

Version accepted before the proof making; the published article is in **open access** on the publisher website:

https://poj.peeters-leuven.be/secure/POJ/viewpdf.php?ticket_id=5e521a06396ca

Returning to Mark 16, 8 : What's New?

Claire Clivaz, SIB Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Lausanne

I. INTRODUCTION

The endings diversity of Mk 16 manuscripts is a well known enigma in New Testament textual criticism and exegesis¹. The two oldest witnesses we have are the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus (4th century CE); they conclude the second gospel in this way: “So they [the women] went out and fled from the tomb, for terror and amazement had seized them; and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid” (Mk 16,8)². Apart from these two codices and the 12th century minuscule 304³, all the other manuscripts present endings after Mk 16, 8, and most often the longer Mk 16,9-20⁴. For centuries, readers apparently preferred to continue the story after Mk 16,8, or sometimes to stop it before, like the traditional Easter liturgy that ends the reading in Mk 16,7 during the Easter night. The enigma is added to by the fact that there is no evidence from the papyri of the Markan ending(s): no manuscript evidence of Mk 16,8 preceding the 4th century has survived.

Belonging to a just starting five years Swiss National Foundation project about Mark 16⁵, this article opens the quest by looking at the state of the art,

¹ See footnote 8 below for some examples of the diverse opinions. Thank you to Brad Anderson for the English proof-reading of this article. All the hyperlinks have been checked on the 28th October 2018.

² I am using the *New Revised Standard Version*.

³ See J. Keith Elliott about the manuscripts ending in Mk 16,8: “these are Sinaiticus (01 Ⲙ), Vaticanus (B 03) and the twelfth century minuscule 304 (which had presumably been part of a four-Gospel codex). We exclude the twelfth century 2386 that at one time appeared in the apparatus (e.g., UBS1) in support of Mark ending at 16,8. This MS merely has its last page of Mark missing; it may be used as an example of how the accidental shortening of Mark could have occurred at this exact place” (J.K. ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark: Original or Not?*, in D.A. BLACK (ed.), *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark, 4 Views*, Nashville, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2008, 80-102, p. 82).

⁴ For a summary of the existing Mark endings, see C. FOCANT, *Un silence qui fait parler (Mc 16,8)*, in C. FOCANT, *Marc, un évangile étonnant, Recueil d'essais* (BETL 194), Leuven, Leuven University Press, 2006, 341-358, pp. 342-344. Focant details the six categories of existing variants (pp. 342-343), whereas they are commonly summarized to four (see for example M.A. ROBINSON, *The Long Ending of Mark as Canonical Verity*, in D.A. Black (ed.), *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark* (n. 2), 40-79, pp. 41-42).

⁵ See the MARK16 project description on p3.snf.ch/project-179755, and the project's blog <https://digitalhumanitiesplus.sib.swiss/#/project/mark16>. MARK16 purpose is to build a virtual research environment (VRE) based that would become a reference portal for MARK16 research. This VRE will notably develop a new tool to compare efficiently diverse scholarly positions. Among the diversity of the scholarly voices, MARK16 will also present its own hypothesis on the case.

underlining a recent diversification among the scholarly opinions, after some decades of an almost complete agreement about an original end in Mk 16,8 (part II). It discusses then in details a new hypothesis published in August 2018 by Stephen Hultgren (part III)⁶, and draws in conclusion some lines about the direction in which the research could be developed (part IV).

II. A DIVERSIFICATION OF THE OPINIONS IN THE STATE OF THE ART

The major exegetical inquiries into Mk 16 are in debt to results stemming from a study of the manuscript evidence: over the last twenty years, exegesis research has been mainly based on “the acceptance of Mark 16,8 as the final verse of the gospel”⁷, whereas some scholars have suggested recently to reexamine the file. The consensus sounds impressive, as Camille Focant states: «Il est aujourd’hui pratiquement acquis dans le monde exégétique que Mc 16, 8 constitue le dernier verset authentique du second évangile»⁸. However, it is wise to remember that this consensus is relatively recent as Clayton Croy points out: “the majority view that developed in the late twentieth century and continues to this day stand in contrast both to the lively debate of the 1960s and the 1970s and to the opposite consensus that existed prior to that era”⁹.

⁶ S. HULTGREN, “A Vision for the End of the Days”: Defferal of Revelation in Daniel and at the End of Mark”, in *ZNW* 109 (2018), no. 2, 153-184.

⁷ G. VAN OYEN, *The Empty Tomb Story in the Gospel of Mark and Michel Foucault's Concept of Heterotopia*, in G. VAN OYEN – T. SHEPHERD (ed.), *Resurrection of the Dead, Biblical Traditions in Dialogue* (BETHL 249), Leuven, Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012, 137-158, p. 140. This is representative of the most common NT exegete opinions. See also Elliott : “most critical editions of the Greek New Testament and most modern English versions reach their climax to [...] v. 8” (ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses* (n. 3), p. 82). Or K.R. IVERSON, *A Further Word on Final Γάρ (Mark 16,8)*, in *CBQ* 68 (2006) 79-94, p. 80.

