

# Are the Last 12 Verses of Mark 16 Genuine?

**The following is taken from E. Schuyler English's  
commentary on *The Gospel of Mark*, pages 495-499.**

<sup>2</sup> Since the 4th Century, and particularly in recent years, there has been considerable controversy as to the authenticity of the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel, namely, chapter 16:9-20. Their genuineness has been questioned by men of deep consecration as well as by critics of the Word of God. The scholarship of very many of those who reject these verses as spurious, or if not that, as the work of another than Mark and of a later date, dare not be disputed. It is obvious, therefore, that we cannot settle the matter here. We shall, however, set down the most important objections to the authenticity of the passage in question, both external and internal, and the most logical answers to those objections, and after the examination, set forth our own conclusion for what it is worth, arrived at after months of study and prayerful consideration.

The chief *external* evidences which oppose the genuineness of verses 9-12 are (1) the fact that this passage does not appear in the two most ancient Greek MSS, namely the Vatican and the Sinaitic; and (2) that this omission is considered conclusive by scholars dating as far back as the 4th Century and up to the present time. Among these are Eusebius (c. 330 A.D.), Jerome (c. 400), Griesback, Wittemberg, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Lightfoot, and others.

*Internal* evidences suggesting that these verses were written by a hand other than Mark's are not wanting, among them these: (1) the descriptive clause about Mary Magdalene, vs. 9; (2) the personal pronoun *she*, vs. 10; (3) the expression *in another form*, vs. 12; (4) the statement that our Lord *upbraided* the Eleven, vs. 14; and (5) the *signs* of vss. 17 and 18. These are not all the *internal* evidences which throw doubt upon Mark's authorship, but they are sufficient to test the case, being the most difficult.

Now suppose we examine the evidences in order. As to *external* evidences, (1) it is quite true, and rather mystifying, that the two oldest MSS do not contain the twelve verses alluded to. But, strangely, while the two most ancient Greek MSS omit the verses, they are the only Greek MSS that do exclude them. *All* the others have them. They are likewise found in the Vulgate and Syriac versions. Where did they get them? Someone may say: "They were added later," a logical surmise. *But*, portions of the passage in question are quoted in writings of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries, namely, Irenaeus (c. 190 A.D.) and Hippolytus (c. 225). The MSS from which these two learned men quoted must have been quite ancient. Then, there is a peculiarity about the Vatican MS to be found nowhere else in the New Testament. We quote Dean Alford; who, by the way, while rejecting Mark's authorship, accepts these verses in the Canon. He states that after the colophone at the conclusion of verse 8, "the remaining greater portion of the column, and the whole of the next (column), to the end of the page, are left vacant. There is no other instance of this in the whole New Testament portion of the manuscript, the next book in every other instance beginning on the next column" (*Greek Testament*). In other words, the transcriber knew that something was missing when he copied the manuscript, and left space for its insertion.

As to other *external* evidence, the fact that (2) certain scholars from the 4th Century to date reject the genuineness of these verses on the ground of their omission from the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS, we suggest that they have placed too much emphasis on this fact alone, and have been governed in determining *internal* evidences by a pre-determined conclusion. In view of (1) the extenuating circumstance of the blank columns in the Vatican MS; (2) the fact that all other Greek MSS contain the passage under discussion; and (3) quotations of verses 9-12 being found in writings dated as early as the 2nd Century; we suggest that the *external* evidences alone are not sufficient to warrant the rejection of these verses. Add to that the fact that such godly men as Tregelles and Alford, while disallowing Mark's authorship, admit the passage as a part of inspired Scripture.

(*Note*: As we finished writing the above sentence there came to our desk a copy of a recently published work by Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer, *Into All the World* [Zondervan Pub. House]. Dr. Zwemer devotes twenty most interesting and convincing pages to the problem we are now discussing, favoring the retention of verses 9-12, and we observe this statement derived from the writings of Dean John W. Brugnion, Oxford, 1871: "They [these twelve verses] are contained in every important manuscript in the world *except two*. However, neither the Vatican nor the Sinaitic is infallible, but both contain omissions and interpolations. Eighteen uncials and six hundred cursive manuscripts of this Gospel *contain* the verses in question.")

Let us examine the *internal* evidences against the acceptance of the passage. It is said that the style of the concluding paragraphs, and many of the words used, are at great variance with the balance of the Second Gospel, and that the identical writer could not have penned both the first fifteen chapters plus eight verses, and the last twelve

verses of chapter sixteen. Words are used here which are not used by Mark earlier in the Gospel, and variant words are employed to mean the same thing as previously expressed by more common terminology. We have chosen the five most frequently offered inconsistencies, and we shall examine them in order.

