, and what is the literary function of these motifs that he employs in order to develop his own ideology.

Firstly, it should be noted that the LE's narrator does not describe the resurrected Jesus' ascension and session in detail. He merely states these motifs in quite a simple and straightforward manner. He does not descriptively tell the reader how Jesus was taken up to heaven and sat on the right hand of God, and what happened at that time. This shows that the LE's author was not interested in telling

²¹¹ V. Taylor, *St. Mark*, p. 613.

²¹² E.g., Lk. 24.51; Acts 1.2, 11, 22; 7.55; Rom. 8.34; Eph. 1.20; Col. 3.1; Heb. 1.3; 8.1; 10.12; 12.2; 1 Pet. 3.22.

²¹³ It is noticeable that the LE author's use of these motifs is different from other Christian authors. Matthew and John do not recount the ascension and session story in their narratives. Luke does in the Gospel of Luke (24.51). However, he mentions Jesus' ascension only. The motif of ascension is often mentioned without other motifs (Lk. 24.51; Acts 1.2, 22; 1 Tim 3.16) or in conjunction with parousia (Acts 1.11). The motif of session on the right hand of God is mentioned alone (Acts 7.55-56; Heb 1.3; 8.1) or in conjunction with resurrection (Acts 2.33; 5.31; Rom. 8.34; Eph. 1.20; Col. 3.1) or in conjunction with the motif of death (Heb. 10.12; 12.2). Therefore, that the LE's author matches ascension with session is unique. The closest parallel is 1 Pet. 3.22, where the author mentions Jesus' session and ascension (note the difference in order), but still it differs from the LE. Therefore, further study of the 'ascension and session' in the LE in this sense is required. However, since my interest here is in its function within the LE and its relationship with MK not with other writings, I will not discuss it in my thesis.

the ascension story, but in stating the current Jesus' status. He is a divine being who is sitting on the right hand of God in heaven.

That the LE's author is interested in Jesus' status then, leads us to the question of what significance it bears. Bruce M. Metzger well explains this, as below:

... that Christ is seated at the right hand of God on high. What is God's right hand? This is metaphorical language for the divine omnipotence. Where is it? Everywhere. To sit, therefore, at the right hand of God does not mean that Christ is resting; it affirms that he is reigning as king, wielding the power of divine omnipotence.²¹⁴

Jesus' session on the right hand of God means that he has divine power and authority. Jesus' ascension to heaven implies that he is no more an earthly human, but a celestial being, and it also highlights the divinity of Jesus. In the previous section, I have discussed the significance of the term, κύριος. The LE's narrator describes Jesus as bearing a divine characteristic, elevated as high as God the Lord. The divinity of the LE's Jesus is emphasized by the narrator's statement of his divine status; ascension and session.

Secondly, the LE's narrator differs from Mark in employing the motif of session. The Markan parallel with Jesus' session in the LE is Mk 14.62. When the high priest questions Jesus about his identity, he answers that 'you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven (NRSV)'. It is noticeable that the session of Jesus in Mark is connected with the motif of his parousia as an eschatological Judge. Mark, by so doing, tells the reader that the role of the future Jesus is to judge people with divine authority.

However, the LE author understands the role of Jesus in future time in a different way. He connects the divinity of Jesus with his presence among the earthly

²¹⁴ Metzger, *Historical and Literary Studies*, p. 87.

ministry of his disciples. He states that Jesus (the Lord) sitting on the right hand of God is working with people (v. 20b). The LE's divine Jesus supports the disciples' mission by working with them and affirming their words (v. 20b, c). He is not portrayed as an eschatological Judge, but as a helper and supporter.

The Markan Jesus is absent during the interim period between his earthly ministry and parousia. However the LE's narrator does not tell the reader anything about parousia. Unlike the Markan Jesus, the LE's Jesus is present among his disciples, even after his ascension and session on the right hand of God. The LE's Jesus helps and affirms his disciples' mission with divine authority. But the Markan Jesus returns with divine authority to judge people. Rather, it is not Jesus but the Holy Spirit that supports his disciples during his absence in Mark's Gospel (Mk 13.11), and in this light the LE's Jesus plays the role of the Markan Holy Spirit in a sense.

I have argued that the LE's narrator highlights the divinity of Jesus by naming him the Lord, and by stating his ascension and session on the right hand of God. I have also pointed out that the LE's narrator connects this motif with Jesus' presence among his disciples and his support and affirmation of their mission. Then we can answer the first and second question that I raised above; why the narrator did not call Jesus by name until this concluding part of the LE, and why he selected κύριος as the reference to Jesus.

That the narrator did not call Jesus by name is his rhetorical strategy. He could draw the reader's attention to this part by doing as such. He selected κύριος in order to emphasize the divinity of Jesus. He connected the motif of Jesus' divinity with his presence among his disciples, his cooperation with them, and his affirmation

of their mission. Therefore it can be argued that the purpose of divinization is for the authentication of the disciples' mission.

4.3.4.4 Summary of Part Three

The last part of the LE consists of three sections, which are the scene about the resurrected Jesus' appearance to the Eleven (v. 14), Jesus' commission (vv. 15-18), and the concluding remarks (vv. 19-20). The LE's narrator restores the honour of the Eleven disciples throughout this part. He gets rid of a negative impression of Jesus' male disciples by naming them the Eleven and not the Twelve. He describes the second commission of them, which is the re-authentication of their apostolic mission. He also portrays them positively in the concluding part by stating that the Lord is present with them, working together and affirming their words.

The positive portrayal of the Eleven cannot be set apart from the theme of the importance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus, to which the LE's narrator has adhered in his narrative. The portrayal of the Eleven suddenly changes when they see the risen Jesus, just as Mary Magdalene (part one) and the two disciples (part two) did. The other theme, having faith/believing, is also emphasized by the characterization of the Eleven (e.g., vv. 14, 16-17). Therefore, the negative characterization of the Eleven in the previous two parts (vv. 9-13) was the narrator's strategy for these themes. Besides the motif of having faith/believing, the LE's narrator suggests baptism as a crucial condition for salvation. Therefore, one of the characteristics of the LE's community was baptism.

The LE's author is very interested in mission or witnessing to the resurrection of Jesus. All the major characters are witnesses to this, and it is the common topic in three parts of the LE. Part three especially, recounts the Eleven's mission in more

detail. Miracles play an important role in their mission because they function as an indication of the proclaimers' success, showing the Lord's divine affirmation on the one hand. It also proves that the audience, who believed and was baptized, receive salvation, on the other. This shows that the LE's community was a mission-oriented group.

4.4 Conclusion of the Chapter Four

‘Then I saw *his* face, and now I am a believer,
not a trace of doubt in my mind...’
- from Smashmouth, ‘I’m A Believer’

The extrinsic and intrinsic examination of the LE enables me to suggest the identity of the assumed LE's ideological primary group (= LE's community) as follows. The LE's community was very interested in mission. Therefore, whether one believes in the good news or not was a sensitive issue, and belief – along with baptism – functioned as an important element for salvation. The LE's community also believed that the miraculous signs proved the divine authentication of their mission.

The LE tells us about the qualification of the leadership of this mission-oriented group. The leading member was expected to be an eyewitness of the risen Jesus or to have experienced the Appearance event. This was crucial for the leaders, while it was not for others.²¹⁵ Therefore the author of the LE does not grant the Eleven to perform the mission tasks until they encounter the risen Jesus.

The LE is different from MK in its characterization of the male disciples. The Markan author portrays the male disciples negatively. They do not hear the resurrection news, and accordingly their apostolic authority is nullified. The female

²¹⁵ If it is the case, it is doubtful if Paul's authority as a leader or apostle was established in the LE's community, because he never encountered the risen Jesus in the same manner that these characters of the LE did.

disciples, including Mary Magdalene, are also portrayed negatively in the OE. All the male and female disciples are disqualified as leaders of the assumed Markan community. However, the male disciples are commissioned for the mission again, and their re-commission is divinely authenticated in the LE. The LE's author re-authenticates the Eleven's mission under the condition that they saw the risen Jesus and believed, and by so doing he recapitulates the theme, the importance of belief and visual experience of the Appearance event.

The LE's author portrays Mary Magdalene as holding the supreme apostolic authority. While the Markan author portrays her as failing to deliver the resurrection news, the LE's author depicts her positively by singling her out as the *first* eyewitness of the Appearance event and messenger. However the LE's author portrays Peter negatively. Judging from the extrinsic and intrinsic study, the LE's Mary Magdalene is presented as the prime leader of the community, but her competitor Peter is set aside. The intrinsic and extrinsic examinations lead us to the hypothesis that the LE was a pro-Mary Magdalene/anti-Peterine community.

The Gospel of Mark locates Galilee as the place where the post-Easter Jesus movement should start. The LE is similar to MK in that it expects this movement. However it is different from MK because it does not adhere to Galilee, but is open to any place as the setting of that movement. The LE also exhibits differences from MK in that it places the disciples as the agents of that movement. The Markan author portrays the disciples as disqualified to lead the post-Easter Jesus movement. But the LE's author sets them in the center of the movement through the divine authentication of their mission.

CHAPTER FIVE

INTRINSIC ANALYSIS OF THE SHORTER ENDING

I warn everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book; If anyone adds anything to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book. And if anyone takes words away from this book of prophecy, God will take away from him his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book.

-Revelation 22.18 (NIV)

5.1 Introduction

The SE (Shorter Ending) that I will examine is from the Codex Bobbiensis (it^k). This is the unique and oldest extant manuscript that has the SE only at the end of Mark's Gospel (MK+SE). It was written in Old Latin in the fourth or fifth century CE,¹ and it is believed to have been translated originally from the second or third century Greek text.² It is believed that St. Columban (ca. 543-615) brought this codex with him to Bobbio in northern Italy where he founded an Irish monastery.³ It is now in the National Library of Turin, Italy.⁴ This codex contains two fragmentary gospels of Mark (8.8-11, 14-16; 8.19-16.9) and Matthew (1.1-3.10; 4.2-14.17; 15.20-36).

¹ Cf. A. Bakker (*A Study of Codex Evang. Bobbiensis* [Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933], p. 7) dates it fifth to sixth century.

² It is argued that the original copy of the SE was in Greek, and the copyist of the Old Latin MS translated this Greek SE into Latin (K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, pp. 186-87. I believe that the *k* copyist transcribed another Latin text to produce his Codex *k* rather than directly translated himself from a Greek text. See below.). The trace of its affinity with Greek is, for instance, the headline of each page that marks 'CATA' (i.e., CATA MARC[UM]. See the picture of the 'Codex Bobbiensis (*k*), fol. 41. recto. Marc. XVI.6-9' on the front page of this thesis). For further argument for this 'Graecism', see J. Wordsworth, W. Sanday and H.J. White, *Portions of the Gospels According to St. Mark and St. Matthew: from the Bobbio MS. (k), now numbered G. VII. 15 in the National Library at Turin* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886), pp. xiv-xv. It is not certain when the original Greek SE was composed, but many scholars conjecture that it was produced around the second or third century CE (K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, pp. 186-87, 287-88; B.F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* [4th edn.; London: Macmillan, 1875], pp. 249-50). Metzger also states, by quoting E.A. Lowe, that this MS was 'copied from a second century papyrus' (*Text of the New Testament*, p. 73).

³ For the brief history of the Codex Bobbiensis (*k*), see Wordsworth, et als., *Portions of the Gospels*, pp. v-xxii.

⁴ Metzger, *Text of the New Testament*, p. 73. For the recent report on the condition of this MS, see D.C. Parker, 'Unequally Yoked: The Present State of the Codex Bobbiensis', *JTS* 42/2 (1991), pp. 581-88.

The Mark's Gospel in the Codex *k* is not an original composition by the *k* copyist but a translation from a Greek MS or a transcription from another Latin MS. It is argued that this Latin copyist of the SE (*k*) was unfamiliar with Christian phraseology but 'not ignorant of Latin'.⁵ Paleographical examination supports that he was a professional scribe.⁶ Thus, Burkitt assumed that the copyist might have been a faithful scribe 'who only copied what he saw' and was either a 'heathen still or only a recent convert'.⁷ These observations hardly lead us to reckon that the *k* copyist composed the Mark's Gospel with the Shorter Ending only (MK+SE).

