

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

hearers are soon left in the lurch. It is no unusual complaint that the circle of a preacher's ideas is so narrow that those who have heard him for a year or two have nothing more to learn from him, because, whatever text he may choose, he puts into it the same message. At bottom this means that his own experience has ceased to grow. We need to develop in two directions—first, man-wards, in sympathy and comprehension, so that we shall be able to find even the simplest where they stand and lead them by the help of what they know already to what is not yet known to them; and, at the same time, God-wards, in the experience of grace, so that those who follow our guidance may continually find themselves entering into fresh fields and pastures new.

JAMES STALKER.

*SOME EARLY EVIDENCE FOR THE TWELVE  
VERSES ST. MARK XVI. 9-20.*

It has been said that in the whole Greek ante-Nicene literature there are *at most but two traces* of St. Mark xvi. 9-20. My purpose in these notes is to show by a few instances that the early evidence for the disputed twelve verses has perhaps been understated.

1. IRENÆUS.

“Irenæus (188) clearly cites xvi. 19 as St. Mark's own (*In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus, corresponding to Marcus interpres et sectator Petri initium evangelicæ conscriptionis fecit sic*); and the fidelity of the Latin text is supported by a Greek scholium” (W. H., *App.* 39). See lib. iii. 11. 6 in Harvey's Irenæus (vol. ii., p. 39).

Irenæus writes that St. Mark's “beginning of the Gospel” (i. 1) was fulfilment of prophecy; and that in accordance with this beginning he writes at the end, *So then the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken unto them, was*

*received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God; thus confirming the prophecy of Psalm cx. : "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool."*

## 2. JUSTIN MARTYR.

Having such testimony to the disputed twelve verses in the latter half of the second century, we may go back a generation to Justin Martyr, and seek for traces of them in his acknowledged writings, without any presumption against the possibility of his acquaintance with them. The New Testament will in general be cited in Greek from Westcott and Hort's edition, and in English from the Revised Version of 1881. Before seeking traces of verses 9-20 we must notice what are their characteristics, not neglecting the previous labours of learned assailants of the verses, who have duly emphasized some of their peculiarities of thought and diction, and thus made it the easier to recognise allusions to them.

Mark xvi. 9. *Now when he was risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene.*

*When He was risen (ἀναστὰς), on the first day (πρώτη), He appeared (ἐφάνη).* Each of the words ἀναστὰς, πρώτη, ἐφάνη is in a sense peculiar to this verse, as is also the statement that Christ rose on the first day. In Matthew xxviii. 6 we find only, "He is not here; for He is risen, even as He said," risen before the arrival of the women, who came "late on the Sabbath day as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week" (ver. 1). Some—notice the harmonistic rendering of the Authorised Version—have found this hard to reconcile with St. Mark's ἀναστὰς πρώτη, and have suspected that Mark xvi. 9 must be spurious: see Eusebius to Marinus in W. H., *App.* 31: others condemn the self-same verse for its "otiose triple repetition." But we have not as yet found, except in that verse, express

testimony to His rising *on the first day*, nor do I know that other such Gospel testimony is to be found. That "He hath been raised on the third day" is of itself indecisive of the day of the week. Early fathers dwell upon the Lord's rising on a Sunday as a cardinal historic fact: and if in so doing they express themselves more or less in terms of the disputed verse 9, we may think (unless reason can be shown to the contrary) that they accepted it as part of the Gospel as it had come down to them.

In Mark xvi. 2, 9, 14 three Greek words are represented by "was risen" (R.V.). In Matthew xxviii. 6 the Greek for "He was risen" is ἠγέρθη, and this word, and not ἀνέστη, is used throughout the Gospel narratives properly so-called of the Resurrection—that is to say, excluding the predictive δεῖ ἀναστῆναι—except in Mark xvi. 9, where we have the latter word in the participial form ἀναστὰς. This is therefore in a sense distinctly characteristic of that verse.