(1) In verse 9 Mary Magdalene is described as "Mary Magdalene, out of whom He cast seven demons." It is said that since Mary's name was used before in relation to the events of the resurrection morning, it would have been previously, and not here, that Mark, were he the writer, would have identified her thus. So, it is argued by critics, verse 9 begins the writing of another man. We maintain that this is not so. After our Lord was raised we find that the first personal message which He initiated, though it was spoken by the "young man . . . in . . . white," was to Peter (vs. 7), who had denied Him. And His first appearance was to Mary Magdalene, whose case had been at one time so hopeless, and whom He healed. She loved Him much, as Peter loved Him much—and His messages to these two were signs of His grace. The author was stating a fact, and was guided by the Spirit of God. Here, and not in verses 40 or 47 of the preceding chapter, or verse 1 of this chapter (in all of which Mary Magdalene is mentioned *with others*), was the place to tell of her former state in contrast to the present.

(2) The personal pronoun *she* of verse 10 is what is known as a *demonstrative* pronoun. It is said that Mark never used the demonstrative pronoun without having some particular point of emphasis in mind. But is not such a point necessary here, to distinguish Mary Magdalene from the others? Instead of "Mary Magdalene . . . *who* went and told them . . ."—it was *she*, and not the other women (see vs. 8) who went and delivered the message that Christ was risen. They had gone *to do* it; *she* did it.

(3) In verse 12 we read of our Lord's appearing *in another form* to two men as they were walking. This is admittedly a difficult problem, and we confess that we are puzzled. But we are equally confounded whoever the writer, Mark or another. *In another form* (*en etera morphee*) means *in a different form*. According to Thayer the word *morphee* means *external appearance*, but Trench states that the three words together, *en etera morphee*, indicate a tremendous and vast change, and refers the reader to a pagan writer who uses the three words to describe a *man* becoming a *stream of water*! We shrink from going further into this. We know that our Lord had His resurrection body, the same body in which He died, yet different, a glorified body. None of us has ever seen a glorified body, and we do not know the nature of its difference, except that it is immortal and that space and mass seem not to affect it. But this we can be sure of—our Lord's body was not different as to *form*, in the strictest sense of the word, that is, as to *shape*. Reverently the writer suggests, however, that it could take on different appearances. Mary Magdalene supposed Him at first to be "the gardener" (John 20:15). She had been weeping, it is true; but we wonder if it was entirely because of her tears that she did not know Him till she heard His voice! Again, at the Sea of Galilee, Simon Peter and some of the disciples had gone back to fishing. Early in the morning

our Lord came upon them, and asked them if they had any meat. When they said that they had not, He told them to cast the net on the right side of the ship. It was not until after they made a remarkable catch that John recognized Him (John 21:7). We wonder if it was due entirely to the morning mist that they did not know Him at first, they who had been with Him daily for three years! Lastly, there is this well-known incident of the two on the Emmaus Road who walked with the Lord and talked with Him, but did not recognize Him until He broke bread before them (Luke 24:30). It is to them that He is said in Mark to have appeared "in another form." It is quite true that it is distinctly written that "their eyes were holden that they should not know Him" (Luke 24:16), and after He broke the bread, that "their eyes were opened, and they knew Him" (vs. 31). We do not wish to misinterpret Scripture—God forbid! But we are trying to comprehend *en etera morphee* as found in our Bible. We wonder if in two verses we do not have *cause* and *effect*—our Lord appearing to the two disciples "in a different form" being the cause, and "their eyes were holden that they did not know Him" being the effect! We do not know. But we do not see that the difficulty of the expression contradicts or affirms Mark's authorship, *unless it is maintained that the whole passage is spurious and not canonical*. We can see absolutely no justification in such a proposition, as we shall endeavor to show later.

(4) The use of the word *upbraided* in verse 14 is questioned. It is suggested that the passage is not genuine, for this "scolding" is so different from any other word spoken by the risen Lord, Whose "Peace be unto you," was a loving and gracious form of greeting (Luke 24:36; cf. John 20:19, 21). *Upbraided* would better be translated *reproved*. But note the literal rendering: "and reproved their unbelief." He did not reprove *them* so much, as their lack of faith, their disbelief that He had done what He had said He would do. To the two on the Emmaus Road our Lord said—and note again it was because of unbelief—"O fools, and slow of heart to believe . . ." (Luke 24:25). The word for *fools* (*anoetoi*) is not as strong as that used for the Pharisees (*aphrones*, Luke 11:40); nevertheless it is certainly a word of reproof, and we do not see that the argument of those who deny the authenticity of the passage holds from this *upbraiding*.