⁸ FOCANT, *Un silence* (n. 4), p. 371. A) examples in favor of the consensus: J.L. MAGNESS, *Sense and Absence: Structure and Suspension in the Ending of Mark's Gospel*, Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1986; J.D. KINGSBURY, *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1989; C. COMBET-GALLAND, *Qui roulera la peur?*, in *ETR* 65 (1990) 171-189; FOCANT, *Un silence* (n. 4), 2006; IVERSON, *A Further Word* (n. 7), 2006; D.B. WALLACE, *Mark 16,8 as the Conclusion to the Second Gospel*, in D.A. BLACK (ed.), *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark, 4 Views*, Nashville, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2008, 1-39; VAN OYEN, *The Empty Tomb Story* (n. 7), 2012; P.N. McLELLAN, *Specters of Mark: The Second Gospel's Ending and Derrida's Messianicity*, *BibInt* 24 (2016), no 3, 357-381; S. HULTGREN, “A Vision for the End of the Days” (n. 6), 2018.

B) examples in favor of the longer ending: B. METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1987; M.A. ROBINSON, *The Long Ending of Mark as Canonical Verity*, in D.A. BLACK (ed.), *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark, 4 Views*, Nashville, Broadman & Holman, 2008, 40-79; N.P. LUNN, *The Original Ending of Mark. A New Case for the Authenticity of Mark 16,9-20*, Eugene, Pickwick Publications, 2014; D.W. HESTER, *Does Mark 16,9-20 Belong in the New Testament?*, Eugene, Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015.

C) examples in favor of a lost or mutilated ending: E. LINEMANN, *Der (wiedergefundene) Markusschluss*, *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 66 (1969), 255-287; C.A. EVANS, *Mark 8,27-16,20*, Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 2001 ; N.T. WRIGHT, *The Resurrection of the Son of God. Christian Origins and the Question of God*, Vol. 3, London, SPCK, 2003 ; C.N. CROY, *The Mutilation of Mark's Gospel*, Nashville, Abingdon, 2003 ; ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses* (n. 3), 2008. D) in favor of a rewriting by Mark himself: D.A. BLACK, *Mark 16,9-20 as Markan Supplement*, in D.A. BLACK (ed.), *Perspectives on the Ending of Mark. 4 Views*, Nashville, Broadman & Holman, 2008, 103-123.

⁹ CROY, *The Mutilation of Mark's Gospel* (n. 8), p. 18.

The main reason for this consensus seems to be that this textual version dispenses with the exegetes to make explicit the relationship between the end of Mark and common history: “it now appears that the results of historical research have reached an impasse”, as Gert van Oyen underlines¹⁰. As a typical example, Hamilton considered the Mk 16,8 ending as an “anti-resurrection” story¹¹, but Elliott rightly points out that “the other Gospel writers show no reluctance to report the announced Christophany. Why should they? Even Paul [...] is aware of the earliest traditions about the end of Jesus’ career and continuation”¹². Eusebius was puzzled by the manuscripts ending with Mk 16,8¹³.

Putting aside the historical-cultural parameters, exegetes have then retained three main approaches to commenting on the Mark ending in 16,8. First, the narrative approach leads either to a *theological-existential reading* of “the presence of the crucified-risen Christ real in the lives of those who live ‘between fear and hope’”¹⁴, or secondly, to a literary analysis of the “subtle game between the final and the rest of the work”¹⁵, according to McLellan. He considers both Mk 16,1-8 and the *Specters of Marx* by Derrida and interprets the young man (v. 5) as a ghost, arguing that Mk 16 “demonstrates [that] a ‘memory for the future’ also serves a haunting function, because a ghost can never really die”¹⁶; philology is completely absent here. Thirdly, some exegetes attempt to bridge the gap between the Mk 16,8 ending and the longer ending, proposing the consideration of two canonical versions, or to read the gospel twice¹⁷. The common point underlying these three main lines of interpretation is their absence of consideration of the Mk 16,8 cultural backdrop, a point that should to be reconsidered in further inquiries (see part IV).

In terms of textual criticism, the field has always known the coexistence of diverse opinions about Mark’s endings: certain important scholars have remained prudent in their evaluation of the case¹⁸, and the longer ending has

¹⁰ VAN OYEN, *The Empty Tomb Story* (n. 7), p. 137.

¹¹ N.Q. HAMILTON, *Resurrection Tradition and the Composition of Mark*, *JBL* 84 (1965), no 4, 415-421, p. 420.

¹² ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (n. 4), p. 94. The potential negation of the resurrection in Mk 16 is also a popular topic on some Islamic websites that are beyond the scope of this article (see LUNN, *The Original Ending of Mark* (n. 8), Kindle l. 87, footnotes 5, 6, 7).

¹³ EUSEBIUS, *PG* 22, 937.

¹⁴ VAN OYEN, *The Empty Tomb Story* (n. 7), p. 158.

¹⁵ C. GRAPPE, *Marc 16,1-8 ou les dernières surprises d'un évangile qui ne cesse de surprendre*, in G. VAN OYEN – A. WENIN (ed.), *La surprise dans la Bible, Hommage à Camille Focant*, (BETHL 247), Leuven, Peeters, 2012, 247-258, p. 252.

¹⁶ MCLELLAN, *Specters of Mark* (n. 8), p. 371 and p. 367.

¹⁷ See Focant, who follows the plurality of reading recommended by Eusebius in *PG* 22,937 (FOCANT, *Un silence* (n. 4), p. 342, n. 4; C. FOCANT, *La canonicité de la finale longue (Mc 16,9-20). Vers la reconnaissance d'un double texte canonique?*, in C. FOCANT, *Marc, un évangile étonnant, Recueil d'essais* (BETHL 194), Leuven, Peeters, 2006, 371-381; pp. 377-381); C. COMBET-GALLAND, *L'Évangile de Marc et la pierre qu'il a déjà roulée*, in O. MAINVILLE – D. MARGUERAT (ed.), *Résurrection. L'après-mort dans le monde ancien et le Nouveau Testament, Le Monde de la Bible* (MdB 45), Genève, Labor et Fides – Montréal, Mediaspaul, 2001, 93-109, p. 107.