The possibility of this hypothesis increases for instance, when the Codex *k*'s insertion of Mk 16.4 and omission of a part of Mk 16.8 are considered. The act of insertion and omission is, as I mentioned previously,⁸ closely related to the matter of ideology. The Codex *k*'s revision of these parts accordingly has something to do with ideology or theology. Therefore, it hardly seems that these are the touch of a copyist who was unfamiliar with Christian phraseology; rather it looks like the work of a mechanical copyist who 'only copied what he saw'.⁹

I believe that the *k* copyist's Mark's Gospel (MK+SE in *k*) and the assumed original Greek Mark's Gospel (the MK+SE that the *k* copyist might have translated) or the assumed Latin translation (the Latin MK+SE that the *k* copyist might have transcribed), if any, presumably exhibit continuity in their ideology. Considering the characteristic of the *k* copyist as above, the Mark's Gospel in the Codex Bobbiensis must be standing on the same tradition/ideology of the original assumed Greek Mark's Gospel (MK+SE).

⁵ F.C. Burkitt, 'Further Notes on Codex *k*', *JTS* 5 (1904), pp. 100-107 (pp. 105-107); Bakker, *Codex Evang. Bobbiensis*, pp. 13-19.

⁶ Wordsworth et als., *Portions of the Gospels*, p. ix.

⁷ Burkitt, 'Further Notes', p. 107.

⁸ See Chapter Two.

⁹ Bakker (*Codex Evang. Bobbiensis*, p. 19) states that the *k* copyist did not 'understand what

Therefore, I will use Codex Bobbiensis to discuss Mark's Gospel of MK+SE in this Chapter because this codex is the only extant MS that consists of MK+SE and it exhibits continuity with the assumed original Greek MS as argued above. In this light, I will also refer to the assumed Greek author who composed Mark's Gospel of the MK+SE as the author of the SE in this Chapter.

It is certain that the author of the SE was a reader of MK. But he was not merely a reader but also an author of the Mark's Gospel that ends with '...eternal salvation. Amen' (MK+SE). He created his own ending to Mark's Gospel which implies that he was not content with the ending of his Mark's Gospel.¹⁰ This means that the SE author's ideology is embedded in the SE. In this Chapter, I will illuminate the ideology in the SE by conducting the intrinsic examination.

5.2 Text analysis

5.2.1 Translation and structure

The Latin text of the SE in the Codex Bobbiensis (*k*) is as follows:¹¹

OMNIA AUTEM QUAECUMQUE PRAE
 CEPTA ERANT ET QUI CUM PUERO ERANT¹²
 BREVITER EXPOSUERUNT POST HAEC¹³
 ET IPSE HI^s ADPARUIT ·ET AB ORIENTE ·
 USQUE·USQUE IN ORIENTEM·MISIT¹⁴

he was writing'. I will discuss insertion and omission of these verses later.

¹⁰ Mark's Gospel that he read might have been either MK that ends at Mk 16.8 or MK + LE or Mark's Gospel that had another virtual original ending if we accept the hypotheses of 'mutilation ending' or 'lost ending'. Regardless of what the ending of Mark's Gospel that he read was like, it is clear that he was not content with that ending, because he added (if the original ending was mutilated by someone, lost or ended at Mk 16.8) the SE or replaced the existing ending (if the SE's author mutilated the hypothetical original ending) with the SE.

¹¹ I thank Revd. Prof. L.C.A. Alexander and Dr. K. Doulamis for helping me with my Latin translation.

¹² I believe 'QUI', which is nominative is the copyist's misspelling for 'QUIBUS', which is dative because the sentence hardly makes sense if it is 'qui'. Furthermore, all other Greek MSS that contain the Shorter Ending read 'τοῖς', instead of 'οἱ' which would correspond to the Latin 'QUI'.

¹³ As is seen in the facsimile of fol. 41 on the front page of this thesis, all words were originally written without any space except for one case. This exceptional space was used to mark the end of a sentence, like the modern punctuation of period mark (I marked it with a big space as above). Fine dots also might have been used to distinguish words (e.g., ADPARUIT·ET), but it is not certain. Concerning punctuation of the Codex Bobbiensis, see Burkitt, 'Further Notes', pp. 100-101.

PER ILLOS ·SANCTAM·ET INCORRUPTAM ·ha·¹⁵
SALUTIS AETERNAE · AMEN·

— —
PRAEDICATIONIS

(fol. 41, lines 8-14)¹⁶

And the English translation is as follows:

But they briefly expounded everything that had been instructed to those who were with Peter. And after this, Jesus himself appeared, and sent through them, from east to east,¹⁷ the holy and incorruptible proclamation of everlasting salvation. Amen.

The Codex Bobbiensis fol. 41, line 9 reads 'PUERO (a boy)', and I believe it is the copyist's misspelling of 'PETRO (Peter)'.¹⁸ Firstly, if this is not a misspelling but what the author/copyist intended to say (i.e., not Peter but a boy), it only results in a very grotesque translation that does not fit into the context; the women were ordered to go and tell the message to Peter and disciples (fol. 41, line 2), and they told all these things to those with a 'boy'? Secondly, besides the mistake of naming Peter, the copyist also made a similar mistake when referring to Mary ('maxriam' for 'mariam'; fol. 44, line 7; Mt. 1.20). Thirdly, it is understandable that he misspelt PUERO for PETRO since these words look very similar; only the second and the third letters differ. Finally, all other MSS and lectionaries that contain the Shorter Ending read 'Peter' instead of 'a boy'. Therefore, PUERO must be the copyist's

¹⁴ The reading of 'USQUE USQUE' is a dittography.

¹⁵ See Wordsworth, et als, *Portions of the Gospels*, p. 23 comment on verse 9 that marks 'ha' as indicating the subscript 'praedicationis', and corrects it as 'praedicationem'.

¹⁶ The corresponding Greek text of the SE is: Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξήγγειλαν. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφάνη ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. ἀμήν.

¹⁷ It should be noted that the Codex Bobbiensis reads 'AB ORIENTE USQUE USQUE IN ORIENTEM', while other Greek MSS read 'ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως'. It is not certain if it is the copyist's mistake or not. However, it does not seem that the discrepancy between them makes serious difference in what the author intended to mean.

¹⁸ See Bakker, *A Full Collation of Codex Ev. Bobbiensis (k)* (Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933), Mc XVI, 9.

misspelling of PETRO. It might be argued that the author/copyist wrote 'PUERO' on purpose in order to denigrate him as merely a 'boy'. However this argument cannot be contended; the author/copyist does not replace Peter's name with any denigrating word, but simply puts Peter when applicable. Furthermore, we find 'puero' in other places (e.g., fols. 6-6b; 8; 10b) but they are all simply referring to a boy/child without any positive or negative value in itself. Therefore, I translate it Peter, as above.¹⁹

The SE of the Codex Bobbiensis belongs to the folio 41, lines 8-14. The first letter of the SE is written slightly bigger than other letters (OMNIA; see the facsimile picture on the front page of this thesis), which indicates the beginning of a paragraph.²⁰ The SE consists of two sentences, lines 8-10 and 11-14. The first sentence is about what the women did after they fled from the tomb. The second sentence reports that Jesus appeared and had the proclamation spread out. The subject of the second sentence is clearly mentioned as Jesus, whereas that of the first sentence is not. Since the content of the SE is quite brief and simple, it does not seem that the author of the SE was interested in describing all that happened in detail.

Interestingly, the author of the SE²¹ made noticeable changes in two parts of the OE. They are (1) the deletion of a phrase from Mk 16.8,²² and (2) the insertion of two sentences between Mk 16.3 and 4.²³ I believe that these two changes alert us to

¹⁹ For further examples of the copyist's mistake, see Burkitt, 'Further Notes', pp. 105-107.

²⁰ Wordsworth, et als., *Portions of the Gospels*, p. ix.

²¹ I prefer 'the author of the SE' to 'the *k* copyist' when I am dealing with the Codex *k*, because I believe the Latin text of the Codex *k* originated from 'the (Greck) author of the SE' rather than the *k* copyist himself. See 'Introduction' above.

²² It is 'they said nothing to anyone'.

²³ They are 'SUBITO AUTEM AD HORAM TERTIAM TENEBRAE DIEI FACTAE SUNT PER TOTUM ORBEM TERRAE ET DESCENDERUNT DE CAELIS ANGELI ET SURGENT(E/ES) IN CLARITATE UIUI DI SIMUL ASCENDERUNT CUM EO ET CONTINUO LUX FACTA EST. TUNC ILLAE ACCESSERUNT AD MONIMENTUM (fol. 40, line 10-fol. 40b, line 5).' D.C. Parker translates it as 'But suddenly at the third hour of the day it became dark throughout the world, and angels descended from heaven and rising in the glory of the living God at once ascended with him, and immediately it became light (*Living Text*, pp. 125-26). *Then they approached the tomb* (italics are my translation)'. I will discuss this inserted part below.

what the author of the SE wanted to say, and eventually to his ideology. I will discuss these two changes first before I examine the SE in the following parts.

5.2.2 Deletion (Mk 16.8) and insertion (fol. 40, line 10 – fol.40b, line 5)

5.2.2.1. Deletion of ‘they said nothing to anyone’ from Mk 16.8

While the author of the LE merely added his ending to the extant ending of Mark’s Gospel, the SE’s author (i.e., the author of the Mark’s Gospel in the Codex *k*) went one step further even to amend the OE itself. The author of the SE deleted ‘they said nothing to anyone’ from Mk 16.8. It has been suggested that this is because the SE’s author wanted to harmonize the SE with the OE,²⁴ and this might be correct. However, the questions that interest me are; why did he want to harmonize them? What difference does this emendation create in reading the SE? And how is it eventually related to his ideology? Since the act of insertion and deletion is a matter of ideology, the literary examination of the deletion of this Markan phrase by the SE’s author will tell us about his ideology.

Mark 16.8, in the Codex *k*, ends by reading, ‘they trembled and feared *on account of fear* (my italics)’.²⁵ However, the OE’s Mk 16.8 is interpreted either as ‘They said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid’ or ‘They said nothing to anyone. For they were afraid that...’ In either cases, the women’s fear makes them keep cowardly silent: ‘they were afraid, *so* they said nothing to anyone’. In contrast to this, the women’s fear in Mk 16.8 of the Codex *k* merely makes them tremble and fear: ‘they were afraid, *so* they trembled and feared’. That is, even though they were afraid, it did not keep them silent.

²⁴ Hug, *La Finale*, p. 208; Lane, *Mark*, p. 602.

²⁵ ‘TENEBAE ENIM ILLAS TREMOR ET PAVOR PROPTER TIMORE’.

In the OE, the author of MK portrays the women negatively by the embarrassing phrase ‘they said nothing to anyone’. However, the SE’s author deletes it, and by so doing he removes the negative impression of them. Even the fear and trembling of the women could not prevent them from delivering the message in the Mark’s Gospel of the Codex *k*. Rather, the deletion of this phrase portrays them positively; *despite* their fear, they *did* deliver the message.

Therefore, the SE’s author restores the women’s honour by deleting ‘they said nothing to anyone’ from the OE. On top of it, he avoids any possible contradiction between the OE and the SE. Through this harmonization, he makes his SE a very natural ending of Mark’s Gospel. His deletion of this phrase alerts us to the fact that he did not agree with the MK author’s characterization of the women. The author of MK wanted to portray the women negatively by ending the story as such, but the SE’s author depicts them more positively by revising MK.

5.2.2.2 Insertion of fol. 40, line10 – fol. 40b, line 5

Another distinctive change in the OE by the author of the SE is the insertion of two sentences between Mk 16.3 and 4. Unlike the OE of MK, the OE in the Codex Bobbiensis (= OE*k*; fol. 40, line 5 – fol. 41, line 7// Mk 16.1-8) recounts the resurrection of Jesus. According to this codex, the women visit the tomb in the morning on the first day of the week. They talk to each other, asking who will roll the stone away from the entrance. After this verse, the OE*k* inserts Jesus’ resurrection scene in a fairly descriptive manner.