(5) Regarding the *signs* promised in verses 17 and 18, suppose we simply quote from Dr. Zwemer's book received about two hours ago, to which we have already referred: "And as for 'the signs' that shall follow those who believe, all of which the critics reject as thaumaturgic and fantastic (vs. 17), we are content with the miracles of missions, since the day when Paul shook off the viper at Melita to the experiences of David Livingstone in Africa, the exorcising of demons in China, and the providential deliverances among the head-hunters of Borneo in our own day. The Lord is still working with His apostles and 'confirming the Word with signs following. Amen.'"

As to words used in these twelve verses not found elsewhere in Mark, would it not be true of any twelve verses of any Bible book that there could be found in them words which do not appear elsewhere in the same book? We contend that objections to the authenticity of these paragraphs are not borne out by *internal* evidences.

We shall rest our case here. If the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel belong at all in the Word of God, if they are inspired Scripture, then Mark, as well as any other man, and in fact better, could have written them. The question arises—are these paragraphs spurious? Do they belong in the Canon at all? To us it is clear that they do. We cannot conceive that the book which opens, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," should close with the words, "they were afraid." It is not complete if it stands thus. But if it is not complete, where is its end? Surely you will not argue that its conclusion was *lost!* Would God the Spirit inspire every word of Scripture written and then allow a portion of it to be lost? If the Word of God abides for ever, then it abides as He has it written, and not at the bottom of the sea, or in ashes. Not one jot or tittle of it *could* be lost, though it *might* be lost *from one or two MSS.*

To us *all* evidences point to the fact (though we admit a few difficulties) that Mark 16:9-20, as written in our Bibles, is genuine. We believe it to be the inspired Word of God. And we believe Mark was its author.

---

<sup>3</sup>The order of the risen Christ's appearances between the day of His resurrection and His ascension appears to have been as follows: (1) first to Mary Magdalene (Mark 16:9-11; John 20:11-18); (2) to other women who went to the sepulchre (Matt. 28:9); (3) to Simon Peter (Luke 24:34; cf. 1 Cor. 15:5); (4) to the two Emmaus disciples (Mark 16:12; Luke 24:13 ff.); (5) to the Eleven, excepting Thomas (John 20:19-24); (6) to the Eleven, including Thomas (Mark 16:14-18; John 20:25-29); (7) to the seven disciples by the Sea of Galilee (John 21:1-24); (8) to five hundred brethren at once (1 Cor. 15:6); (9) to James (1 Cor. 15:7); (10) to the Apostles at Jerusalem and near Bethany at the Ascension (Mark 16:19; Matt. 28:16-20; Luke 24:33-53; Acts 1:3-12; 1 Cor. 15:7).

The following defense of the last 12 verses of Mark is a bit more technical, but very valuable nonetheless. It is by the brilliant textual critic, Frederick Henry Scrivener, in his work, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (second edition). If this material is not sufficient, the reader should consult J. W. Burgon's monograph, *The Last Twelve verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark vindicated against recent objectors and established*.

(10). MARK xvi. 9—20. In Chapter I. we engaged to defend the authenticity of this long and important passage, and that without the slightest misgiving (p. 7). The Rev. J. W. Burgon's brilliant monograph, "The Last Twelve verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark vindicated against recent objectors and established" (Oxford and London, 1871), has now thrown a stream of light upon the controversy, nor does the joyous tone of his book misbecome one who is conscious of having triumphantly maintained a cause which is very precious to him. This whole paragraph is set apart by itself in the critical editions of Tischendorf and Tregelles. Besides this, it is placed within double brackets by Westcott and Hort, followed by the wretched