¹⁸ See K. CLARK, *Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, *JBL* 85 (1966) 1-16, quoted by HESTER, *Does Mark 16,9-20* (n. 8), p. 146: “we should consider the question still open”.

been supported for example by Bruce Metzger¹⁹. The collected essays, edited by David Allan Black in 2008 – with four diverse points of view by Bock, Elliott, Robinson and Wallace – clearly represent a milestone in recent research on the chapter. It should lead exegetes away from reaffirming the Mk 16,8 ending evidence so evidently. J. Keith Elliott demonstrates that the scribes of \aleph and B “were aware [...] that the ending of Mark was disputed”²⁰. This conclusion is based, on one hand, on the calculation of spaces and letters in the codex Sinaiticus Q.77 (folio 5r) which presents an empty space after Mark’s ending²¹. On the other hand, a close reading of B makes it clear that there is an entire empty column at the end of Mark and Luke only begins on the next folio²². This is not the case at the end of the other gospels in B²³. Compared to Mark, at the end of Luke, the first column of the Gospel of John follows immediately on the same folio. Moreover, keeping in mind that “scribe D of Sinaiticus was also very likely to have been one of two scribes of Codex Vaticanus”²⁴ and that they are two MSS from the same scriptorium, one may consider Elliott’s statement: “we are concerned effectively with only one MS witness to the text of Mark ending at 16,8 rather than with two independent early Greek manuscripts”²⁵. The possibility for scholars to look directly at the concerned manuscripts will progressively modify their perception of \aleph and B in Mk 16,8: as Wido van Peursen has persistently argued, the digital turn averts our attention from the “text” to the “document”²⁶. Each available online manuscript should now be *seen* before to be appreciated and commented on.

In summary, if the majority of NT exegetes continue developing readings based on the Mk 16,8 ending, one should not forget that this consensus is a quite recent one. Moreover, the possibility to look online at the only three²⁷ available manuscripts ending the second gospel in 16,8 is progressively transforming the perception of this well known textual variant. The time is ripe for a new quest based on Mk 16,8 manuscript evidence and on the historical-cultural backdrop of the verse, beyond the conclusion of an “historical impasse”²⁸. The most recent article on Mk 16,8 will be considered in the next part as a test case of this analysis of the current state of the art.

¹⁹ METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament* (n. 8), p. 270. Recently, see LUNN and HESTER (n. 8).

²⁰ ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses* (n. 3), p. 85.

²¹ See <http://www.codexsinaiticus.org>.

²² See https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1307.

²³ Compare *Bibliorum sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B facsimile edition*, published by Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Vatican, 1999, p. 1303 (Mk 16), to p. 1277 (Mat 28) and p. 1349 (Lk 24); online versions: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1307; https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1281; https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1353.

²⁴ ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses* (n. 3), p. 85.

²⁵ ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses* (n. 3), p. 86.

²⁶ W. van PEURSEN, *Text Comparison and Digital Creativity: An Introduction*, in W. van PEURSEN – E.D. THOUTENHOOFD – A. VAN DER WEEL (ed.), *Text Comparison and Digital Creativity. The Production of Presence and Meaning in Digital Text Scholarship* (Scholarly Communication 1), Leiden, Brill, 2010, 1-27, p. 6.

²⁷ The minuscule 304 can be observed on the *New Testament Virtual Room of Manuscripts* website, <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/>.

²⁸ See VAN OYEN, *The Empty Tomb Story* (n. 7), p. 137.

III. A NEW PROPOSAL: THE THEODOTION VERSION OF DN 10,7 AS KEY ELEMENT TO UNDERSTAND MK 16,8

Stephen Hultgren's 2018 article on Mk 16,8²⁹ deserves consideration as new interesting proposal. His thesis is that "the original end of Mark 16,8 is inspired by Daniel"³⁰, according to the Theodotion version of Dan 10,7: "And I, Daniel, alone saw the vision, and the men who were with me did not see the vision, rather great astonishment (ἐκστασις) fell upon them, and they fled in fear (ἔφυγον ἐν φόβῳ)"(NETS version, slightly adapted³¹). The Old Greek version (OG) is somewhat different here³². For Hultgren, Mk 16,8 "is an intertextual allusion to Dan 10,7 [according to Theodotion]. Daniel 10–12 establishes a pattern of revelation, concealment, and future revelation, in which the resurrection of the dead is apocalyptically deferred - its truth not confirmable until it happens at the end of days. A similar pattern of concealment and revelation characterizes Mark's gospel"³³. This 31-pages study is innovative within the field and raises further questions, that I discuss in three parts : textual criticism and history, intertextuality and the case of the co-called Theodotion version in Dan 10,7.

1. Textual criticism and history

This study is written from an exegetical perspective. Stephen Hultgren shortly attests to the majority consensus regarding Mk 16,8 manuscript evidence: "With the rise of modern textual criticism and gospel studies, it became clear that neither the longer ending nor the so-called shorter ending could be original to Mark. [...] The vast majority of scholars have accepted that 16,8 gives the oldest recoverable ending for Mark, as do I"³⁴. Regarding the mutilation hypothesis, Hultgren considers it as unlikely because without evidence³⁵, and because episodes such as Jesus' appearance to Peter can absolutely be omitted, as Matt 28,16-20 demonstrates³⁶. However, stories such as Jesus' appearance to James, mentioned by Paul in 1 Co 15,7, could absolutely have disappeared without leaving any later trace in the NT corpus: early tensions or disagreements may have led to canonical silences, as the study of apocryphal Christian literature

²⁹ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6).