No less characteristic is its expression πρώτῃ for "on the first day," which is alleged as proof of the spuriousness of the verse. The evening and the morning were "day one (μία)"; and this Hebraism is used in the Gospels for the first day of the week, except in Mark xvi. 9, where it is called—as some say by a Latinism, pointing to the Roman origin of the section—not the "one" but the "first" day.

A third word, peculiar in a sense to the same verse is ἐφάνη, "he appeared," which is found there only of appearances of the Lord after the Resurrection. The words for "appear" (R.V.) in Acts i. 3 and 1 Corinthians xv. 5-8 are different. Thus we have found four things peculiar in a sense to Mark xvi. 9, namely, its distinct specification of the day of the Resurrection, and the two words which express this, and the word expressing that "He appeared" on that day.

Justin, in *Trypho* § 138, speaks of the "day eighth in number, in which our Christ *appeared* (ἐφάνη), *when He was risen* (ἀναστάς) from the dead, but in rank ever *first* (πρώτης)," laying stress upon the word "first" to which special attention is always called in discussions of the twelve verses.

In *Apol.* i. 67 he tells us that "On Sunday so-called there is an assemblage of all, whether resident in town or country, and the *Memoirs of the Apostles* or the writings of the Prophets are read (p. 98 D). . . . And on Sunday it is that we all assemble, since it is the *first* (πρώτη) day, on which God changed the darkness and matter and made *cosmos*, and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day *rose* (ἀνέστη) from the dead; for on the day before Saturday they crucified Him, and on Sunday, the day after Saturday, *He appeared* (φανεῖς) to His apostles and disciples and taught these things" (p. 99 A, B).

In each case Justin states expressly and emphatically that Christ rose on the first day, and in each he has a threefold verbal agreement with St. Mark as tabulated below:

MARK XVI. 9.	APOL. I. 67.	TRYPHO 138.
ἀναστάς	ἀνέστη	ἀναστάς
πρώτη	πρώτη	πρώτης
ἐφάνη	φανεῖς	ἐφάνη

Hence (1) the verse Mark xvi. 9, or something closely resembling it, must have formed part of his "Memoirs of the Apostles," and (2) it must have been much relied upon as Gospel authority for the fact of the Resurrection upon a Sunday, and for the consequent observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's Day.

Mark xvi. 17. *And these signs shall follow them that believe: in My name shall they cast out devils.*

On this and the following verse it has been said, that they "contain suspicious circumstances—an excessive love of the miraculous. Miracles and the power of performing them are attributed to all believers." This again is a criticism which I welcome as serviceable for my present purpose, since it sets in strong relief the powers assigned to the faithful as such, one of which was the power to exorcise *δαιμόνια*. Akin to these verses is Matthew vii. 22, "Many will say to Me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not . . . by Thy name cast out devils, and by Thy name do many mighty works?" But peculiar to Mark xvi. 17 is its place in a narrative of the Lord's Resurrection and Ascension, and its express promise of the power named to "them that believe."

The assertion that this power was possessed by such persons is a salient feature in the writings of Justin.

In *Trypho* § 85 he writes that *by the name* of Him who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and *arose* (*ἀναστάντος*) from the dead, and went up to heaven every *devil* (*δαιμόνιον*) when exorcised is vanquished and made subject.

In *Trypho* § 76 he quotes Matthew vii. 22 (p. 301 D), and adds that now we *that believe* (*οἱ πιστεύοντες*) in our Lord Jesus, who was crucified, have all *devils* (*δαιμόνια*) and evil spirits subject to us by exorcism.

These and other passages in his works ascribe to *believers* the power of casting out *devils by the name* of Christ, and they connect this power with the Lord's Resurrection and Ascension. The express mention of *οἱ πιστεύοντες* as having this power, and some other things in the passages in question, point again to Mark xvi. 9 *sq.* as one of Justin's sources.