supplement derived from Cod. L (*vid. infra*) annexed as an alternative reading ἀλλωc. Out of all the great manuscripts, the two oldest (Ⲙ B) stand alone in omitting ver. 9—20. altogether<sup>1</sup>. Cod. B, however, betrays consciousness on the scribe's part that something is left out, inasmuch as after ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ ver. 8, a whole column is left perfectly blank (*the only blank one in the whole volume*), as well as the rest of the column containing ver. 8, which is usual at the end of every book of Scripture (*see* p. 98). No such peculiarity attaches to Cod. Ⲙ. The testimony of L, that close companion of B, is very suggestive. Immediately after ver. 8 the copyist breaks off; then in the same hand (for all corrections in this manuscript seem *primâ manu*: *see* p. 125), at the top of the next column we read...φερετε που και ταυτα+...πάντα δὲ τα παρηγγελμενα τοῖς περι του πετρου συντομωσ ἐξηγγιλαν+ μετα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτος ὁ ἰσ̄, ἀπο ἀνατολησ καὶ ἀχρι δυσεωσ ἐξαπεστιλεν δι αὐτων το ἱἔρον καὶ ἀφθαρτον κηρυγμα+ τησ αἰῶνιου σωτηριασ+ .....εστην δε και ταῦτα φερομενα μετα το εφοβουντο γαρ+... Αναστὰσ δὲ πρωῖ κ.τ.λ., ver. 9, *ad fin. capit.* (Burgon *facsimile*, facing his p. 113: our *facsimile* No. 21): as if vv. 9—20 were just as little to be regarded as the trifling apocryphal supplement which precedes them. Besides these, the twelve verses are omitted in none but some old Armenian codices and two of the Æthiopic, *k* of the Old Latin, and an Arabic Lectionary [IX] No. 13, examined by Scholz in the Vatican. The Old Latin Codex *k* puts in their room a corrupt and careless version of the subscription in L ending with σωτηρίας (*k* adding *amen*): the same subscription being appended to the end of the Gospel in the two Æthiopic manuscripts, and (with ἀμήν) in the margin of 274 and the Philoxenian. Not unlike is the marginal note in *Hunt.* 17 or Cod. 1 of the Memphitic, translated by Canon Lightfoot above, p. 332. Of cursive Greek manuscripts 137. 138, which Birch had hastily reported as marking the passage with an asterisk, each contains the marginal annotation given below,

<sup>1</sup> I have not ventured to vouch for Tischendorf's notion, that six leaves of Cod. Ⲙ, *that containing* Mark xvi. 2—Luke i. 56 *being one of them*, were written by the scribe of Cod. B (*see* pp. 87, 106). On mere identity of handwriting and the peculiar shape of certain letters who shall venture to insist? Yet there are parts of the case, apparently unnoticed by Tischendorf himself (*see* p. 489, note 1), which I know not how to answer; and if it be so, then at least in these leaves, Codd. Ⲙ B make but one witness, not two.

which claims the passage as genuine, 138 with no asterisk at all, 137 (like 36 and others) with an ordinary mark of reference from the text to the note, where (of course) it is repeated. Other manuscripts contain marginal scholia respecting it, of which the following is the substance. Cod. 199 has τέλος\*<sup>1</sup> after ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ and before Ἀναστὰς δέ, and in the same hand as τέλος we read, ἐν τισι τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὐ κεῖται ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα καταπαύει. The kindred Codd. 20. 215. 300 (but after ver. 15, not ver. 8) mark the omission in some (τισὶ) copies, adding ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις πάντα ἀπαράλειπτα κεῖται, and these had been corrected from Jerusalem copies (*see* pp. 144 and note, 167). Codd. 15. 22 conclude at ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, then add in red ink that in some copies the Evangelist ends here, ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φέρεται, affixing vv. 9—20. In Codd. 1. 205 (in its duplicate 206 also), 209 is the same notice, ἄλλοις standing for πολλοῖς in 206, with the additional assertion that Eusebius “canonised” no further than ver. 8, a statement which is confirmed by the absence of the pseudo-Ammonian and Eusebian numerals beyond that verse in  $\aleph$ ALSU and at least eleven cursives, with *am. fuld. ing.* of the Vulgate. It would be no marvel if Eusebius, the author of this harmonising system (*see* p. 55, 56), had consistently acted upon his own rash opinion respecting the paragraph, which we shall have to notice presently, and such action on his part would have added nothing to the strength of the adverse case. But it does not seem that he really did so. These numerals appear in most manuscripts, and in all parts of them, with a good deal of variation which we can easily account for. In the present instance they are annexed to ver. 9 and the rest of the passage in Codd. CEK VII, and (with some changes) in GHMΓΔΛ and many others: in h<sup>scr.</sup> the concluding sections are there (σλδ ver. 11, σλε ver. 12, σλς ver. 14) without the canons. In their respective margins the annotated codices 12 (of Scholz), 24. 36. 37. 40. 41. 108. 129. 137. 138. 143. 181. 186. 195. 210. 221. 222. 237. 238. 255. 259. 299. 329. 374 (twenty-four in all),