³⁰ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 154.

³¹ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 154; R. Timothy McLay has translated Dn 10,7 Theodotion in the 2009 NETS edition: "And I, Daniel, alone saw the appearance, and the men who were with me did not see the appearance, rather a great terror fell upon them, and they fled in fear" (*A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009, p. 1018).

³² NETS, Dan 10,7 OG : "And I, Daniel, saw this great vision, and the persons who were with me saw the vision, and a mighty fear fell on them, and they ran away in haste" (n. 31), p. 1018.

³³ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 153.

³⁴ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), pp. 163-164.

³⁵ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 166: "Such a hypothesis requires that the original of Mark's gospel or an early copy was mutilated in such a 'clean' way that it left no indication to the earliest scribes that Mark 16,8 was not the original ending".

³⁶ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 166: "The lack of a specific appearance to Peter in Matt 28,16-20 makes it unlikely that that passage preserves the lost ending".

often demonstrates. Moreover, we do not have any Mark 16 manuscript evidence anterior to the 4th century, and \aleph and B evidence apparently shows consciousness of other endings³⁷. So the case remains open in the first three centuries CE.

With respect to the historical parameters, Hultgren is also in harmony with the mainstream NT exegetes. He begins by evoking a possible historical backdrop: “speaking strictly, however, from a historical perspective the reunion in Galilee does not depend on the women’s report”³⁸. But he prefers then to consider that “from a historical perspective it is true, of course, that if the women never said anything to anyone about what they had seen, then the story of the empty tomb would never have become known. It seems that either the women must have told (in a lost ending) or (more likely) that Mark intends the reader to imagine that they told”³⁹. Consequently, Hultgren validates a literary interpretation, situated in the world of the text: “But it is also possible that for literary purposes Mark wants the reader or hearer of his gospel to imagine that he or she is hearing the words of the young man in 16,6-7, previously kept secret, for the first time. In other words, in the very reading (or hearing) of the gospel, what was previously hidden is now revealed”⁴⁰.

Consequently, this article fits neatly into the mainstream of NT exegesis on Mk 16,8, specifically in the second mentioned category mentioned in part II. Points 2 and 3 will now scrutinize Hultgren’s thesis in two steps: first, the intertextual reading, then the question of the Greek Dan 10,7 versions, the keystone of Hultgren’s argumentation.

2. Intertextuality at stake

The article does not mention a state of the art of the intertextual relationship between Dan 10,7 and Mk 16,8: only three references are mentioned briefly in footnotes⁴¹. For Stephen Hultgren, the case is clear: his predecessors overlooked the allusion: “It is astonishing that these chapters [Dan 10–12] have not played a greater role in interpretation of Mark 16,1-8 than they have done. The more thorough commentators call attention to Dan 10,7, but they do not make much of the possible allusion”⁴². But can one be convinced by an auctorial intertextuality between Dan 10,7 Theodotion and Mk 16,8? Adela Yarbro Collins’ commentary – referred to in footnote but not commented by Hultgren⁴³ – is here enlightening.

She clearly recognizes a common pattern of fear in front a divine epiphany in Dan 10,7 and Mk 16, 8, but does not come to the conclusion of a literary dependence here. Firstly, she inscribes the fear reaction in Mk 16,8 in a generic literary pattern of Ancient religious cultures: “in Greek literature, fear is a

³⁷ ELLIOTT, *The Last Twelve Verses* (n. 3), p. 85; quoted in part II.

³⁸ HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 168 ; see also p. 175 : “if Mark’s real point is that the meeting between Jesus and the disciples in Galilee did in fact happen, he could have described that meeting and its consequences”.

³⁹ HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 169.

⁴⁰ HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 169.

⁴¹ HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 162, n. 35.

⁴² HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 162.

⁴³ HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 162, n. 35.

common reaction to divine epiphany. In biblical literature, the appearance of an angel is analogous to the Greek divine epiphany”⁴⁴. Then she fully comments on the case of the Greek versions of Dan 10,7 without opposing OG and Theodotion, since they illustrate the same literary schema as Mk 16,8: “Note that the trans. of the latter text attributed to Theodotion speaks about Daniel’s companions fleeing in fear (καὶ ἔφυγον ἐν φόβῳ) when his vision commences (10,7), in a way analogous to the flight of the women in Mark, even though Daniel alone saw the vision. The OG of 10,7 is also analogous: ‘and a mighty fear fell upon them, and they ran away in haste’”⁴⁵.

Yarbro Collins is correct in keeping to the same general literary cultural pattern of Dan 10,7 OG and Theodotion, to not force the minor differences between the OG and Theodotion, nor to search for a deliberate literary dependence between Mk 16,8 and Dan 10,7 Theodotion. Indeed, the next point will reinforce Collins’ prudent judgments by examining the pieces of the complex Dan 10,7 Theodotion file. From a literary point of view, Hultgren himself verifies that the intertextuality diagnostic essentially relies on generic elements of vision or epiphany, as arguments 1 and 2 make clear in his summary statement:

- (1) Both texts feature an ‘angelic’ messenger described as a ‘man’ dressed in bright apparel.
- (2) In both cases the angelic message involves resurrection of the dead (Dan 12,1-3; Mark 16,6).
- (3) In both cases the response to the vision includes speechlessness and secret keeping (Dan 10,15.17; 12,4.9; Mark 16,8).⁴⁶

Argument 3 may even cause uncertainty amongst readers since there is no evidence of secret keeping request in Mk 16,8⁴⁷. Moreover, it should be underlined that in the Dan 10,7 Theodotion version, the men who flee due to fear *do not see* the vision, whereas the women in Mk 16,8 do see the young man in white clothes. In conclusion, Hultgren’s attention to the intertextual backdrop of Dan 10–12 proves to be valuable for the general layout of the gospel according to Mark⁴⁸, but Yarbro Collins correctly identifies a same generic framework for Dan 10,7 Theodotion, OG, and Mk 16,8. Moreover, as pointed by Nathalie Piégay-Gros⁴⁹, allusion diagnostic remains entirely based on the reader’s memory. So if

⁴⁴ A. YARBRO COLLINS, *Mark: A Commentary (Hermeneia)*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2007, p. 800.

