

## Examples of Duality in Mark 16:9-20 and Their Implications for The Markan Narrative

Larry Perkins

Northwest Baptist Seminary/Associated Canadian Theological Schools  
Of Trinity Western University

Within the Markan narrative various forms of repetition occur to such an extent that this has led many scholars to name this phenomenon a Markan characteristic. While described in the literature in different ways, Frans Neiryneck uses the term ‘duality’ to define this “so-called Markan redundancy.”<sup>1</sup> A classic example of this phenomenon is found in Mark 1:32:

ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος.

Matthew in its parallel passage writes ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης (8:16), whereas Luke writes δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου (4:40).<sup>2</sup> Such examples have provided ample fuel for those seeking to discern the relationship among the Synoptics, as well as to explain what sources the Markan author may have used in the composition of this gospel.

Neiryneck restricted his analysis of duality and his published list of examples to Mark 1 – 16:8. The disputed materials in 16:9-20<sup>3</sup> that occur in many Markan manuscripts are not part of this examination. We do not know from Neiryneck’s or Hawkins’ work whether duality occurs in Mark 16:9-20. They provide no evidence. Other treatments of this problematic text by W. Farmer<sup>4</sup>, for example, have discussed in detail various elements of the textual issues and diction/stylistic matters, but have not evaluated Mark 16:9-20 from the standpoint of duality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Frans Neiryneck, *Duality in Mark. Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XXXI (Leuven University Press, 1988), 13.

<sup>2</sup> In his publication Neiryneck provides a very full, if not exhaustive list of examples of duality occurring in Mark 1 – 16:8. He builds on earlier lists offered, for example, by writers such as John Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968, second edition), 139-141. Hawkins names them “duplicate expressions” (p.139).

<sup>3</sup> Evidence indicates that the material in Mark 16:9-20 was known in the first half of the second century AD. References to the content are found in Irenaeus, probably Justin Martyr, Tatian’s Diatessaron, and Tertullian. There may also be references to it in the *Gospel of Peter* and the *Epistula Apostolorum*. For a brief summary of this data see Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 167-168, footnote 47.

<sup>4</sup> W. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974). Consider also the discussion in R. Gundry, *Mark. A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B.Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1993), 1009-1012. Note also comments by N.T.Wright, *The Resurrection of the SON of GOD* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003), 616-631. Wright does not consider 16:9-20 as the original ending to this Gospel. After suggesting what the original ending might have contained, he admits “that the existing ‘longer ending’ may well not be too far, in outline, from what originally stood there, though in quite different language and with emphases for which Mark himself has not prepared us” (624). Wright does not define what this “different language” in 16:9-20 is specifically.

If stylistic duality is a characteristic feature of Markan discourse<sup>5</sup>, then 16:9-20 should be examined to see whether examples of such duality occur within it. If stylistic duality can be demonstrated to occur in this longer ending, then this data may contribute to the overall debate about the ending of the Markan narrative. We will examine then Mark 16:9-20 using Neiryck's thirty categories of duality<sup>6</sup> and seek to discern whether any examples of duality from these thirty categories do occur. Once the investigation is completed and the data evaluated, we will comment on their possible implications for our understanding of the Markan narrative and the status of the longer ending.

Neiryck clusters his thirty categories of duality into four major groups:

1. grammatical usage;
2. duplicate expressions and double statements;
3. correspondence within one pericope;
4. the structuring of the gospel.<sup>7</sup>

#### A. Grammatical Usage.

1. compound verbs followed by the same preposition (παράγων παρά):<sup>8</sup>

In 16:18 we have the construction ἐπὶ ἄρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν. The verb ἐπιθήσουσιν is modified by the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ ἄρρώστους. This construction would fit within this category. Neiryck cites a similar example in Mark 8:25<sup>9</sup> which has the construction ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς.

2. There are no examples in Mark 16:9-20 of adverbs ending in -θεν and so there are no examples of this category. However, we also note from Neiryck's analysis that no examples occur in the first four chapters of Mark.
3. No examples of cognate datives or accusatives occur in Mark 16:9-20. Similarly no examples of this grammatical construction are listed for Mark 11-12.
4. The multiplication of cognate verbs within the same context:

---

<sup>5</sup> Werner Kelber, ed., *The Passion in Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 42 stated that "F. Neiryck has demonstrated that duality in the broad sense of the word, including double phrases, repetition of single words, double questions, doublets of indirect and direct discourse and pleonastic constructs of various kinds form an integral part of Mkan [sic] style and syntax."