The passages fol. 40, line 10 – fol. 40b, line 5 read that it suddenly became dark at the third hour and angels came down from heaven; they ascend with him

(Jesus), rising up²⁶ in the glory of living God, and it becomes light. As D.W. Palmer points out, the description of the scene looks like the ascension of Jesus. For instance, the frame of the coming of darkness and the consequent return of light (i.e., darkness – ascension – light) parallels the structure of the ascension of Enoch (2 Enoch 67.1-2).²⁷ Through this descriptive scene, the author gives the reader a strong ‘impression of a visible resurrection from the tomb’.²⁸

In order to make the interpolation fit the context, the OE*k* changed Mk 16.2 and created fol. 40b, lines 4-5. The OE*k* deleted ‘very’ and ‘when the sun has risen’ from the OE (Mk 16.2), merely saying, ‘they went in the morning on the first day of the week’, in order to avoid the contradiction with ‘at the third hour (fol. 40, line 11)’. Furthermore, he added ‘then they approached the tomb (fol. 40b, lines 4-5)’ to the end of the interpolation. By so doing, he makes the narrative naturally come back to the existing context where the women visited the tomb.²⁹

The interpolation alerts us to two points. Firstly, the author did not feel comfortable with the Markan empty tomb story. The OE does not tell the reader about the resurrection of Jesus; it is merely implied within the context. Accordingly, the Markan women do not experience the resurrection of Jesus, which also results in the negative impression of them.³⁰ However, the author of the SE did not think the

²⁶ The subject of ‘rising up’ is debated. As C.H. Turner pointed out, the reading of ‘surgent’ in fol. 40b, line 1 is a corruption (‘A Re-Collation of Codex *k* of the Old Latin Gospels [Turin G VII 15]’, *JTS* 5 [1904], pp. 88-100 [p. 94]). Burkitt argued that ‘surgent’ should be ‘surgente’ (*Old Latin and Itala*, p. 94), which implies the resurrection of Jesus. However D.W. Palmer challenges this argument, and argues that it should be ascribed to the angels (‘surgentes’), which depicts the angels’ coming down and going up (‘Notes and Studies: the origin, form, and purpose of Mark XVI. 4 in Codex Bobbiensis’, *JTS* 27 [1976], pp. 113-22). The Oxford editors’ emendation also supports the reading of ‘surgentes’ (Wordsworth, et als., *Portions of the Gospels*, p. 22). Cf. The Codex Bobbiensis has a few strata. Burkitt marks the original stratum *k**, the second corrections by the original scribe or the corrector *k*^c (*m.* 2), and the third by the third scribe of several centuries later *m.* 3. The first two correctors (*k** and *k*^c/*m.* 2) are the contemporaries, and the Oxford editors belong to the second stratum. See Burkitt, ‘Further Notes’, p. 101.

²⁷ Palmer, ‘Notes and Studies’, pp. 120-21.

²⁸ Palmer, ‘Notes and Studies’, p. 122.

²⁹ Palmer, ‘Notes and Studies’, p. 115.

³⁰ See Chapters One and Four.

empty tomb was enough for telling about Jesus' resurrection, so he wanted to include the explicit resurrection scene. He tells the reader about the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus in the SE, and thought that the resurrection scene should clearly precede the Appearance story.

Secondly, it is noticeable that the OE*k*'s women who visited the tomb do not witness the resurrection of Jesus. Verse 3 recounts that the women were talking to each other about rolling away the stone from the entrance of the tomb; the last sentence of the interpolation and the following verse 4 describe that the women arrived at the tomb and found the stone rolled away. The author of the SE shows the reader that the women did not know about Jesus' resurrection, not to mention that they did not see it. Unlike MK's author, the SE's author includes the resurrection scene in his narrative. However the women in the OE*k*, like those in the OE, do not experience Jesus' resurrection or see him.

This raises the question 'Whom did the SE's author select as the first witness of the resurrection of Jesus?' The answer is important because it was, as I have discussed in Chapter Three, a sensitive issue to early Christians, and it is eventually related to the author's ideology. In the following part, I will discuss this issue through the examination of the SE.

5.2.3 Analysis of the first sentence: fol. 41, lines 8-10

5.2.3.1 Obscuring Mary Magdalene as an anonymous woman

In the first sentence (fol. 41, lines 8-10), the SE's author states that the women delivered the message as the angelic young man had instructed. One of the significant differences between the SE and the LE is the identity of the messenger and the recipient of the message.

The LE's author depicts 'Mary Magdalene' as the subject of that act, while the SE's author, 'they (the women)'. According to the OE, the three women are sent to deliver the message to Peter and the other disciples, but they flee and keep silent. With regard to Mark's characterization of the women, the LE's author could not agree with him, and he changes the negative impression of them. Interestingly, he restores only Mary Magdalene among them by depicting her as the only messenger.

In contrast to the LE's author, the SE's author does not single out Mary Magdalene but obscures her presence among the messengers by *not* mentioning her by name. It is not Mary Magdalene but 'they' who deliver the message in the SE. While the silence of the women gave the reader a negative impression of them in the OE, the SE's author rids it of them by depicting them as delivering the message and by deleting 'they said nothing to anyone' from the OE. However, Mary Magdalene does not receive the spotlight in the SE; rather, she becomes anonymous. Therefore, the SE forms a significant contrast with the LE in this regard.

Secondly, it is noticeable that Mary Magdalene is not the first witness of the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus in the SE. The LE's author singles out Mary Magdalene by depicting her not only as the first and unique female messenger but also the first eyewitness of the Appearance event; 'ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρία τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ'(LE v. 9). The LE's author emphasizes that Jesus *did* appear to Mary Magdalene by clearly mentioning 'ἐφάνη', and that she was *the first* eyewitness by saying 'πρῶτον'. Therefore, Mary Magdalene holds the primary apostolic authority above all others (especially Peter) in the LE.³¹

However, Mary Magdalene loses this authority in the SE. According to the SE, the women do not see the resurrected Jesus, or at least are not depicted as the

³¹ See Chapters Three and Four.

first eyewitnesses; they are merely messengers of the angelic young man. The resurrected Jesus appears and makes the proclamation spread through ‘them (illos)’, referring to those who were with Peter. Therefore, the first witnesses of the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus are not the women but those who were with Peter in the SE.

This alerts us to the SE author’s ideology. He did not want to make Mary Magdalene a heroine in *his* Mark’s Gospel. Rather, it is implicitly said that Jesus’ disciples became the first eyewitnesses and Peter’s name is singled out among them. Mary Magdalene is the first named messenger and is the unique woman who is portrayed positively among the female characters in the LE; but she loses her name, and her positive portrait is obscured in the SE. This shows us that it was not beneficial to the SE’s author (or SE’s ideological community) if Mary Magdalene were portrayed as a primary authoritative figure.

5.2.3.2 Peter

The OE tells that an angelic young man bade the women go and tell the message to ‘his disciples and Peter (Mk 16.7)’. The author of MK clearly mentions Peter’s name, which leads the reader to reckon that Peter was supposed to hear the message. But the abrupt Markan ending makes the reader understand that Peter and the other disciples of Jesus did not hear the message, which implies that they did not go to Galilee and see the risen Jesus either. Therefore, the author of MK depicts the disciples, especially *Peter*, as not having apostolic authority.

In the LE, Mary Magdalene delivers this message. However, it is to ‘those who had been with him (Jesus)’ not to ‘*Peter* and his disciples’. By doing so, the

LE's author does not give the reader a positive impression of Peter.³² As I have discussed in Chapter Four, the LE's author restores the disciples' apostolic authority in his own ways. But Peter's presence among the recipients of the message is still obscured in the LE.

However, the SE's author explicitly mentions Peter's name.³³ Unlike the women in the OE, the women in the SE deliver the message as instructed. In contrast to the LE, the SE states that the message was delivered to those with Peter. His name is singled out among the recipients in the SE. It leads the reader to understand that the disciples, especially *Peter*, heard the message.

That the disciples, especially Peter, heard the message foreshadows the reunion of the resurrected Jesus with his disciples – especially with Peter. It is not clearly stated whether they went to Galilee or not in the SE, but it is certain that they met Jesus, because it is implied in the word 'ADPARUIT/ἐφάνη (fol. 41, line 11)'. Therefore the author of the SE wants to restore Peter's honour as well as that of the other disciples by mentioning Peter's name; Peter, who once lost his name in the LE, finds it in the SE.

The author of the SE gives Peter the primary position by depicting him as the eyewitness of the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus. As I have discussed in many places in this thesis, being an eyewitness of the Appearance event was a crucial issue with regard to one's apostolic authority. In this light, the SE author's portrayal of Peter as above alerts us to the fact that Peter had the primary apostolic authority in the SE community (or for the SE's author).

³² For further discussion of this, see Chapter Four.

³³ With regard to 'PUERO' and 'PETRO', see above.

5.2.3.3. Summary of the first sentence analysis

While the author of the LE portrays Mary Magdalene as holding a primary apostolic authority, the SE's author singles out Peter. The SE's author portrays the disciples, especially Peter, as the first eyewitnesses of the resurrected Jesus, whereas he obscures the presence of Mary Magdalene. This alerts us to the hypothesis that Peter was holding a primary apostolic authority or at least he was more supported than Mary Magdalene in the SE's ideological primary community. The hypothesis is strengthened in the second sentence of the SE, and I will discuss it in the following part.

5.2.4 Analysis of the second sentence: fol. 41, lines 11-14

The second sentence of the SE tells about Jesus' appearance to the disciples and commission to them. It parallels the LE vv. 14-20, where Jesus appears to the Eleven, rebukes them, commissions them with the promise of five signs, ascends to heaven, and authenticates their mission. Compared with the corresponding part in the LE, the second sentence of the SE is quite brief and plain.

The second sentence begins with 'post haec (after this)', which marks the shift of topic. The topic of the first sentence is focused on the characterization of Peter (presence) and Mary Magdalene (absence). The topic of the second is focused on the authentication of the mission of those who hold apostolic authority in the SE's community. Through the second sentence, the SE's author reinforces the legitimacy of the authority that he gave to Peter and the disciples.

5.2.4.1 'IPSE HI^s ADPARUIT (fol. 41, line 4)'

The SE's author identifies the subject of the second sentence as Jesus. The resurrected Jesus appeared to 'them', and it is his first appearance in the Markan narrative of the Codex *k* (MK+SE). Considering that the encounter with the resurrected Jesus was an important issue, the SE author's mention of 'Jesus' should not be overlooked.

While the LE's author names the resurrected Jesus the Lord (LE v. 19), the SE's author refers to him as 'Jesus'. The LE author's reference to Jesus as the Lord is purposeful, exhibiting its significant meaning.³⁴ However, the SE author's reference to him as 'Jesus' does not seem to have any significant meaning for the sake of the author's ideology. Rather, the clear reference to Jesus itself is meaningful. That is, the SE's author highlights that *Jesus* appeared; it is *Jesus* – not others – who appeared.

This argument is supported by the word 'IPSE'. The SE's author wanted to tell the reader that Jesus *himself* (IPSE) appeared. It was not angelophany that the disciples around Peter experienced; it was not a sort of apparition, nor was it an illusion that they saw. It was Jesus himself that appeared to them. Therefore, the word 'IPSE', along with 'Jesus (HI^s)', emphasizes their experience of the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus, which eventually legitimates their apostolic authority.

The apostolic authority of Peter and the disciples is highlighted by the word 'ADPARUIT'. The OE or OE*k* do not recount the appearance story of the resurrected Jesus. Even the first sentence of the SE does not describe his appearance. The SE's author postpones the appearance of the resurrected Jesus until Peter and the disciples

³⁴ See Chapter Four.

hear the message. While the resurrected Jesus appeared to Mary Magdalene and *then* the disciples hear the message in the LE, he appears to them first only after they hear the news in the SE. The SE's author does not say any word like 'appeared' when he talks about the female messengers. However, he clearly states 'he appeared' in the second sentence, and by so doing he clarifies who the first eyewitness of the Appearance event are; Peter and the disciples.