<sup>1</sup> Of course no notice is to be taken of τέλος after ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, as the end of the ecclesiastical lesson is all that is estimated (*see* p. 70 and note 1). The grievous misstatements of preceding critics from Wetstein and Scholz down to Tischendorf, have been corrected throughout by means of Mr Burgon's laborious researches (pp. 114—123).



present in substance<sup>1</sup> the same weighty testimony in favour of the passage: *παρὰ πλείστοις ἀντιγράφοις οὐ κείνται* (thus far also Cod. 119, adding only *ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα καταπαύει*) ἐν τῷ παρόντι εὐαγγελίῳ, ὡς νόθα νομίσαντες αὐτὰ εἶναι ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς ἐξ ἀκριβῶν ἀντιγράφων ἐν πλείστοις εὐρόντες αὐτὰ καὶ κατὰ τὸ Παλαιστιναῖον εὐαγγέλιον Μάρκου, ὡς ἔχει ἡ ἀλήθεια, συντεθείκαμεν καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπιφερομένην δεσποτικὴν ἀνάστασιν. Now this is none other than an extract from Victor of Antioch's [v] commentary on St Mark, which they all annex in full to the sacred text, and which is expressly assigned to that Father in Codd. 12. 37. 41. Yet these very twenty-four manuscripts have been cited by critical editors as adverse to the authenticity of a paragraph which their scribes never dreamt of calling into question, but simply copied Victor's decided judgment in its favour. His appeal to the famous Palestine codices which had belonged to Origen and Pamphilus (*see* pp. 51 and note, 454) is found in twenty-one of them: possibly these documents are akin to the Jerusalem copies mentioned in Codd. Evan. A. 20. 164. 262. 300, &c (*see* p. 509).

All other codices, e.g. ACD (which is defective from ver. 15, *primâ manu*) EF<sup>w</sup>GH (begins ver. 14) KMSUVXΓΔII. 33. 69, the Peshito, Jerusalem and Curetonian Syriac (which last, by a singular happiness, contains vv. 17—20, though no other part of St Mark), the Philoxenian *text*, the Sahidic (only ver. 20 is preserved), the Memphitic and Æthiopic (with the exceptions before named, p. 508), the Gothic (to ver. 12), Vulgate, all extant Old Latins except *k* (though *a. primâ manu* and *b.* are defective), the Georgian (*see* p. 364), the printed Armenian, its later manuscripts, and all the lesser versions (Arabic, &c.) agree in maintaining the paragraph. It is cited, possibly by Papias, unquestionably by Irenæus (both in Greek and Latin) and by Justin Martyr as early as the second century; by Hippolytus (*see* Tregelles, *Account of Printed Text*, p. 252), and, apparently by Celsus in the third; by Aphraates (in a Syriac Homily dated A.D. 337), Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, &c. in the fourth. Add to this, what has been so forcibly stated by Mr Burgon (*ubi supra*, p. 205), that in the

<sup>1</sup> The minute variations between these several codices are given by Burgon (Appendix E, pp. 288—90).

Calendar of Church lessons, which existed certainly in the fourth century, very probably much earlier, the disputed verses were honoured by being read as a special matins service for Ascension Day (*see* p. 75), and as the Gospel for S. Mary Magdalene's Day, July 22 (p. 82); as well as by forming the third of the eleven *εὐαγγέλια ἀναστάσιμα ἑωθινά*, the preceding part of the chapter forming the second (p. 79), so little were they suspected as of even doubtful authenticity.

The earliest objector to ver. 9—20 we know of was Eusebius (*Quæst. ad Marin.*), who tells that they were not *ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις*, but after *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ* that *τὰ ἐξῆς* are found *σπανίως ἐν τισιν*, but not in *τὰ ἀκριβῆ*: language which Jerome (*see* p. 457) *twice* echoes and almost exaggerates by saying "in raris fertur Evangeliiis, omnibus Græciæ libris pæne hoc capitulum fine non habentibus." A second cause with Eusebius for rejecting them is *μάλιστα ἔπερ ἔχοιεν ἀντιλογίαν τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν μαρτυρίᾳ*<sup>1</sup>. The passage of Eusebius has been minutely examined by Mr Burgon, who proves to demonstration that all the subsequent evidence which has been alleged against the passage, whether of Severus, or Hesychius, or any other writer down to Euthymius Zigabenus in the twelfth century, is a mere echo of the doubts and difficulties of Eusebius, if indeed he is not retailing to us at second-hand one of the fanciful Biblical speculations of Origen (*see* p. 458).