<sup>6</sup> Neiryck, 32-37.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. In part II of his publication (75-136) he provides lists of every example for each category that he can identify in Mark's gospel. He also has an appendix in which he updates his lists in the light of evaluations offered and new studies made by other scholars (236-246).

<sup>8</sup> In each case I use the exact wording that Neiryck uses to define the categories to make sure that the same kinds of constructions are being identified and compared.

<sup>9</sup> Neiryck, 75.

- i. repetition of the same verb (ἐγένετο...ἐγένετο): The repetition of ἀπήγγειλεν (10)...ἀπήγγειλαν (13); ὁ πιστεύσας (16)...τοῖς πιστεύουσιν (17); κηρύξατε (15)...ἐκήρυξαν (20) and ἐθεάθη(11)...τοῖς θεασαμένοις (14) fits this category. While it is not an exact fit, the use of ἐφάνη (9) and ἐφανερώθη (12) forms an interesting related example.
- ii. repetition of its compound (ἔρχεται...συνέρχεται): The use of ἀπίστησαν (11) and ἐπίστευσαν (13,14) and the repetition of this same contrast in v.16 (ὁ πιστεύσας...ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας) might belong in this category, if the alpha-privative formation can be classified as a type of compound verb. Neiryck provides no alpha-privative examples in his list. So probably we should conclude that there are no examples of this category of duality in 16:9-20.
- iii. two compounds with identical preposition (εἰσπορεύονται...εἰσελθόντων): In v.13 the text has ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν, which would seem to belong in this category. However, this may be more apparent than real, because the meaning of these two verbs is quite distinct. In the examples that Neiryck cites the related verbs normally have semantic similarity.<sup>10</sup>
- iv. two compounds...with the same verbal root (ἐξῆλθεν...ἀπηλθεν): The use of παρακολούθησει (17) and ἐπακολουθούντων (20) matches this category.
- v. some non-verbal repetitions (γάρ...γάρ): In v.9 the temporal formation πρῶτῃ πρώτῃ σαββάτου followed by ἐφάνη πρῶτον presents a probable example. The repeated usage of ἐκεῖνος as a personal pronoun (10,11,13,20) might also fit in this category.

5. Double participles (φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα): Several examples of this category occur in 16:9-20. The condition of the eleven is described in v.10 as πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν. In v. 12 the dative object (δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν) is modified by two participles (περιπατοῦσιν...πορευομένοις). The writer does the same thing in v.16 where two participles are joined to form the subject of the verb (ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς). The genitive absolute in v.20 is formed with two present participles (τοῦ κυρίου συνεργούντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος).
6. There are no examples of double imperatives in 16:9-20. Neiryck lists no examples in Mark 3 or 12.

---

<sup>10</sup> Neiryck's lists for this category are on pages 77-81.

- 7 i. there are no examples in 16:9-20 of the repetition of the antecedent, such as a substantive instead of a pronoun (Σίμωνος for τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ);
- ii. redundant pronouns (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ): The usage of ἐκεῖνος in 16:9-20 several times is formally redundant, although it does add potentially an emphatic element ('that person', 'those persons'). For example in v.11 κἀκεῖνοι is not necessary to define the subject of the clause given that the plural indirect object in v.10 (τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις) would be the expected subject since the verb in v.11 (ἠπίστησαν) is third person plural in form. The same relationship exists between κἀκεῖνοι in v.13 and the dative object (δυσὶν) in v.12. A similar usage comes in v.20 with ἐκεῖνοι picking up the αὐτοῖς in v.19. The usage of ἐκεῖνο in 7:20 reflects the same usage. However, none of these examples exactly parallels what Neiryck seems to define in this category.
- iii. instances of a resumptive pronoun preceded by a relative (ἣς...τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς): Only one example of a relative clause occurs in 16:9-20 (9), describing Mary Magdalene and no resumptive pronoun occurs in that clause.
8. The use of double negatives (οὐκ οὐδέις): In an additional note<sup>11</sup> Neiryck lists nine examples of οὐ μή usually followed by a subjunctive verb form (all in chapters 9-14) and the writer uses this same construction in v.18 οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάβῃ.