The LE's author used the term, 'he appeared' firstly for Mary Magdalene.³⁵ However, the SE's author used the word, 'appeared' for Peter and the disciples. As I have discussed in Chapter Three, the question of 'To whom did the resurrected Jesus appear the first?' was a critical issue for early Christians. Therefore, the SE's author gives the primary apostolic authority to Peter and the disciples, while the LE's author to Mary Magdalene. This shows that the SE's primary ideological group was supporting Peter and the disciples rather than Mary Magdalene.

5.2.4.2 'PER ILLOS (fol. 41, line 13)'

After the resurrected Jesus appeared to Peter and the disciples, he makes the proclamation of salvation spread out 'through them'. It is significant that the author of the SE places Jesus as the subject of spreading the proclamation. That is, he says that the resurrected *Jesus* – not the disciples – sent the proclamation ('MISIT' fol. 41, line 12). They are the agents for the spreading out of the proclamation. It shows that the SE's author wanted to denote the divine authority of the proclamation.

That the SE's author emphasizes the divine authority of the proclamation is also found in the phrase, 'SANCTAM ET INCORRUPTAM (fol. 41, line 13)'. It is holy and incorruptible. It shows that the proclamation is not from a human but from

³⁵ He states 'ἐφάνη πρῶτον (LE v. 9)' for Mary Magdalene, and 'Μετά δὲ ταῦτα ... ἐφανερώθη (LE v. 12)' for the two disciples, and then 'ὕστερον δὲ ... ἐφανερώθη (LE v. 14)' for the

God. Thus no one can stop the proclamation; it spreads out with divine authority. Furthermore, the SE's author defines this proclamation as of 'SALUTIS AETERNAE (fol. 41, line 14)'. The proclamation generates everlasting salvation, and this also shows that the proclamation is not human but divine. Therefore the SE's author legitimates the authority of the proclamation by depicting it as originating from Jesus himself (IPSE), and as exhibiting sanctity.

Interestingly, the SE's author portrays Peter and the disciples as agents of this proclamation by saying 'PER ILLOS'. This sacred and divine proclamation is spread out *through them*. They are authorized agents of this divine mission task. The resurrected Jesus authenticates their mission, and this indicates that Peter and the disciples have divine apostolic authority. Their authority is from the resurrected Jesus himself, not from human beings.³⁶ The SE's author, by doing so, alerts the reader to the fact that their apostolic authority cannot be challenged, and that if any one does so, they are opposing not only them, but also Jesus himself.

Therefore, it can be argued that the SE's author (or ideological community) supported Peter and the disciples as authoritative apostolic figures. He believed that their mission was authenticated by the resurrected Jesus himself, and accordingly that the proclamation coming out of their mouth should not be challenged. This alerts us to the hypothesis that the SE's primary ideological group was pro-Petrine (including his fellow disciples of Jesus).

5.2.4.3 Summary of the second sentence analysis

The second sentence of the SE is about the Appearance of the resurrected Jesus to Peter and the disciples. The author of the SE shows the reader that they are the first

Eleven.

³⁶ It is noticeable that Paul also claimed his apostolic authority in his mission based on the

eyewitnesses of the Appearance event. He does so by clearly saying ‘HI^s’ and ‘IPSE’; it was none other than ‘Jesus himself’ that they saw. He also emphasizes their visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus by saying ‘ADPARUIT’. Therefore, the SE’s author grants them apostolic authority.

The SE’s author strengthens the apostolic authority of Peter and the disciples by depicting the resurrected Jesus as the subject of the word, ‘MISIT (fol. 40, line 12)’. It is the resurrected Jesus who sends the proclamation out. This shows the divine authority of the proclamation; it is a divine work, not human. The SE’s author strengthens this characteristic of the proclamation by describing it as of ‘SANCTAM ET INCORRUPTAM’ and ‘SALUTIS AETERNAE’.

The SE’s author authenticates their mission by depicting the proclamation as exhibiting the unchallenged divine authority. They are authorized agents of the resurrected Jesus (‘PER ILLOS’). By doing so, the SE’s author grants Peter and the disciples the apostolic authority that originates from the resurrected Jesus himself. The characterization of Peter and the disciples as above alerts the reader to the fact that the SE’s author (or primary ideological community) was in favour of Peter and the disciples.

5.3 Conclusion of the Chapter Five

I have examined the SE based on the Codex Bobbiensis (it^k), and found a few distinctive things that alert us to the identity of the assumed ideological group of the SE. Firstly, the author of the SE did not agree with the author of MK in ending Mark’s Gospel. Thus he made some emendation of the OE, which I named as OE*k*. Judging from the analysis of the OE*k*, the SE’s author was not content with a Mark’s

divine authentication of it (e.g., Gal. 1.1).

Gospel that recounts no resurrection story. Therefore, he inserted the resurrection scene into the OE in a fairly descriptive manner. It draws me to assume that the resurrection of Jesus was a very important issue for the SE's community, and that it necessitated them clearly stating it.

With regard to the SE author's emendation of Mk 16.8, some scholars suggested that it was because the author wanted to make the narrative flow naturally, without any contradiction between MK and the Shorter Ending, which might be possible. However, I suggested another interpretation; it was because the SE's author did not agree with the authors of MK and the LE in their characterization of the women at the tomb. He did not like the Markan author's negative portrayal of the women at the tomb. So he deleted a phrase that gives them a negative impression, i.e., 'they said nothing to anyone' from the OE.

The SE author's characterization of the women also differs from that of the LE author's. The LE author selected Mary Magdalene as the most positive figure (e.g., the first eyewitness of the resurrection of Jesus), and he portrayed her as holding the primary apostolic authority. However, the SE does not contain this positive portrayal of Mary Magdalene.

The SE's author also did not agree with the LE's author in his characterization of Peter. The LE's author did not depict Peter in a positive way, and by so doing he granted the primary apostolic authority to Mary Magdalene, rather than to Peter. However the SE's author, in contrast to the LE's author, presented Peter and the disciples as the first eyewitnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, and he especially singled out Peter among them.

The author of the SE strengthened the apostolic authority of Peter and the disciples by authenticating their mission. He shows the reader that the proclamation

is divine, and by so doing he emphasizes that they hold divine authority in performing their mission task; they are authorized agents of divine mission.

Therefore, it is assumed that the SE's primary ideological community was in favour of Peter and was at odds with, or at least not in favour of, Mary Magdalene. Compared with the LE, the SE is very simple and brief, and this shows that the SE was not interested in describing all that happened after the empty tomb event in detail. Despite the brevity and conciseness of the SE, it is still enough to alert us to the ideological identity of the SE.

CONCLUSION

The study of the Longer Ending and the Shorter Ending of Mark's Gospel in this thesis was an attempt to illuminate the ideology of the assumed ideological primary groups of the LE and the SE respectively, by reading these endings as responses to Mark's Gospel. This research was inspired by quite a simple question: 'Why are these two endings different from each other?' They are telling the reader the same story of the post-Easter event, but in a different way and from a different point of view. This observation was followed by another question: 'What has made these authors have different perspectives?'

The approach of my investigation to answer these questions was to take the authors of the LE and the SE as readers of Mark's Gospel. This means that the LE and the SE are ancient readers' responses to Mark's Gospel, which implies that the LE and the SE are fairly ideological literary productions. These authors read the Mark's Gospel that was available to them – regardless of whether it ended at Mk 16.8¹ or it has more story beyond Mk 16.8² – and composed their endings. They were not merely passive readers but active respondents who consumed what they read and created their own responses to it.

First of all, I surveyed the Markan scholarship concerning the Markan endings in Chapter One. Until comparatively lately, the Markan ending studies have been focused on the authenticity of the LE. The question of whether Mk 16.8 is the original ending of Mark's Gospel was pointed out even in the second century CE by early Church Fathers. The Markan authorship of the LE, however, had been believed

¹ This case assumes the original ending hypothesis (Mark's Gospel intended to end at Mk 16.8), the lost ending hypothesis and the mutilation (by someone else than these authors) hypothesis.

² This case assumes the mutilation hypothesis by the authors themselves.

as a 'matter of fact' for more than a thousand years until some pioneers of Markan ending study began to suspect it.

In this Chapter, I divided the Markan ending scholarship into two large groups. The argument of the first group of scholars is that Mk 16.8 is not the original ending, and that of the second is that it is the original ending of Mark's Gospel. The first group is divided into four small groups, according to their hypothesis of the Markan ending; (1) the LE as the original and intended ending of Mark's Gospel; (2) that the original ending was lost by accident (lost ending theory); (3) that the original ending was mutilated on purpose (mutilation theory); (4) that the Markan author could not finish his gospel for some reason (incomplete ending theory).

The argument of the second group is that Mk 16.8 was the Markan author's intended original ending to Mark's Gospel. This hypothesis that supposes the non-Markan authorship of the LE is dominant in the contemporary Markan ending scholarship, just as the hypothesis of Markan authorship of the LE was prevailing a few centuries ago. The hypothesis of Mk 16.8 as the original ending however, resulted in Markan scholars' indifference to the endings beyond Mk 16.8, since they are not Mark's Gospel. Recently some Markan scholars paid attention to the LE, but it was mainly concerning the question of Markan authorship of the LE, and was a challenge to another 'matter of fact' that presupposes Mk 16.8 as the original Markan ending.³ Furthermore, the SE has never, to the best of my knowledge, been studied in detail.

In Chapter One therefore, I argued the necessity of joint study of the LE and the SE. I also suggested that these endings should be studied for their own sake, rather than just to illuminate possible Markan authorship of these endings (i.e., 'Is

³ E.g., Croy, *Mutilation of Mark's Gospel*.

Mk 16.8 the Markan original ending?') or their origins (i.e., 'What is the source of these endings?').

In Chapter Two, I explained my methodology and the presuppositions I adopted to examine the LE and the SE. I employed an ideological critical perspective to illuminate the ideological identity of the assumed ideological primary groups of the LE and the SE. Ideological criticism presupposes that all (literary) productions are ideological; they are not objective and free from one's ideology either. I adopted one of Terry Eagleton's definitions of ideology to clarify the term of ideological criticism.

The ideology I employed was closely related to 'interests'. People tend to pursue their own interests and they often do so by eliminating their competitors or opponents. The main strategies to win the competition are promotion and legitimation. People promote what is favourable to their interests by emphasizing and highlighting them, and by concealing what is against their interests. They also legitimate their interests by making their ideology look natural, and by denigrating, excluding and obscuring the opponent's.

Ideological criticism is interested in the sound of silence in the literary production. It excavates the silenced and distorted voices in serving the ideological primary group's interests. In order to illuminate the power dynamics between the voices of the heard and the silenced, ideological criticism conducts the extrinsic analysis. The extrinsic examination is focused on the 'circumstances under which the author produced the text'.⁴ That is, it suggests the assumed matrix in which a literary production was brought out.

⁴ Yee, 'Ideological Criticism', pp. 535-36.

The second stage in conducting ideological criticism is the intrinsic analysis of the text. Ideological criticism presupposes that the literary production is one of the most effective ways that ideological groups/individuals use to make their voice heard. The intrinsic analysis is interested in the rhetorical function of the ideologically charged text. It explores *how* the author legitimates his or her ideology. Therefore, my intrinsic analysis examined various kinds of literary elements, above all characterization, but also plot, structure, and word choice by adopting literary critical methods.

Through the extrinsic and intrinsic analysis, ideological criticism suggests an assumed identity of the ideological primary group that produced an ideologically charged text. Therefore, the ideological primary group is purely an assumed and virtual community that is embedded within the text. It does not necessarily reflect the historical reality, because every literary production is ideological, and might have been distorted to serve the interests of ideological primary groups; they are historiographies rather than history.

In Chapter Three, I conducted the extrinsic analysis of the LE and the SE. For the extrinsic examination, I dealt with the contemporary literary productions of the LE and the SE, which covers the first few centuries CE. My interest was initially in the question of the importance of being an Appearance witness for early Christians. I argued that to be an eyewitness of the Appearance event was a critical and sensitive issue among early Christians, because it was often closely related to one's apostolic authority as a leader of his or her community.

The hypothesis that to be a witness of the Appearance event was crucial to be an authoritative leader in an early Christian community, was followed by the observation that many early Christian documents report the different list of the

Appearance witness. The discrepancies in the list are found not only in canonical documents such as the four gospels and Pauline epistles, but also in many other extra-canonical writings. These observations led me to suggest a hypothesis that there were conflicts among the early Christian groups over the question of who should be their authoritative apostolic leader.