⁴⁵ YARBRO COLLINS, *Mark: A Commentary* (n. 44), p. 800, n. 276.

⁴⁶ HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 155.

⁴⁷ HULTGREN minimizes the divergence, see for example “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 163: “To be sure, there are two important differences between Daniel and Mark. First, in Daniel it is the people who do not see the vision that flee in fear, while in Mark the women both see the angel and flee in fear. Second, in Daniel explicit commands are given to keep the vision secret, whereas in Mark there is an explicit command to reveal the content of the epiphany, and the secrecy is, or at least appears to be, disobedience to the command. Nonetheless, the affinities between Daniel and Mark are too strong to ignore”.

⁴⁸ See for example about the Transfiguration story, HULTGREN, “*A Vision for the End of the Days*” (n. 6), p. 159: “Deferral of revelation runs like a red thread through Mark. The most obvious instance is the transfiguration story. After Peter, James, and John witness Jesus transfigured on the mountain, Jesus admonishes them not to tell anyone what they have seen until the Son of Man should rise from the dead (9,9). The resurrection becomes the *terminus ad quem* for the keeping of the secret”.

⁴⁹ N. PIÉGAY-GROS, *Introduction à l’Intertextualité*, Paris, Dunod, 1996, p. 98. For a discussion on allusion and methodology, see C. CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22,43-44) ou comment on*

intertextuality is at stake here, it should be considered from the readers' rather than from the auctorial point of view, as point 3 demonstrates it.

3. *The Theodotion case in Dan 10,7*

Stephen Hultgren affirms that "Theodotion reads" Dan 10,7, quoting R. Timothy McLay's translation in NETS⁵⁰, and briefly explains in a footnote that "Theodotionic readings are well attested in the New Testament, including Mark, and it is likely that Theodotion actually antedates the New Testament". He also refers to John Collins Daniel's *Hermeneia* commentary⁵¹, and to Rahlfs' and Ziegler's LXX editions⁵² in another footnote. However, the case of the Theodotion version in Dan 10,7 is much more complex. As McLay explains in the introduction to Daniel in NETS, "the portions of the Greek versions in these chapters [7–12], where the verbal agreements between the texts are strong, give the appearance that the TH text is a revision of the OG"⁵³. McLay is in line with the impressive work of Armin Schmitt on the topic⁵⁴.

In his 1994 Daniel commentary, John Collins further validates also Schmitt's thesis: "A. Schmitt carried out a thorough comparison of the Theodotionic text of Daniel with the rest of the Theodotionic corpus and concluded that they have virtually nothing in common. [...He] made a convincing case that Daniel was not translated by the same hand as the rest of Theodotion"⁵⁵. Joseph Ziegler's 1999 Daniel edition, revised by Olivier Munich, presents the same orientation, even estimating that "wahrscheinlich hat unser Text mit Theodotion überhaupt nichts zu tun"⁵⁶. Collins concludes: "it may be that Theodotion is a compilation from different hands, marked by a degree of literalism less extreme than that of Aquila. The nature and coherence of Theodotion as a whole is an issue that lies

pourrait bien encore écrire l'histoire (BiTS 7), Leuven, Peeters, 2010, notably p. 188: "Nathalie Piégay-Gros a montré que lorsqu'une allusion ne contenait pas de marque d'hétérogénéité, on en revenait alors, au sein même de la définition de Genette, à une intertextualité de type de celle de Julia Kristeva 'sa perception dépend alors entièrement de la mémoire du lecteur'. C'est en raison de ce jeu entre texte et mémoire du lecteur que Genette lui-même a affirmé que l'objet de la poétique, 'posons-le fermement, n'est pas le texte mais l'architexte'".

⁵⁰ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 154.

⁵¹ HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 154, n. 2.

⁵² HULTGREN, "A Vision for the End of the Days" (n. 6), p. 154, n. 3.

⁵³ *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (n. 31), p. 992.

⁵⁴ Since his 1966 dissertation, Armin Schmitt has constantly confirmed this reading, see for example A. SCHMITT, *Die griechischen Danieltexte ("θ" und ο) und das Theodotionproblem*, in C. WAGNER (ed.), *Armin Schmitt. Der Gegenwart verpflichtet. Studien zur biblischen Literatur des Frühjudentums, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (BZAW 292)*, Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2000, 47-75.

⁵⁵ J. J. COLLINS, *Daniel (Hermeneia)*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1993, p. 10.