Mark xvi. 20. *And they went forth, and preached everywhere* (*ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ*), *the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed.*

"The Greek patristic evidence for *vv.* 9-20 perhaps

begins with Justin (*Ap.* i. 45), who interprets . . . Psalm cx. 3 as predictive τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ ὄν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοῦ ἐξεληθόντες πανταχοῦ ἐκήρυξαν. . . . On both sides the evidence is slight, and decision seems impossible" (W. H., *App.* 39).

With reference to this apparent quotation from our verse 20 "*the word* which . . . *they went forth and preached everywhere,*" Dr. Samuel Davidson remarks that "probably Justin Martyr" had the disputed twelve verses before him (1868). Scrivener, following Burgon, judged that they were cited "unquestionably by Justin Martyr" (1874). The late Dean Alford, perhaps not thinking of *Apol.* i. 45, asserted that Justin took no notice of the verses. To Westcott and Hort "decision seems impossible": that is to say from *Apol.* i. 45 only. But what has been said above on other passages, and in *The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels* on that passage, may to some readers seem to suffice to turn the scale. If not, there is still much more to be said in proof that Justin knew the so-called appendix to St. Mark's Gospel. It seems to me that he was well acquainted with it; knew it (like Irenæus) as part of one of the Gospels customarily read in his own day on Sunday; and has frequent allusions to things in it, some of which are not mentioned in these notes.

### 3. THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS.

The Epistle of Barnabas was perhaps written about 120 A.D. Its parallelisms with Justin's works are of such a nature that the two writers can scarcely have been wholly independent of one another. If Justin did not quote Barnabas, the ideas common to them must have been drawn in part from the Church teaching of their day. They speak in like terms of the Christian observance of the "eighth day," and had presumably the same Gospel authority for holding it in honour as the day of the Resurrection.

In *Epist. Barn.* xv. 9, we read: "Wherefore also we celebrate the *eighth* day unto gladness, whereon Jesus arose (*ἀνέστη*) from the dead, and *was manifested* (*ἐφανερώθη*), and went up to the *heavens*." The word *eighth* implies the use of *πρώτη* as by Justin and St. Mark; the word *arose*, and the fact of the ascent to *heaven*, are common to the Evangelist and Barnabas: and these agree in two other points which must now be mentioned.

St. Mark xvi. 12-14: *And after these things He was manifested* (*ἐφανερώθη*) *in another form unto two of them as they walked*. . . . *And afterward He was manifested* (*ἐφανερώθη*) *unto the eleven themselves as they sat at meat*.

Here *ἐφανερώθη* is used twice of appearances of the Lord after the Resurrection. It is so used again once only in the New Testament, namely, in John xxi. 14, "This is now the third time that Jesus *was manifested* to the disciples after that He was risen from the dead." St. John indeed uses also *ἐφανερώσεν ἑαυτὸν* in the like sense, *He manifested Himself*, but it remains that *ἐφανερώθη*, *He was manifested*, may be said to be characteristic of the disputed twelve verses. We may therefore reckon *φανερωθεῖς*, *having been manifested*, in the passage from Barnabas, as a perhaps not undesigned coincidence with St. Mark.

Again, Mr. Rendal quotes from the book *Supernatural Religion*: "In making the Resurrection, appearances to the disciples, and the Ascension take place in one day, the author [of *Epist. Barn.*] is in agreement with Justin Martyr, who made use of a Gospel different from ours." The statement is open to criticism. Were it in part true, we might say that Barnabas and Justin had the twelve verses for their authority, interpreted them hastily, and so were led to express themselves as they have done; for in the said verses there is no palpable break between the Resurrection and the Ascension. A short summary of Mark

xvi. 9-19 is "On the first day He arose; He was manifested; He ascended to heaven." And this is what Barnabas says, agreeing in substance with the eleven verses, and, except as regards the Ascension, with their phraseology; for his "eighth" implies *πρώτη* (rather than *μία*) for "first" day. The hypothesis that they were acquainted with the ending of St. Mark's Gospel, accounts for the passage quoted from Barnabas as well as for the parallels in Justin.