In order to support this hypothesis, I examined some extra-canonical documents that deal with the post-Easter story. My examination categorized these documents in roughly two groups. One group of writings⁵ portrays Mary Magdalene positively, and even as holding supreme apostolic authority. Most of them depict Peter as her opponent, portraying him as inferior to her. In contrast to this group, the other group⁶ portrays Peter as a positive and authoritative figure by replacing Mary Magdalene with Peter. In some writings, Mary the mother of Jesus takes over Mary Magdalene's role as the first witness of the Appearance event.

The examination of these documents drew me to suggest a hypothesis that there were groups of early Christians who supported Mary Magdalene as their authoritative apostolic leader while others advocated Peter. These assumed groups competed with each other to make their voices heard by denigrating the competitor and portraying their leader positively. That is, there were the pro-Mary Magdalene/anti-Petrine group and the pro-Petrine/anti-Mary Magdalene group in early Christianity.

Chapters Four and Five dealt with the LE and the SE respectively, by employing literary critical methods. Chapter Four consisted of three parts; the first part dealt with the appearance of the resurrected Jesus to Mary Magdalene, the

⁵ This group includes the *Gospel of Mary*, the *Gospel of Thomas*, *Pistis Sophia*, the *Gospel of Philip*, the *Dialogue of the Saviour*, the *Greek Acts of Philip*, and the *Greek Acts of Philip Martyrdom*.

second to the two disciples, and the third to the Eleven. In the first part, I argued that Mary Magdalene held a supreme apostolic authority in the assumed LE's ideological community; she is depicted as the first and unique witness of the Appearance event. I also argued that the author depicts Peter as losing the competition with Mary Magdalene.

The LE's author highlights that the visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus is an important condition to hold an apostolic authority in his community. This theme flows throughout the three parts of the LE. This motif of visual encounter does not nullify the validity of hearing the message, because people are supposed to hear the proclamation and the Lord affirms it (part three). Therefore, I suggested that the visual encounter is only required for those who want to have apostolic leadership authority. That is, the LE's author provides the reader with a sort of guideline for the qualification of the leadership in the LE's community, and by so doing he recapitulates the apostolic authority of Mary Magdalene, who is depicted as the first and unique eyewitness.

In part two, I discussed the second scene where two disciples see the resurrected Jesus. I argued that the LE's author wanted to emphasize the theme of the importance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus, by repeating the same pattern he employed in the first part. I also pointed out that the LE's author, unlike the Markan author, did not adhere to Galilee as the place where the post-Easter Jesus movement was supposed to take place. This alerts us to the fact that if the assumed Markan community was the Galilean community, as some scholars suppose, the LE's community shares different views from the Markan community in this regard.

⁶ This group includes the *Coptic Acts of Philip*, the *Coptic Acts of Philip Martyrdom*, *Acta Thaddaei*, *Coptic Revillout Frgment 14* and the *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ by Bartholomew the Apostle*.

The third part of the LE was about the appearance and commission of the resurrected Jesus to the Eleven. The LE's author states that the Eleven disciples are commissioned to proclaim by the resurrected Jesus. The Eleven, like Mary Magdalene and two disciples, also see the resurrected Jesus and *then* they go out for mission. This shows us that the LE's author emphasizes the theme of the importance of visual encounter with the resurrected Jesus.

The LE's author at this stage gets rid of the negative impression of the Eleven disciples by referring to them as 'the Eleven', while the Markan author sticks to 'the Twelve', which bears a negative impression in the Markan narrative. By so doing, the LE's author makes them prepared for the mission task as qualified authentic agents. The LE's author re-authenticates the mission of the Eleven disciples by following the same pattern that the Markan author used to commission the Twelve disciples for the mission task in the Markan narrative. The male disciples of Jesus who were disqualified in the Markan narrative restore their honour in the LE.

The LE's author strengthens the re-authentication of the Eleven's mission by referring to Jesus as the Lord. The term of the Lord was used to refer to God in the Markan narrative. But the LE's author elevates Jesus as high as the Markan God, and by so doing he authenticates the Eleven's mission as divine.

The assumed LE's community was a mission-oriented group. The LE defines who could hold a qualified apostolic leadership in this community, and suggests Mary Magdalene – who is the first witness, and who had experienced one of five promised signs – as the supreme leader. They were also so interested in miracles that they believed miracles proved the divine affirmation of one's mission task. Besides faith/believing, they also claimed baptism as a condition of salvation; without

baptism, no salvation is guaranteed. Therefore, I suggested that baptism was one of the characteristics of this community.

In Chapter Five, I examined the SE from a literary critical point of view. It was noticeable that the author of the SE⁷ even changed the OE itself, while the LE's author merely added his ending to the OE. The emendation of the OE by the SE's author gives a glimpse of his ideology. The SE's author believed that the resurrection of Jesus was very important, and he could not be content with the Markan author's empty tomb story. So the SE's author clarified that Jesus rose from death by depicting the resurrection in quite a clear and descriptive manner.

The SE's author also did not agree with the Markan author in his characterization of the women at the tomb. Therefore he deleted the phrase of 'they said nothing to anyone', which might have given the reader a negative impression of the women if it remained within the text as it is in MK (Mark's Gospel that ends at Mk 16.8), from the OE.

The SE exhibits differences from the LE in its characterization of important figures such as Mary Magdalene and Peter. The SE's author downgrades Mary Magdalene by obscuring her in the description of their delivering the angelic young man's message. She was the first and unique eyewitness of the Appearance event in the LE. But she is not in the SE.

Rather, Peter and the disciples replace the LE's Mary Magdalene. It is Peter and the disciples who are the first eyewitnesses of the Appearance event in the SE. The SE's author especially singles out Peter from them by clearly mentioning his name. The SE's author, like the LE's author, was interested in mission. However, the divine authentication of their mission is more highlighted in the SE. In the LE, the

⁷ By the author of the SE, I mean the assumed (Greek) author of the Mark's Gospel in the Codex *k* (MK+SE). See Chapter Five, 'Introduction'.

Eleven perform the mission task and Jesus affirms their works. However in the SE, it is Jesus himself who makes the proclamation spread out throughout the world. Therefore, the apostolic authority of Peter and the disciples is emphasized in the SE. This alerts us to the hypothesis that the assumed SE's ideological primary community was in favour of Peter and was a pro-Petrine/anti-Mary Magdalene community.

Some Markan scholars have interpreted the LE and the SE from their own perspectives. For instance, some scholars understand the LE as an alternative ending to Mark's Gospel. They assume that the LE's author believed the OE was not suitable for concluding Mark's Gospel. Therefore they understand the LE as a result of this ancient author's harmonization to make the ending of his Mark's Gospel look more natural. They also interpret discrepancies between the LE and the SE in this light.

Others studied the LE in order to illuminate its authorship or its literary sources. Some of them were interested in such questions as whether the LE was composed by the same author of Mark's Gospel and whether Mk 16.8 is the original intended ending of Mark's Gospel. Others tried to illuminate what source the LE's author used, presupposing that this ending is not Markan. They examined the LE and compared it with Mark's Gospel or with other literary productions.

I did not want to nullify their arguments or suggestions. Rather, I wanted to suggest another way to the interpretation of the LE and the SE from a different perspective in this thesis. I read these endings as a result of ancient readers' responses to Mark's Gospel. Therefore, I was interested in the ideological relationship between MK, especially the OE, and the LE or the SE respectively. I

also interpreted the LE and the SE in relation to the contemporary assumed social matrix within which they were produced.

In this light, this thesis might be a kind of experimental exploration of other endings of Mark that have not received serious interest from Markan scholars for a long time. I believe that my thesis suggested alternative ways to read the LE and the SE. These ways may be related to textual criticism, literary criticism in a broad sense (especially rhetorical criticism or reader-response criticism, and characterization analysis), social-scientific approach, and even to historical criticism. Therefore, I hope my methodology will provide some inspiration to these approaches and methodologies.

I do not believe that my thesis has put a period to Markan ending scholarship; rather, I should admit its imperfection. For instance, it is regretful that I could not discuss the FLE due to the limit of time and space within this thesis. Unlike the LE and the SE, the study of the FLE is more complicated. The LE and the SE are the responses to Mark's Gospel. However, the FLE is the response to the LE, which is also a response to Mark's Gospel. Therefore, the study of the FLE requires more intricate procedures than that of the LE and the SE, and we would need much more space to explore it.

However, complicacy does not mean impossibility or worthlessness. Rather, it needs to be investigated further. The FLE may be approached as a response to the LE. For example, a few questions may be raised such as 'How is the FLE author's characterization of the Eleven different from the LE author's, and how are discrepancies understood from an ideological critical perspective?' 'How is the dualistic theme in the FLE understood in relation to the contemporary social matrix of its production?' 'How are the FLE author's word choice or phrases such as

“Messiah”, “this age”, “righteousness” and “the limit of the years of the authority of Satan” understood, and what do they alert us to in terms of the author’s ideology? Furthermore, the LE that contains the FLE (i.e., the LE of the Codex Washingtonianus, W) may also be studied in terms of its ideological relationship with MK, the LE or the SE.

In this regard, Markan scholarship will be able to find a new research field in the study of Markan endings. I believe that other endings of Mark’s Gospel are like a field of abundance, and I hope more Markan workers will join the harvest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Paul J., *Mark* (Proclamation Commentary; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
- Aland, Kurt and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. Erroll F. Rhodes; 2nd edn.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989).
- Alford, Henry, *The Greek New Testament: With a Critically Revised Text, Prolegomena and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary; vol 1. The Four Gospels* (London: Rivington, 1868).
- Allen, Willoughby C., 'St. Mark 16.8, "They were afraid." Why?', *JTS* 47 (1946), pp. 46-49.
- Alsup, John E., *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel-Traditions* (London: SPCK, 1975).
- Alter, Robert, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (NY: Basic Books, 1981).
- Althusser, Louis, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (trans. Ben Brewster; London: New Left Books, 1971).
- Anderson, Hugh, *The Gospel of Mark: Based on the Revised Standard Version* (New Century Bible Commentary; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981).
- Anderson, Janice C., 'Feminist Criticism: The Dancing Daughter', in Janice C. Anderson and Stephen D. Moore (eds.), *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 103-34.
- Arai, Sasagu, "'To Make Her Male": an Interpretation of Logion 114 in the Gospel of Thomas', *StPatr* 24 (1993), pp. 373-76.
- Atwood, Richard, *Mary Magdalene in the New Testament Gospels and Early Tradition* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1993).
- Bakker, Adolphine, *A Study of Codex Evang. Bobbiensis* (Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933).
- _____ *A Full Collation of Codex Ev. Bobbiensis (k)* (Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1933).
- Bacon, Benjamin W., *The Beginning of the Gospel Story: A Historico-critical Inquiry into the Sources and Structure of the Gospel According to Mark: with Expository Notes upon the Text for English Readers* (New Haven: H. Frowde, 1909).
- _____ *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (New Haven: Yale University Press,

1925).

- Bailey, Kenneth E., *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).
- Bar-Efrat, Shimon, *Narrative Art in the Bible* (JSNTSup 70; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
- Barnett, Paul W., 'Apostle', in G.F. Hawthorne and R.P. Martin (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (Leicester and Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1993), pp. 45-51.
- Barnouin, M., 'Marie, Mère de Jacques et de José (Marc 15.40): Quelques Observations', *NTS* 42 (1996), pp. 472-74.
- Barrett, Michèle, *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
- Beasley-Murray, George R., 'Review of "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark" by William R. Farmer', *RevExp* 72 (1975), pp. 373-75.
- _____, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd., 1962).
- Beasley-Murray, Paul, 'Baptism for the Initiated', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 467-76.
- Best, Ernest, *Disciples and Discipleship: Studies in the Gospel According to Mark* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986).
- _____, 'Paul's Apostolic Authority – ?', *JSNT* 27 (1986), pp. 3-25.
- Bible and Culture Collective, *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Bickermann, E., 'Das leere Grab', *ZNW* 23 (1924), pp. 281-92.
- Birdsall, J. Neville, 'Review of "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark" by W.R. Farmer', *JTS* 26 (1975), pp. 151-60.
- Bolt, Peter G., 'Mark 16:1-8: The Empty Tomb of a Hero?' *TynBul* 47.1 (1996), pp. 27-37.
- Boomershine, Thomas E. and Gilbert L. Bartholomew, 'The Narrative Technique of Mark 16.8', *JBL* 100/2 (1981), pp. 213-23.
- Boomershine, Thomas E., 'Mark 16:8 and the Apostolic Commission', *JBL* 100/2 (1981), pp. 225-39.
- Booth, Wayne C., *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd edn; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983).