⁵⁶ J. ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna - Daniel - Bel et Draco. Editio secunda : Versionis iuxta LXX interpretes textum plane novum constituit Olivier Munnich. Versionis iuxta (Sept.VTG)*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999, p. 121–122, n. 1: "Die Siegel "θ" ist in Anführungszeichen gesetzt, weil es kein eigentlicher Theodotion-Text ist ; dies gilt sicherlich für die Textform, die uns die älteste Überlieferung bietet. In ihr fehlen nämlich sehr viele Teile, die in M stehen ; während in den anderen Büchern Theodotion das Minus nach der Vorlage ergänzt, ist es bei Daniel nicht geschehen. [...] Wahrscheinlich hat unser Text mit Theodotion überhaupt nichts zu tun".

beyond the scope of this commentary”⁵⁷. This general analysis of the Theodotion Daniel, particularly in chapters 7–12, is fully confirmed in Dan 10,7.

Origen’s Hexapla edition by Montfaucon in 1713 is a worthy starting point to consider the case. Montfaucon does not mention a specific Theodotion Dan 10,7 tradition⁵⁸, even though in the introduction to Daniel he evokes Jerome’s statement affirming that Theodotion was received in early Christian communities⁵⁹. This statement, quoted by Collins in his commentary⁶⁰, has been often used in scholarship⁶¹. This could explain why scholars remains generally convinced to read a Theodotion version of Daniel, whereas the specialists in the field like Ziegler, Schmitt, Collins and McLay speak rather about a compilation or revision of the Theodotion Daniel, notably in chapters 7–12.

In fact, during Monfaucon’s time, no edition of a Theodotion Daniel was published. Montfaucon did not possess a trace of manuscript, comment nor gloss mentioning a Theodotion version of Dan 10,7. With the currently available evidence, until now there has only been a single trace of Theodotion *inscriptio* in an 11th century manuscript, the Greek minuscule 62⁶². Minuscule 62 has been grouped together with codex V (8th century CE) and minuscule 147 (12th century CE) to represent the Theodotion version of Origen’s Hexaplaric recension. However, it should be underlined that V has in its *inscriptio* only δανηλ and no mention of Theodotion⁶³, also not mentioned in all the other manuscripts⁶⁴. Therefore, if the Old Greek version is already attested to by a 3rd century CE papyrus, the Cologne Papyrus 967⁶⁵, in comparison, the Theodotion Daniel version lacks such an attestation. The 62 *inscriptio* is a faint trace that links a concrete textual version to Theodotion and may simply attest to the influence of Jerome’s statement.

So what is in fact the Theodotion version, just one time attested to in the Greek manuscripts of Daniel, but regularly published as such? The strong tendency towards a concrete Theodotion version has been mainly based on the Codex Vaticanus B⁶⁶. This has been principally grouped together with the Codex

⁵⁷ COLLINS, *Daniel* (n. 55), p. 11.

⁵⁸ B. DE MONTFAUCON (ed.), *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt : multis partibus auctiora*, tome 2 : *Complectens Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, Canticum Cantorum, Prophetas majores & minores itemque notas aliquot posteriores praevidiam disquisitionem ad duo lexica, lexicon Hebraicum ad hexapla, lexicon Graecum ad hexapla, addenda quaedam ad lexicon Hebraicum*, Paris, Ludovic Guérin, Jean Boudot et Charles Robustel, 1713, p. 336.

⁵⁹ DE MONTFAUCON (ed.), *Hexaplorum Origenis*, tome 2 (n. 58), p. 327.

⁶⁰ JEROME, *Preface to Daniel*, in *PL* 28, col. 1357; quoted by COLLINS, *Daniel* (n. 55), p. 4.

⁶¹ See for example H. BARCLAY SWEET, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. III, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1894, pp. V–VI.

⁶² ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna - Daniel - Bel et Draco* (n. 56), p. 235.

⁶³ ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna - Daniel - Bel et Draco* (n. 56), p. 235.

⁶⁴ ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna - Daniel - Bel et Draco* (n. 56), pp. 217 and 235.

⁶⁵ A. GEISSEN (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel : nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967. [3]: Kap. 5-12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther, Kap. 1, 1a-2, 15*, Bonn, R. Habelt, 1968, p. 228; online: http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PTheol/PT29_4v.jpg

⁶⁶ Codex Vaticanus (B) online : https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209; Dan 10,7 can be seen on page 1228: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209/1232.

Alexandrinus (5th century CE) and the Codex Quirinus (6th century CE)⁶⁷. This conviction has endured⁶⁸, and was already attested to in the re-edited version of Origen's Hexapla by Frederik Field in 1875 where he added Theodotion Dan 10,7 to the Montfaucon edition, and included the Aquila variant from the Syro-Hexapla⁶⁹. Dan 10,7 is a useful test-case to show how Schmitt and McLay are correct about Dan 7–12 and the Theodotion question. Indeed, Q presents a tradition other than B and A at the end of Dan 10,7: ἔφυγον ἐν τρόμῳ; in the margin, φόβῳ is proposed as alternative⁷⁰. Ziegler comments on Q: "Die Sonderlesarten von Q sind sehr zahlreich. [...] Die zahlreiche Wortänderungen sind affallend. Besonders wichtig ist 11,14, wo Q^{txt} eine Symmachus-Leseart bezeugt. Vielleicht sind auch andere Varianten von Q verdeckte Symmachus-Lesearten"⁷¹. He proposes eventually considering the Q variants as based on the Symmachus version. In Dan 10,7, the full text of Q has a specific word – ἐν τρόμῳ; present in the margin is the variant from the codex Vaticanus (B), usually considered as Theodotian, φόβῳ. There is almost no better example of the fluidity of an Ancient codex, which can present variants from diverse traditions.