We have seen that there are other indications that Justin knew the passage; and when we go back some three decades to the earlier writer, who has such striking coincidences with Justin, we do not need any great mass of evidence to make it probable, or not improbable, that he knew what was known to Justin. Their singular agreement in the matter of the "eighth" day at once raises a presumption that they rested upon the same authority for its religious observance.

But if Barnabas knew the twelve verses, he ought perhaps to show other traces of them in his *Epistle*. Or such actual or possible traces, I will here mention one only. If he knew Mark xvi. 17, with its promise of miraculous powers to true believers indiscriminately, this would certainly have appealed strongly to a writer of his individualizing bias, and we might have expected to find some trace of the verse in his writings. Further, we might have anticipated, from his inveterate habit of spiritualizing, that he would have been tempted to explain away the outward fact of demoniacal possession and make the "devils" tendencies in the heart of man. Accordingly, in *Epist. Barn.* xvi. 7, we read: "Before we *believed* (*πιστεῦσαι*) our heart was truly a temple made by hand, for it was full of idolatry, and a house of *devils* (*δαιμονίων*), because we did whatsoever things were contrary to God. But it shall be built upon the *name* of the Lord." This is his way of

saying, They that *believe* do thereby cast out *devils in the name* of the Lord Jesus.

#### 4. THE QUARTODECIMAN CONTROVERSY.

The late Bishop Lightfoot wrote of Polycarp of Smyrna, who flourished not very long before the date to which we have traced the twelve verses :

“In the closing years of his life he paid a visit to Rome, where he conferred with the Bishop Anicetus. They had other points of difference to discuss, but one main subject of their conference was the time of celebrating the Passion. Polycarp pleaded the practice of St. John, and the other Apostles with whom he had conversed, for observing the actual day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th Nisan, without respect to the day of the week. On the other hand, Anicetus could point to the fact that his predecessors, at least as far back as Xystus, who succeeded to the see soon after the beginning of the century, had always kept the anniversary of the Passion on a Friday, and that of the Resurrection on a Sunday, thus making the day of the month give place to the day of the week.”

The weekly observance of the first day as the day of the Lord's Resurrection prepared the way for the decision of this controversy in the above sense. If St. Mark's "when He was risen on the first day" was the most obvious Gospel authority for the Christian observance of Sunday in each week, it would have served as an argument for keeping Easter always on a first day; and the argument would have commended itself all the more to a bishop of Rome if the verse was found in a Gospel traditionally associated with that city. St. Mark's Gospel generally satisfies this condition; and in the twelve verses, the very expression "first" day (as above remarked) has been thought by some to be a sign of their Roman origin. Can we confirm the hypothesis that one of the twelve verses

decided the Quartodeciman controversy by adducing evidence that they were known at Rome before or about the end of the first century?

#### 5. CLEMENT OF ROME.

*Clem. R.* § 42 runs thus in the translation in Lightfoot's edition:—

“The Apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ. . . . Having therefore received a charge, and having been fully assured through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in the word of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, *they went forth* (ἐξῆλθον) with the glad tidings that the kingdom of God should come. So *preaching* (κηρύσσοντες) everywhere in country and town, they appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe.”

Thus the Roman Clement, for St. Mark's ἐξελεθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, has ἐξῆλθον κηρύσσοντες, with a paraphrase for the word πανταχοῦ, which he had used in the previous chapter of his *Epistle*.

If St. Clement knew the twelve verses, they must have been known to Anicetus, and cited by him against Polycarp's authorities for regulating the date of Easter by the Jewish calendar. If he so cited them, they must have contributed not a little to a decision which has governed the usage of the Church from that day till now. That decision was the logical sequel to the disestablishment of the Sabbath by the hebdomadal observance of the First Day.

C. TAYLOR.