- Borrell, Agusti, *The Good News of Peter's Denial: A Narrative and Rhetorical Reading of Mark 14.54, 66-72* (trans. Sean Conlon; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).
- Bovon, François, 'Le Privilège Pascal de Marie-Madeleine', *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 50-62.
- _____ 'Les Actes de Philippe', in *ANRW* 2:25/6 (1988), pp. 4432-4525.
- Bovon, François, Bertrand Bouvier, and Frédéric Amsler (trans.), *Actes de l'apôtre Philippe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996).
- _____ B. Bouvier and F. Amsler (eds.), *Acta Philippi: Textus* (CCSA 11; Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 1999).
- Branscomb, B. Harvie, *The Gospel of Mark* (Moffatt New Testament Commentary; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1946).
- Brock, Ann G., 'What's in a Name: The Competition for Authority in Early Christian Texts', in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1998 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), pp. 106-24.
- _____ 'Peter, Paul, and Mary: Canonical vs. Non-Canonical Portrayals of Apostolic Witnesses', in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1999 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), pp. 173-202.
- _____ 'Setting the Record Straight – The Politics of Identification: Mary Magdalene and Mary the Mother in *Pistis Sophia*', in Jones, F. Stanley (ed.), *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition* (SBLSymS 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), pp. 43-52.
- _____ *Mary Magdalene, the First Apostle: the struggle for authority* (HTS 51; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).
- Brock, Rita N., *Journeys by Heart: A Christology of Erotic Power* (NY: Crossroad, 1995).
- Brown, Raymond E., *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* (NY: Doubleday, 1994).
- _____ 'The Burial of Jesus (Mark 15.42-47)', *CBQ* 50 (1988), pp. 233-48.
- Brown, Raymond E., et als (eds.), *Mary in the New Testament* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1978).
- Budge, E.A. Wallis, *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London: British Museum, 1913).
- Burgon, John W., *The Revision Revised* (London: John Murray, 1883).
- _____ *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to Mark* (Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1987).

- _____ *The Traditional Texts of the Holy Gospel* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1896).
- Burkill, T. Alec, 'The Syrophoenician Woman: The Congruence of Mark 7:24-31', *ZNW* 57 (1966), pp. 23-37.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford, *The Old Latin and the Itala* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1896).
- _____ *Two Lectures on the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1901).
- _____ 'Further Notes on Codex *k*', *JTS* 5 (1904), pp. 100-107.
- Butler, Christopher, *Interpretation, Deconstruction and Ideology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).
- Cadbury, Henry J., 'Brief Communications: Mark 16.8', *JBL* 46 (1927), pp. 344-45.
- Cartwright, Michael G., 'Ideology and Interpretation of the Bible in the African-American Christian Tradition', *ModT* 9 (1993), pp. 145-52.
- Catchpole, David, 'The Fearful Silence of the Women at the Tomb', *JTSA* 18 (1977), pp. 3-10.
- Chatman, Seymour, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978).
- Clark, Kenneth W., 'Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament', *JBL* 85 (1966), pp. 1-16.
- Clines, David J.A., *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- Collins, Adela Yarbro, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probing of Mark in Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).
- _____ 'Mysteries in the Gospel of Mark', *ST* 1/49 (1995), pp. 11-23.
- _____ 'The Empty Tomb in the Gospel According to Mark', in E. Stump et al. (eds.), *Hermes and Athena* (Notre Dame, ND: University of Notre Dame, 1993), pp. 107-40.
- Collins, Raymond F., *First Corinthians* (D.J. Harrington [ed.]; Sacra Pagina Series vol. 7; Minnesota: the Liturgical Press, 1999).
- Colwell, Ernest C., 'The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts', in Allen P. Wikgren (ed.), *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby* (Chicago: Quardangle Books, 1961), pp. 128-38.
- Conybeare, Frederick C., 'Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark', *ExpTim*, 4th series, viii (1893), pp. 241-54
- _____ 'On the Last Twelve Verses of St. Mark's Gospel', *ExpTim*, 5th series, ii (1895), pp.

401-21.

- Cote, Mary, 'Women, Silence and Fear (Mark 16.8)', in George J. Brooke (ed.), *Women in the Biblical Tradition* (NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), pp. 150-66.
- Cox, Steven L., *The History and Critique of Scholarship Concerning the Markan Endings* (Lampeter, UK: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1993).
- Cranfield, C.E.B., *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).
- _____ 'St. Mark 16.1-8', *SJT* 5 (1952), pp. 398-413.
- Creed, John M., 'The Conclusion of the Gospel According to Saint Mark', *JTS* 31 (1930), pp. 175-80.
- Cross, Anthony R., 'The Meaning of "Baptisms" in Hebrews 6.2', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (JSNTSup 234; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 163-80.
- Crossan, John D., 'Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16.1-8)', in Werner H. Kelber (ed.), *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), pp. 135-52.
- _____ 'Mark and the Relatives of Jesus', *NovT* 15 (1973), pp. 81-113.
- _____ 'A Form for Absence: the Markan Creation of Gospel', *Semeia* 12 (1978), pp. 41-55.
- _____ *The Birth of Christianity* (NY: HarperCollins, 1998).
- Crouch, Walter B., 'To Question an End, To End a Question: Opening the Closure of the Book of Jonah', *JSOT* 62 (1994), pp. 101-12.
- Croy, N. Clayton, *The Mutilation of Mark's Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003).
- Culley, Robert C., *Themes and Variations: A Study of Action in Biblical Narrative* (SBLSS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).
- Culpepper, R. Alan, 'The Passion and Resurrection in Mark', *RevExp* 75 (1978), pp. 583-600.
- Danove, Paul L., *The End of Mark's Story: A Methodological Study* (Leiden; NY; Köln: E.J. Brill, 1993).
- _____ 'The Characterization and Narrative Function of the Women at the Tomb (Mark 15.40-41, 47; 16-1-8)', *Bib* 77/3 (1996), pp. 375-97.
- Davis, Philip R., *In Search of Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 148; Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).
- Davis, Stevan L., *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom* (NY: The Seabury Press, 1983).

- De Boer, E., *Mary Magdalene: Beyond the Myth* (PA: Trinity Press International, 1997).
- De Conick, April D., *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas* (VCSup 33; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
- Derrett, J. Duncan M., 'Christ's Second Baptism (Lk 12.50; Mk 10.38-40)', *ExpTim* 100 (1989), pp. 294-95.
- Dewey, Joanna, *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6* (SBLDS, 48; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980).
- _____ 'The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2.1-3.6', *JBL* 92 (1976), pp. 394-401.
- Dockery, Davis S., 'Baptism', in Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Leicester, Downers Grove; IVP, 1992), pp. 55-58.
- Dunn, James D.G., "'Baptized" as Metaphor', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 294-310.
- Dwyer, Timothy, *The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup 128; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- Dyck, Jonathan E., 'A Map of Ideology for Biblical Critics', in Mark Daniel and Carroll R. (eds.), *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), pp. 108-28.
- Eagleton, Terry, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London, NY: Verso, 1991).
- _____ *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983).
- _____ *Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory* (London: Verso, 1976).
- Eco, Umberto, *Lector in Fabula* (trans. W.C. Kim; Seoul: The Open Books Co., 1996).
- Elliott, James K., *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: an Edition of C.H. Turner's "Notes on Marcan Usage" Together with Other Comparable Studies* (Leiden; NY; Koln: E.J. Brill, 1993).
- _____ *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- _____ 'The Text and Language of the Ending of Mark's Gospel', *TZ* 27 (1971), pp. 255-62.
- Emmel, Stephen, 'The Dialogue of the Savior (III, 5)', in NHL, pp. 243-55.
- Enslin, Morton S., 'ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ Mark 16.8', *JBL* 46 (1927), pp. 62-68.
- Evans, Craig A., *Mark 8.27-16.20* (Word Biblical Commentary 34b; Nashville: Thomas

- Nelson Publishers, 2001).
- Evans, Christopher Francis, *Resurrection and the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1981).
- _____, 'I Will Go Before You into Galilee', *JTS* (1954), pp. 3-18.
- Farmer, William R., *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- Fee, Gordon D., 'Review of "The Last Twelve Verses of Mark" by W.R. Farmer', *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 461-64.
- Fenton, John, 'The Mother of Jesus in Mark's Gospel and its Revisions', *Theology* 86 (1983), pp. 433-37.
- Ferguson, E., 'Christians and Jewish Baptism According to the *Epistle of Barnabas*', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Dimensions of Baptism: Biblical and Theological Studies* (JSNTSup 234; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 207-23.
- Fish, Stanley, *Is There Text in This Class?* (London: Harvard University Press, 1980).
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979).
- Foster, John, 'St. Paul and Women', *ExpTim* 62 (1950-51), pp. 376-79.
- Fowl, Stephen, 'Texts Don't Have Ideologies', *BI* 3 (1995), pp. 15-34.
- Fowler, Robert M., *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- Freyne, S., *Galilee Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
- Fuller, David Otis, *Counterfeit or Genuine: Mark 16? John 8?* (Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975).
- Funk, Robert, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988).
- Gaventa, Beverly R., *Mary: Glimpses of the Mother of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999).
- Genette, G., *Narrative Discourse* (trans. J.E. Lewin; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980).
- Gibson, W., 'Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers', in Jane P. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 1-6.
- Goodspeed, E.J., 'The Original Conclusion of the Gospel of Mark', *AJT* 9 (1905), pp. 484-90.

- Gottwald, Norman K., *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel 1250-150 BCE* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979).
- Graham, Gordon, *Philosophy of the Arts: An Introduction to Aesthetics* (London, NY: Routledge, 1997).
- Grässer, E., 'Jesus in Nazareth', *NTS* 16 (1969/70), pp. 1-23.
- Green, Joel B., 'From "John's Baptism" to "Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus": the Significance of Baptism in Luke-Acts' in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 157-72.
- Gregory, C. René, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907).
- Griesbach, Johann J., *Io. Iac. Griesbachii Theol. D. et Prof Primar in academia Jenensi Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur, scripta nomine Academiae Jenensis, (1789. 1790) jam recognita multisque augmentis locupletata;*, in B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff (trans. and eds.), *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text Critical Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
- Guelich, Robert A., *Mark 1.1-8.26* (Word Biblical Commentary 34a; TX: Word Books, 1989).
- Gundry, Robert H., *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).
- Guthrie, Donald, *New Testament Introduction* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1970).
- Hagner, D.A., 'James', in *ABD vol. 3* (D.N. Freedman [ed.]; NY: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 616-18.
- Haines-Eitzen, K., *Guardians of Letters: Literary, Power, and the Transmission of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Hamilton, Neil Q., 'The Resurrection Tradition and the Composition of Mark', *JBL* 84 (1965), pp. 415-21.
- Hanson, James, 'The Disciples in Mark's Gospel: Beyond the Pastoral/Polcmical Dcbate', *HBT* 20/2 (1998), pp. 128-55.
- Hartman, Lars, 'Baptism', in *ABD vol. 1* (D.N. Freedman [ed.]; NY: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 583-94.
- Haskins, Susan, *Mary Magdalene: Myth and Metaphor* (NY: Riverhead Books, 1993).