Let's summarize now the contents of the different Greek versions of Dan 10,7 and then compare them to the Syriac versions. As demonstrated with respect to the Lk 22,43–44 variant, the Syriac tradition is indeed an important echo chamber to understanding Greek variants⁷². It is all the more important when it comes to the central test-case in question that we possess the Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus, whose facsimile was published by Ceriani in 1874⁷³. The Greek versions of Dan 10,7 are all different from the Hebrew versions, where the people who flee do not see the vision and escape *to hide themselves*⁷⁴. The Old Greek version claims that the people do indeed see the vision, but "ran away in haste" (ἐν σπουδῇ)⁷⁵. The Vaticanus (B) version claims that the people do not see the vision and flee in fear (ἐν φόβῳ), or in trembling in Q (ἐν τρόμῳ).

Although these examples already refer to four versions, the Syriac tradition adds a fifth, related explicitly to Aquilas: the people flee in secret (*b-tuššāyā*), as indicated in the margin of the Ambrosianus⁷⁶. The Peshitta follows the Vaticanus

⁶⁷ BARCLAY SWEET, *The Old Testament* (n. 61), p. VI: "BAQ [...] supply a fair amount of uncial authority for the text of Theodotion".

⁶⁸ COLLINS, *Daniel* (n. 55), p. 9, n. 76; ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna - Daniel - Bel et Draco* (n. 56), p. 137.

⁶⁹ F. FIELD (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (1875), Hildesheim, G. Olms, 1964, vol. 2, p. 928.

⁷⁰ Codex Q online: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.2125; Dan 10,7 is on page 816: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.2125/1643.

⁷¹ ZIEGLER (ed.), *Susanna - Daniel - Bel et Draco* (n. 56), p. 140.

⁷² CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sœur de sang* (n. 49), pp. 449-450 and 457-460.

⁷³ A.M. CERIANI, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus*, vol. VII, London, Williams & Norgate, 1874; for Dan 10,7, f. 149r., p. 245. I am in debt to Dr. Sara Schulthess for all the Syriac readings.

⁷⁴ FIELD (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum* (n. 69), p. 928.

⁷⁵ NETS (n. 31), p. 1018.

⁷⁶ CERIANI, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus*, f. 149r., p. 245; online: https://archive.org/stream/CerianiCodexSyroHexaplarisAmbrosianusMonumentaSacraEtProfana7Milan1874_201312/Ceriani%2C%20Codex%20Syro-hexaplaris%20Ambrosianus%20%28Monumenta%20sacra%20et%20profana%207%3B%20Milan%201874%29#page/n245.

(B) with respect to the fear aspect (*men dheltā*)⁷⁷, whereas the main text of the Ambrosianus presents the OG reading - in haste (*b-surhābā*)⁷⁸. It should be underlined that this codex presents the OG version in the main text, and not the so-called Theodotian version. An inquiry based on the Septuagint Greek and Syriac manuscripts confirms Dan 10,7 with respect to the opinions of the scholars about Dan 7–12: it cannot be related to Theodotion in the same way as the rest of the Theodotion version (Ziegler, McLay), but rather attests most probably to a compilation by diverse hands (Collins) or even to an OG rewriting (Schmitt). The diversity of Dan 10,7 traditions makes clear that it would be more prudent to speak of a Vaticanus (B) tradition in Dan 10,7, rather than of a Theodotion one.

After the discussions of part 2 and 3, the hypothesis of a deliberate auctorial intertextuality with respect to Mk 16,8 and the so-called Theodotion version of Dan 10,7 seems not demonstrable from the auctorial perspective. However, the influence of Stephen Hultgren's article makes its presence felt: it turns attentions to the readers⁷⁹ of Dan 10,7 and Mk 16,8, since the Codex Q even adds in Dn 10,7 a word that we find in Mk 16,8, τρόμφ. One faces here a shared general backdrop: indeed, in the five diverse Hebrew, Greek and Syriac versions of Dan 10,7, the fear in front of a divine epiphany is present, a pattern highlighted by Adela Yarbro Collins⁸⁰. All these versions refer to fear, as does Mk 16,8. They present variations and interpretations of the phenomenon, but these are not significant enough to be opposed. If the manuscript data is closely examined, the biggest common point between Dan 10,7 and Mk 16,8 is at the end the diversity of variant readings around an identical religious pattern. This presents an important clue for the direction of a further research about the Markan endings: why is there such a diversity of variants, of stories, of readings, in the last chapter of Mark, narrating a religious experiment?

IV. CONCLUSION

IN SEARCH OF THE EMOTIONAL BACKDROP TO THE 'DEAD-ALIVE' APPEARANCES STORIES

In summary, the overview of the state of the art, including the detailed discussion of the latest proposal, has pointed to the necessity to be more attentive to the historico-cultural backdrop of Mk 16,8. Secondly, a renewed look at the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus has underlined the most ancient presence of various versions of Mark endings. Thirdly, the interesting echo chamber of the multiple linguistic Dan 10,7 versions has pointed out to the link between emotions – fear in particular – and religious experiences. Is such a link also at stake in the diverse Markan endings? Is it possible to point to some elements in conclusion for looking further in that direction?

⁷⁷ A.M. CERIANI, *A facsimile edition of the Peshitto Old Testament based on Codex Ambrosianus (7a1) translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti: ex codice Ambrosiano, Sec fere VI*, Piscataway, Gorgias Press, 2013, p. 433.

⁷⁸ CERIANI, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus* (n. 73), f. 149r., p. 245.

⁷⁹ For the methodological background, see C. CLIVAZ, *Luke, Acts and the Ancient Readership: The Cultures of Author, Scribes and Readers in New Testament Exegesis*, in A. GREGORY – K.C. ROWE (ed.), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Religious Studies), Columbia, SC, University of South Carolina Press, 2010, 153-171.