With regard to the argument against these twelve verses arising from their alleged difference in style from the rest of the Gospel, I must say that the same process might be applied—and has been applied—to prove that St Paul was not the writer of the Pastoral Epistles (to say nothing of that to the Hebrews), St John of the Apocalypse, Isaiah and Zechariah of portions of those prophecies that bear their names. Every one used to literary composition may detect, if he will, such minute

<sup>1</sup> To get rid of one apparent *ἀντιφωνία*, that arising from the expression *πρῶτ' τῇ μιᾷ τοῦ σαββάτου* (*sic*), ver. 9, compared with *ὁψὲ σαββάτων* Matth. xxviii. 1, Eusebius proposes the plan of setting a stop between *Ἀναστὰς δέ* and *πρῶτ'*, so little was he satisfied with rudely expunging the whole clause. Hence Cod. E. puts a red cross after *δέ*: Codd. 20. 22. 34. 72. 193. 196. 199. 271. 345. 405. 411. Milan, M. 48 *sup.* have a colon: Codd. 332. 339. 340. 439, a comma (Burgon, *Guardian*, Aug. 20, 1873).

variations as have been dwelt upon<sup>1</sup>, either in his own writings, or in those of the authors he is most familiar with.

Persons who, like Eusebius, devoted themselves to the pious task of constructing harmonies of the Gospels, would soon perceive the difficulty of adjusting the events recorded in ver. 9—20 to the narratives of the other Evangelists. Alford regards this inconsistency (more apparent than real, we believe) as “a valuable testimony to the antiquity of the fragment” (*N. T. ad loc.*): we would go further, and claim for the harder reading the benefit of any critical doubt as to its genuineness (Canon I. p. 436). The difficulty was both felt and avowed by Eusebius, and was recited after him by Severus of Antioch or whoever wrote the scholion attributed to him. Whatever Jerome and the rest may have done, these assigned the *ἀντιλογία*, the *ἐναντίωσις* they thought they perceived, as a reason (not the first, nor perhaps the chief, but as *a* reason) for supposing that the Gospel ended with *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*. Yet in the balance of probabilities, can anything be more unlikely than that St Mark broke off so abruptly as this hypothesis would imply, while no ancient writer has noticed or seemed conscious of any such abruptness<sup>2</sup>? This fact has driven those who reject the concluding verses to the strangest fancies;—that, like Thucydides, the Evangelist was cut off before his work was completed, or even that the last leaf of the original Gospel was torn away.

<sup>1</sup> The following peculiarities have been noticed in these verses: *ἐκεῖνος* used absolutely, ver. 10, 11, 13; *πορεύομαι* ver. 10, 12, 15; *τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ γενομένοις* ver. 10; *θεάομαι* ver. 11, 14; *ἀπιστέω* ver. 11, 16; *μετὰ ταῦτα* ver. 12; *ἕτερος* ver. 12; *παρακολουθέω* ver. 17; *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* ver. 17; *κύριος* for the Saviour, ver. 19, 20; *πανταχοῦ, συνεργούντος, βεβαιῶ, ἐπακολουθέω* ver. 20, all of them as not found elsewhere in St Mark. A very able and persuasive plea for the genuineness of the paragraph, as coming from that Evangelist’s pen, appeared in the *Baptist Quarterly*, Philadelphia, July 1869, bearing the signature of Professor J. A. Broadus, of South Carolina. Unfortunately, from the nature of the case, it does not admit of abridgement. Mr Burgon’s ninth chapter (pp. 136—190) enters into full details, and amply justifies his conclusion that the supposed adverse argument from phraseology “breaks down hopelessly under severe analysis.”

<sup>2</sup> “Can any one, who knows the character of the Lord and of His ministry, conceive for an instant that we should be left with nothing but a message baulked through the alarm of women” (Kelly, *Lectures Introductory to the Gospels*, p. 258).

We emphatically deny that such wild surmises<sup>1</sup> are called for by the state of the evidence in this case. All opposition to the authenticity of the paragraph resolves itself into the allegations of Eusebius and the testimony of  $\aleph B$ . Let us accord to these the weight which is their due: but against their verdict we can appeal to the reading of Irenæus and of *both* the elder Syriac translations in the second century; of nearly all other versions; and of all extant manuscripts excepting two. So powerfully is it vouched for, that many of those who are reluctant to recognise St Mark as its author, regard it notwithstanding as an integral portion of the inspired record originally delivered to the Church.