- Havelock, Eric A., 'Oral Composition in the Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles', *NLH* 16 (1984), pp. 175-97.
- Heil, John P., 'The Progressive Narrative Pattern of Mark 14.53-16.8', *Bib* 73 (1992), pp. 331-58.
- Heise, Ursula K., *Chronoschisms: Time, Narrative, and Postmodernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Hennecke, E., *New Testament Apocrypha vol. 1: Gospels and Related Writings* (W. Schneemelcher [ed.]; R. McL. Wilson [trans.]; London: Lutterworth Press, 1963).
- Hickling, C.J.A., 'Baptism in the First-Century Churches: A Case for Caution', in David J.A. Clines, Stephen E. Fowl and Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in celebration of forty years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* (JSOTSup 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), pp. 249-67.
- Hills, E.F., 'The Magnificent Dean Burgon and the Original Text', in David O. Fuller (ed.) *Counterfeit or Genuine: Mark 16? John 8?* (Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1975), pp. 15-24.
- Hirsch, Eric D., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967).
- Hochman, Baruch, *Character in Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985).
- Hodges, Zane C., 'The Greek Text of the King James Version', *BS* 125/500 (October-December, 1968), pp. 339-45.
- van der Horst, Pieter W., 'Can a Book End with ΓΑΡ? – a note on Mk 16.8', *JTS* 23 (1972), pp. 121-24.
- Hug, Joseph, *La Finale de L'Évangile de Marc (Mc 16.9-20)* (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie Éditeurs, 1978).
- Hurtado, Larry W., *Mark* (A Good News Commentary; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983).
- van Iersel, B.M.F., 'Failed Followers in Mark: Mark 13:12 as a Key for the Identification of the Intended Readers', *CBQ* 58 (1996), pp. 244-63.
- _____ 'The Gospel according to st. Mark - written for a persecuted community?', *NedTTs* 34 (1980), pp. 15-36.
- _____ *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary* (JSNTSup 164; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- _____ "'To Galilee" or "in Galilee" in Mark 14.28 and 16.7?', *ETL* 58 (1982), pp. 365-70.
- Isenberg, Wesley W., 'The Gospel of Philip (II, 3)', in *NHL*, pp. 138-60.

- Iser, Wolfgang, *The Act of Reading* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
- _____ 'Interaction between Text and Reader', in Suleiman and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 106-19
- _____ 'The Reading Process. A Phenomenological Approach', *NLH* 3 (Winter 1971/2), pp. 279-99.
- Jameson, Frederic, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981).
- _____ 'A Conversation with Frederic Jameson', *Semeia* 59 (1992), pp. 227-38.
- Jenkins, Allan K., 'Young Man or Angel', *ExpTim* 94 (1983), pp. 237-40.
- Jeremias, Joachim, *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962).
- Jobling, David, 'Writing the Wrongs of the World: The Deconstruction of the Biblical Text in the Context of Liberation Theologies', *Semeia* 51 (1990), pp. 81-118.
- _____ 'Feminism and 'Mode of Production' in Ancient Israel: Search for a Method', in David Jobling et al. (eds.), *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis* (Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press, 1991), pp. 239-52.
- Johnson, Harry M., 'Ideology: Ideology and the Social System', in David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 7* (Macmillan Co and Free Press, 1968), pp. 76-85.
- Johnson, Luke T., *Religious Experience in Earliest Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).
- Johnson, Steven R., 'The Identity and Significance of the Neaniskos in Mark', *Forum* 8 (1992), pp. 123-39.
- Jones, F. Stanley (ed.), *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition* (SBLSymS 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002).
- Juel, Donald H., *Mark* (Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament; Minneapolis, Augsburg Pub. House, 1990).
- Katz, Peter, 'The Early Christians' Use of Codices instead of Rolls', *JTS* 46 (1945), pp. 63-65.
- Kee, Howard C., *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1980).
- Keenan, John P., *The Gospel of Mark: A Mahayana Reading* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995).
- Kelber, Werner H., *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).
- _____ *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press,

- 1974).
- _____ 'Apostolic Tradition and the Form of the Gospel', in F.F. Segovia (ed.), *Discipleship in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), pp. 39-42.
- Kelhoffer, James A., *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- _____ 'The Witness of Eusebius' *ad Marinum* and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark's Gospel', *ZNW* 92 (2001), pp. 78-112.
- Kermode, Frank, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (London; Oxford; NY: Oxford University Press, 1967).
- Kevin, Robert O., 'The Lost Ending of the Gospel according to Mark', *JBL* 45 (1926), pp. 81-103.
- Kim, Young-Bong, 'Rereading of Philemon', in <http://mail.hyupsung.ac.kr/~bongbong/articles3.zip>. (Dec.20th, 2001).
- King, Karen L., 'The Gospel of Mary Magdalene', in Elisabeth S. Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures Volume Two: A Feminist Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1995), pp. 601-34.
- _____ 'Why All the Controversy? Mary in the Gospel of Mary', in F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition* (SBLSymS 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), pp. 53-74.
- Kingsbury, Jack D., *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989).
- _____ *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).
- Knox, Wilfred L., 'The Ending of St. Mark's Gospel', *HTR* 35 (1942), pp. 13-23.
- Koester, Helmut and Elaine H. Pagels, 'Introduction' to 'The Dialogue of the Savior (III,5)', in NHL, pp. 244-46.
- Kraeling, Carl H., 'Brief Communications: A Philological Note on Mark 16.8', *JBL* 44 (1925), pp. 357-58.
- Krieger, Murray, *A Window to Criticism; Shakespeare's Sonnets and Modern Poetics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964).
- Kristeva, Julia, 'Stabat Mater', L.S. Roudiez (trans.), in Toril Moi (ed.), *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp. 160-86.
- Lambdin, Thomas O., 'The Gospel of Thomas (II, 2)', in NHL, pp. 124-38.

- Lambrecht, Jan, 'The Relatives of Jesus in Mark', *NovT* 16 (1974), pp. 241-58.
- Lane, William L., *The Gospel According to Mark* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).
- Larrain, Jorge, *The Concept of Ideology* (London: Hutchinson, 1979).
- LaVerdiere, Eugene, 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20)', *Emmanuel* 103 (April 1997), pp. 156-64.
- _____ 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20). Interpretation', *Emmanuel* 103 (May 1997), pp. 232-39.
- _____ 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20). Interpretation (cont.)', *Emmanuel* 103 (June 1997), pp. 282-90.
- _____ 'The Gospel According to Mark: The Longer Ending, An Alternate Ending (16.9-20). Interpretation (cont.)', *Emmanuel* 103 (July, August 1997), pp. 358-65.
- Lightfoot, Robert H., *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950).
- _____ *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938).
- Lincoln, Andrew T., 'The Promise and the Failure', *JBL* 108/2 (1989), pp. 283-300.
- Loader, W.R.G., 'Christ at the Right Hand: Ps. CX.1 in the New Testament', *NTS* 24 (1978), pp. 199-217.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957).
- _____ *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (Göttingen: Vandenhæck & Ruprecht, 1936).
- Lucchesi, Enzo, 'Évangile selon Marie ou Évangile selon Marie-Madeleine?', *AnBoll* 103 (1985), p. 366.
- Lunny, William J., *The Sociology of the Resurrection* (London: SCM Press, 1989).
- Luz, Ulrich., 'The Secrecy Motif and the Marcan Christology', in C. Tuckett (ed.), *The Messianic Secret* (London: SPCK, 1983), pp. 75-96.
- Macherey, Pierre, *A Theory of Literary Production* (trans. G. Wall; London: Routledge, 1985).
- MacRae, George W. and R. McL. Wilson (trans.), 'The Gospel of Mary (BG 8502, 1)', in NHL, pp. 523-27.
- Magness, J. Lee, *Sense and Absence: Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).
- Maisch, Ingrid, *Mary Magdalene: The Image of a Woman through the Centuries* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Collegeville, Minnesota: the Liturgical Press, 1998).
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (Sheffield: JSOT

- Press, 1991).
- _____ 'Galilee and Jerusalem: History and Literature in Marcan Interpretation', *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 242-55.
- _____ 'Fallible Followers: women and men in the Gospel of Mark', *Semina* 28 (1983), pp. 29-48.
- _____ 'The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee', *JBL* 103/3 (1984), pp. 363-77.
- _____ 'Disciples/ Crowds/ Whoever: Marcan Characterization and Readers', *NovT* 28/2 (1986), pp. 104-30.
- _____ 'Text and Context: Interpreting the Disciples in Mark', *Semeia* 62 (1993), pp. 81-102.
- _____ 'Echoes and Foreshadowings in Mark 4-8: Reading and Rereading', *JBL* 112/2 (1993), pp. 211-30.
- Mann, C.S., *Mark* (the Anchor Bible 27; NY: Doubleday, 1986).
- Marcus, Joel, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville: WJKP, 1992).
- Marjanen, Antti, 'Women disciples in the *Gospel of Thomas*', in R. Uro (ed.), *Thomas at the Crossroad: Essays on the Gospel of Thomas* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), pp. 89-106.
- _____ *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
- _____ 'The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts', in F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition* (SBLSymS 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), pp. 31-41.
- Marshall, Christopher D., *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Martin, Dale B., *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Martin, J.P.P., *Introduction à la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament; vol 2* (Paris : Maisonneuve frères et C. Leclerc, 1884).
- Marxsen, W., *Mark, the Evangelist* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969).
- _____ *The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth* (trans. M. Kohl; London: SCM, 1970).
- Matera, Frank J., *Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15* (SBLDS 66; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982).

- McArthur, H.K., 'Son of Mary', *NovT* 15 (1973), pp. 38-58.
- McDonald, James I.H., *The Resurrection: Narrative and Belief* (London: SPCK, 1989).
- McHugh, John, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (London: Longman & Todd Ltd., 1975).
- McKnight, Scot, *A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- Merenlahti, Petri, 'Characters in Making: Individuality and Ideology in the Gospels', in David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative-Criticism* (JSNTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Metzger, Bruce M., *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- _____, *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).
- _____, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).
- _____, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).
- Meye, Robert P., 'Mark 16:8 - The Ending of Mark's Gospel', *BibRes* 14 (1969), pp. 33-43.
- Meyer, A. and W. Bauer, 'The Relatives of Jesus', in B. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha vol. 1: Gospels and Related Writings* (W. Schneemelcher [ed.]; R.McL. Wilson [trans.]; London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), pp. 418-32.
- Meyer, Michael W., 'Make Mary Male: The Categories "Male" and "Female" in the Gospel of Thomas', *NTS* 31 (1985), pp. 554-70.
- Miguens, Manuel, *The Virgin Birth: An Evaluation of Scriptural Evidence* (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1975).
- Miller, Robert J., *The Complete Gospel: Annotated Scholars Version* (NY: HarperCollins, 1994).
- Mirecki, Paul A., 'The Antithetic Saying in Mark 16:16: Formal and Redactional Features', in Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp. 229-41.
- Mitchell, Joan L., *Beyond Fear and Silence: A Feminist-Literary Reading of Mark* (NY & London: Continuum, 2001).
- Moltmann-Wendel, E., *The Women around Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1982).

- Moule, C.F.D., 'St Mark 16.8 Once More', *NTS* 2 (1955), pp. 58-59.
- Munro, Winsome, 'Women Disciples in Mark?', *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 225-41.
- Myers, Ched, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1988).
- Nineham, D.E., *The Gospel of Saint Mark* (London: Penguin Books, 1976).
- Nolland, John, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35b; Dallas: Wordbooks, 1993).
- Ong, Walter J., *Orality and Literacy* (NY: Routledge, 1982).
- Ottley, R.R., 'εφοβουντο γαρ Mark xvi 8', *JTS* 27 (1926), pp. 407-409.
- Pagels, Elaine H., *The Gnostic Gospels* (NY: Vintage Books, 1981).
- Painter, John, *Just James: The Brothers of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).
- _____, *Mark's Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- Pallares, José C., *A Poor Man Called Jesus: Reflections on the Gospel of Mark* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1986).
- Palmer, David G., *The Markan Matrix: A Literary-Structural Analysis of the Gospel of Mark* (Paisley, UK: Ceridwen Press, 1999).
- Palmer, D.W., 'Notes and Studies: the origin, form, and purpose of Mark XVI. 4 in Codex Bobbiensis', *JTS* 27 (1976), pp. 113-22.
- Parker, David C., *The Living Text of the Gospels* (NY; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- _____, 'Unequally Yoked: the Present State of the Codex Bobbiensis', *JTS* 42/2 (1991), pp. 581-88.
- Parrinder, Geoffrey, *Son of Joseph: the Parentage of Jesus* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992).
- Parrott, Douglas M., 'Gnostic and Orthodox Disciples in the Second and Third Centuries', in Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr. (eds.), *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1986), pp. 193-219.
- Pasquier, Anne, *L'Évangile selon Maries* (Québec : Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1983).
- Pearson, Brook W.R., 'Baptism and Initiation in the Cult of Isis and Sarapis', in Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross (eds.), *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White* (JSNTSup 171; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 42-62.
- Penchansky, David, 'Up For Grabs: A Tentative Proposal for Doing Ideological Criticism', *Semiea* 59 (1992), pp. 35-42.