⁸⁰ YARBRO COLLINS, *Mark: A Commentary* (n. 44), p. 800.

In his 2006 article⁸¹, Iverson briefly mentions Gen 18,15 LXX and Gen 45,3 LXX⁸² in the Mk 16, 8 backdrop. For Iverson, Sarah's fear is "the most impressive parallel [...]. When confronted by Abraham, Sarah denies [her laugh], ἐφοβήθη γάρ – an expression with striking similarity to Mark 16,8"⁸³. He does not focus on the case of Joseph in LXX Gen 45,3. In the 2008 Black collected essay, Wallace is the only one to refer to Iverson, in a footnote in reference to Gen 18, 15 LXX⁸⁴; there is no mention of Gen 45,3 LXX. Before Iverson's text, Kelhoffer's monograph did not mention Gen 18, 15 LXX nor Gen 45, 3 LXX. In the two monographs published after Iverson's article, Hester (2015) does not mention the LXX occurrences, while Lunn signals them without analyzing them⁸⁵. In other words, the parallel with Gen 18,5 LXX, described as "impressive" by Iverson, has not been examined in details until now, and Gen 45,3 LXX has not been considered at all, apart from Iverson's brief mention thereof.

Gen 45, 3 LXX could matter as much as Gen 18, 5 LXX when it comes to better understanding the general backdrop of Mk 16,8: it is indeed a scene of recognition of a person believed dead by the others (Joseph and his brothers), a scene including trouble (ἐταράχθησαν γάρ, see Mk 16, 5.8) and sadness (Gen 45, 5 LXX). Such scenes were very popular particularly in the 1st and 2nd centuries CE, illustrating the diverse feelings of people confronted with an apparently dead person coming "back to life", as in *Chaireas and Callirhoe*⁸⁶. As Bernhard Kytzler, a Classicist, demonstrates, it is a literary *topos*, recurrent in Greco-Roman literature, which explains the presence of diverse feelings in such circumstances. He calls it the "contrast of feelings" (*der Kontrast der Empfindungen*⁸⁷). This *topos* helps the reader to share characters' feelings and is also present in historical literature⁸⁸.

As demonstrated in 2007⁸⁹, this literary *topos* is present in an unusual expression in the resurrection story in Lk 24,41a: "still disbelieving by joy and wondering", ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων. Such mixed feelings can be explained using the above literary *topos* of the "contrast of feelings" defined by Kytzler. The entire Mark 16 chapter should be explored in this light, and by paying attention not only to the trouble and fear expressed by

⁸¹ IVERSON, *A Further Word* (n. 7), p. 81.

⁸² Gen 18, 15 LXX: ἠρνήσατο δὲ Σαρρα λέγουσα Οὐκ ἐγέλασα· ἐφοβήθη γάρ. Gen 45,3 LXX: εἶπεν δὲ Ἰωσηφ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ Ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰωσηφ· ἔτι ὁ πατήρ μου ζῆ; καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ· ἐταράχθησαν γάρ.

⁸³ IVERSON, *A Further Word* (n. 7), p. 87.

⁸⁴ WALLACE, *Mark 16,8 as the Conclusion* (n. 8), p. 37, n. 108.

⁸⁵ LUNN, *The Original Ending of Mark* (n. 8), p. 13; J. Snapp (2016) is not considered in the present article since it is a self-edited book, nevertheless it contains useful information (J. SNAPP, *Authentic: The Case for Mark 16:9-20*, self-edited, Amazon Digital Services LLC, 2016).

⁸⁶ See *Chaireas and Callirhoe* III.3.2-3 ; IV.2.8 ; V.8.2, notably.

⁸⁷ B. KYTZLER, *Der Regenbogen der Gefühle: zum Kontrast der Empfindungen im Antiken Roman*, in *Scholia* 12 (2003), 69-81, p. 70.

⁸⁸ For example POLYBIUS, *Histories* IX.21.1.

⁸⁹ C. CLIVAZ, "Incroyants de joie" (*Lc 24, 41*). *Point de vue, Histoire et Poétique*, in RRENAB (ed.), *Regards croisés sur la Bible. Etudes sr le point de vue. Actes du IIIe colloque international du Réseau de recherche en narrativité biblique. Paris 8-10 juin 2006* (Lectio Divina), Paris, Cerf, 2007, 183-195.

the women in 16,5.8, but also to the disbelief at stake in 16,16⁹⁰. Indeed, disbelief belongs to the contrast of feelings present in 'dead-alive' apparition stories⁹¹. Gen 18, 5 LXX and Gen 45, 3 LXX encourage one to look in this direction. This common historical cultural backdrop goes far beyond the limited preoccupation with what is supposed to be canonical or not, and could relate Mk 16,8 and 16,16 in ways not considered until now. There might be echoes of concurrent Christian Churches and groups. Such explorations are at the menu of the MARK16 SNF project.

Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, DH+
Amhipole 817
Quartier Sorge - Dorigny
CH-1015 Lausanne

Claire Clivaz
claire.clivaz@sib.swiss

⁹⁰ See M. GOURGUES, "Qui ne croira pas sera condamné" (Mc 16,16). Sur la déclaration surprenante de la finale de Marc, in G. VAN OYEN – A. WÉNIN (ed.), *La surprise dans la Bible, Hommage à Camille Focant (BETHL 247)*, Leuven, Peeters, 2012, 259-275.

⁹¹ CLIVAZ, "Incroyants de joie" (n. 89), p. 187.