- Perkins, Pheme, 'The Gospel of Thomas', in Elisabeth S. Fiorenza (ed.), *Searching the Scriptures Volume Two: A Feminist Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1995), pp. 535-60.
- _____ *The Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism* (NY: Paulist, 1980).
- Perrin, Norman *The Resurrection according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).
- _____ *The Resurrection Narratives: A New Approach* (London: SCM Press, 1977).
- Perry, Menakhem, 'Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates its Meanings', <http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/publications/poetics/art/lit4.html>. (accessed on 7th June, 2002; print copy under the same title in *Poetics Today* 1/1 [1979], pp. pp. 35-64, 311-61.).
- Pesch, Rudolf, *Das Markusevangelium, Teil 2: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap 8.27-16.20* (HTKNT/II; Freiburg: Herder, 1984).
- _____ *Das Markusevangelium, Teil 1* (HTKNT/II; Freiburg: Herder, 1984).
- _____ 'Der Schluss der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte und des Markusevangeliums: Mk 15.42-16.8', in M. Sabbe (ed.) *L'Évangile selon Marc* (BETL 34; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974), pp. 365-409.
- Petersen, Norman R., 'When is the End Not the End? Literary Reflections on the Ending of Mark's Narrative', *Int* 34 (1980), pp. 151-66.
- _____ *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).
- Phillips, Victoria, 'Full Disclosure: Toward a Complete Characterization of the Women who Followed Jesus in the Gospel According to Mark', in Ingrid G. Kitzberger (ed.), *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 13-32.
- Powell, Mark A., *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (London: SPCK, 1993).
- Prince, Gerald, 'Notes on the Text as Reader', in Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 225-40.
- _____ 'Introduction to the Study of the Naratee', in Jane P. Tompkins (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), pp. 7-25.
- Probyn, H.E.H., 'The End of the Gospel of St. Mark', *Expositor Ninth Series* 4 (1925), pp. 120-25.

- Pusey, Karen, 'Jewish Proselyte Baptism' *ExpTim* 95 (1984), pp. 141-45.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J., "'What's Hecuba to Us?'" The Audience's Experience of Literary Borrowing', in Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 241-63.
- Radcliffe, Timothy, 'The Coming of the Son of Man: Mark's Gospel and the Subversion of "the apocalyptic imagination"', in Brian Davies OP. (ed.), *Language, Meaning and God: Essay in honour of Herbert McCabe OP* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1987), pp. 176-89.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J., *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1936).
- Reedy, Charles J., 'Mk 8.31-11.10 and the Gospel Ending: A Redaction Study', *CBQ* 34 (1972), pp. 188-97.
- Reicke, Bo, 'Griesbach's Answer to the Synoptic Question', (trans. R. Walls), in *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text Critical Studies* (B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff [trans. and eds.]; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 50-67.
- Rengstorf, Karl H., 'ἀπόστολος', in *TDNT vol. 1* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 407-47.
- Rhoads, David et al., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2nd edn, 1999).
- _____ 'The Syrophoenician Woman in Mark: A Narrative-Critical Study', *JAAR* 62 (1992), pp. 342-75.
- Ricoeur, Paul, *Time and Narrative* (trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer; Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1985).
- Riley, Harold, *The Making of Mark: an exploration* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1989).
- Rimmom-Kenan, Shlomith, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Routledge, 1983).
- Roberts, C.H., 'The ancient book and the ending of St. Mark', *JTS* 40 (1939), pp. 253-57.
- Roberts, Keith A., *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (CA: Wadsworth, 1990).
- Salmon, George, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament* (London: John Murray, 1885).
- Saxer, Victor, 'Marie Madeleine dans le commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le Cantique des Cantiques', *RevB* 101 (1991), pp. 219-39.
- Schaberg, Jane, *The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987).

- _____ 'How Mary Magdalene Became a Whore', *BR* 8/October (1992), pp. 30-37, 51-52.
- Schmid, Josef, *The Gospel According to Mark* (trans. K. Condon; Cork: the Mercier Press, 1968).
- Schmidt, Carl (ed.), *Pistis Sophia* (trans. V. MacDermot; NHS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1978).
- Schnellbächer, E.L., 'The Temple as Focus of Mark's Theology', *HBT* 5/2 (1983), pp. 95-112.
- Schoedel, William R., 'The (First) Apocalypse of James (V, 3)', in NHL, pp. 260-68.
- Schottroff, Luise, *Let the Oppressed Go Free: Feminist Perspectives on the New Testament* (Louisville:W/JKP, 1992).
- Schreiber, Johannes, 'Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums', *ZTK* 58 (1961), pp. 175-79.
- Scroggs, Robin and Kent I. Groff, 'Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ', *JBL* 92/4 (1977), pp. 531-48.
- Segovia, Fernando F., 'Cultural Studies and Contemporary Biblical Criticism', in Fernando F. Segovia and Mary A. Tolbert (eds.), *Reading from this Place, vol. 2* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 1-17.
- Shils, Edward, 'Ideology: The Concept and Function of Ideology', in David L. Sills (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, vol. 7* (London: Macmillan Co and Free Press, 1968), pp. 66-76.
- Shiner, Whitney T., *Follow Me!: Disciples in Markan Rhetoric* (SBLDS 145; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Shoemaker, Stephen J., 'A Case of Mistaken Identity? Naming the Gnostic Mary', in F. Stanley Jones (ed.), *Which Mary? The Marys of Early Christian Tradition* (SBLSymS 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), pp. 5-30.
- Smid, Harm Reinder, *Protevangelium Jacobi: A Commentary* (Assen: Royal VanGorcum Ltd., 1965).
- Smith, Stephen H., *A Lion with Wings: A Narrative-Critical Approach to Mark's Gospel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- Stendahl, Krister, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).
- Stein, Robert H., 'The Proper Methodology for Ascertaining a Markan Redaction History', *NovT* 13 (1971), pp. 181-98.
- Sternberg, Meir, 'The Bible's Art of Persuasion: Ideology, Rhetoric, and Poetics in Saul's Fall', *HUCA* 54 (Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institution of Religion; 1984), pp.

45-82.

- Streeter, Burnett H., *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1930).
- Stuart, Douglas, *Hosea – Jonah* (Word Biblical Commentary vol. 31; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).
- Sturz, Harry A., *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984).
- Suleiman, Susan and Inge Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text* (NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980).
- Swete, Henry B., *The Gospel According to St Mark: the Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Indices* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1908).
- Tannehill, Robert C., 'Narrative Christology', *Semeia* 15 (1979), pp. 57-93.
- _____ 'The Disciples in Mark: the Function of a Narrative Role', *JR* 57 (1977), pp. 386-405.
- Taylor, David Bruce, *Mark's Gospel as Literature and History* (London: SCM Press, 1992).
- Taylor, Theophilus M., 'The Beginning of Jewish Proselyte Baptism', *NTS* 2 (1955/56), pp. 193-98.
- Taylor, Vincent, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (NY: St. Martin's Press, 1966).
- _____ *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920).
- Thimmes, Pamela, 'Memory and Re-Vision: Mary Magdalene Research Since 1975', *CR* 6 (1998), pp. 193-226.
- Thomas, J. Christopher, 'A Reconsideration of the Ending of Mark', *JETS* 26/4 (December 1983), pp. 407-19.
- van Tilborg, Sjef, 'Ideology: Ideology and Text: John 15 in the Context of the Farewell Discourse', in P.J. Hartin and J.H. Petzer (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 259-70.
- Till, Walter C., *Die gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955).
- Tolbert, Mary A., 'How the Gospel of Mark Builds Character', *Int* 47 (1993), pp. 347-57.
- _____ *Sowing the Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).
- _____ 'Mark', in C.A. Newsom and S.H. Ringe (eds.), *The Women's Commentary* (Louisville: W/JKP, 1992), pp. 263-74.
- Tompkins, Jane P. (ed.), *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980).

- Trocmé, Etienne, *La Formation de l'Évangile selon Marc* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963).
- Trompf, Garry W., 'The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel', *NTS* 18 (1972), pp. 308-30.
- Turner, Cuthbert H., 'The Gospel of Peter', *JTS* 14 (1913), pp. 161-95.
- _____ 'A Re-Collation of Codex *k* of the Old Latin Gospels (Turin G VII 15)', *JTS* 5 (1904), pp. 88-100.
- Tyson, Joseph B., 'The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark', *JBL* 80 (1961), pp. 261-68.
- _____ *The New Testament and Early Christianity* (NY: MacMillan, 1984).
- Vorster, W.S., 'Characterization of Peter in the Gospel of Mark', *Neot* 21 (1987), pp. 57-76.
- Waetjen, Herman C., 'The Ending of Mark and the Gospel Shift in Eschatology', *ASTI* 4 (1965), pp. 114-31.
- _____ *A Reordering of Power: A Socio-Political Reading of Mark's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989).
- Weeden, Theodore J., *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).
- _____ 'The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel', *ZNW* 59 (1968), pp. 145-58.
- Wenham, John W., 'The Relatives of Jesus', *EvQ* 47 (1975), pp. 6-15.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (4th edn.; London: Macmillan, 1875).
- Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1898).
- _____ 'Notes on Selected Readings', in *The New Testament in the Original Greek Vol. 2: Introduction and Appendix* (London: Macmillan, 1909), pp. 1-142.
- Wheeler, F.E., 'Alphaeus', in *ABD vol. 1* (D.N. Freedman [ed.]; NY: Doubleday, 1992), p. 162.
- Williams, Clarence R., 'The Appendices to the Gospel According to Mark: A Study in Textual Transmission' *TCAAS* 18 (1915), pp. 347-447.
- Williams, Charles Stephen Conway, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951).
- Williams, Joel F., *Other Followers of Jesus: Minor Characters as Major Figures in Mark's Gospel* (JSNTSup 102; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).
- _____ 'Literary Approaches to the End of Mark's Gospel', *JETS* 42/1 (1999), pp. 21-35.
- Williamson, Lamar Jr., *Interpretation: Mark* (A Bible Commentary for Teaching and

- Preaching; Atlanta: J. Knox Press, 1983).
- Wilson, Rawdon, 'On Character: A Reply to Martin Price', *Critical Inquiry* 2 (1975), pp. 191-98.
- Wilson, R.McL., 'The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary', *NTS* 3 (1956-57), pp. 236-43.
- Wisse, Frederik, 'The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Chapters in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels', in William L. Petersen (ed.), *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Traditions, Text and Transmission* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), pp. 39-54.
- Witherington, B. III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Wordsworth, John, William Sanday and Henry Julian White, *Portions of the Gospels According to St. Mark and St. Matthew: From the Bobbio MS. (k), Now Numbered G. VII. 15 in the National Library at Turin* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886).
- Yang, Jayhoon, 'How did Rembrandt Read the Emmaus Story? – A Literary Critical Reading of the Emmaus Story (Lk. 24.12-35)', in Y.B. Kim and D.H. Oh (eds.), *A Fresh Reading of Luke* (Seoul: Handle Press, 2001), pp. 209-31.
- _____ 'Review of "Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark" by J.A. Kelhoffer', *JSNT* 25/4 (2003), p. 499.
- _____ "'One of the Twelve" and Mark's Narrative Strategy', *ExpTim* 115/8 (May 2004), pp. 253-57 (*forthcoming*).
- Yee, Gale A., 'Ideological Criticism', in J.H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), pp. 534-37.
- _____ 'Ideological Criticism: Judges 17-21 and the Dismembered Body', in G.A. Yee (ed.), *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 146-67.
- Zuntz, Günther, *The Text of the Epistles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953).