In this first group 16:9-10 has examples of duality conforming to the categories defined in numbers 1, 4.i, 4.iv, 4.v, 5, and 8, but not of 2, 3, 6, 7i, and 7.iii. Examples of the forms of duality defined in 4.ii, 4.iii, and 7ii may occur in Mark 16:9-20, but the examples identified do not match any of Neiryck's examples.

#### B. Duplicate Expressions and Double Statements.

##### 9. Negative-positive:

- i. there are no examples of a negative followed by εἰ μή or ἐὰν μὴ (οὐδέις ἀγαθὰς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός) in 16:9-20.
- ii. a negative following by the opposite in an οὐ...ἀλλά construction (οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει) and allied constructions:<sup>12</sup> The use of οὐδέ in v.13 creates a contrast between the initial positive statement describing the announcement of a resurrection appearance, followed by the rejection of that witness (οὐδέ ἐκεῖνοις ἐπίστευσαν). This construction is similar to the example Neiryck cites in 6:19 and 13:31. The other potential example is the contrast in

<sup>11</sup> Neiryck, 88.

<sup>12</sup> Again, I use Neiryck's wording to define the categories.

v.16 (ὁ πιστεύσας...σωθήσεται...ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται). In 9:24 the father of the demonized boy says to Jesus πιστεύω· βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. Neiryck includes this in his list of examples.

10. i. a double temporal statement (πρῶτῃ / ἔννυχα λίαν): The expression πρῶτῃ πρώτη σαββάτου (9) represents a double statement of time. It is also possible that μὲν οὖν...μετὰ τὸ λαλήσαι αὐτοῖς (19) fits this category. The sense of μὲν οὖν (then) would be repeated and expanded in the articular infinitive following μετὰ.
- ii. a local statement (ἀλλαχοῦ / εἰς τὰς ἔχομένας κωμοπόλεις): The two participles in v.12 (περιπατοῦσιν...πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν) define the locality of a resurrection appearance. Neiryck provides no example of this kind of duplicate local description using two participles.

11. General and special:

i. in some indications of time and space a first general expression is followed by a more specific one. There are no examples of this feature of duality in Mark 16:9-20, unless πρῶτῃ πρώτη σαββάτου (9) would also belong here.

ii. likewise in connection with indications of persons

(πάσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται): In his command Jesus tells his followers to go εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα and proclaim the good news πασῇ τῇ κτίσει (15) which defines a movement from general to specific in terms of humanity. The promise that σημεῖα...τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ταῦτα (17) gains definition in the list of five specific examples that follow in vv.17b-18. The signs all have to do with specific things that will happen to those who proclaim the Gospel. However, these are events, not persons and so this does not fit Neiryck's category.

12. Repetitions of the motif in narrative and discourse material (thus in 3:14, 16 :

καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα...καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα): In v.11 the eleven hear Mary's testimony that Jesus ζῆ καὶ ἔθεάθη ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἠπίστησαν. When Jesus appears to all eleven at once he criticizes them because

τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγηγεμένον οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν (14). The repetition of the verbal components is noteworthy.

13. Synonymous repetitions, or repetition of the motif in one duplicate expression (ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ ἀύξανόμενα): The description of the eleven in v.10 (πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσιν) would fit this category. It is similar to examples that Neiryneck cites from 5:33, 38.<sup>13</sup> Perhaps as well the conjoined substantive participles ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθῆς (16) is a form of this kind of synonymous repetition.

14. There are no examples of “an Aramaic word followed by the Greek translation” in Mark 16:9-20. However, Neiryneck gives no examples from Mark chapters 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 or 13.

15. A substantive followed by an apposition (Βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱὸς βροντῆς): The reference to Μαρία τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ (9) belongs in this category. Neiryneck cites the same construction in his list of examples (15:40,47; 16:1).<sup>14</sup> The expression ὁ...κύριος Ἰησοῦς may fit this category also.

16. i. there are no examples of “a double group of persons

(οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα)”

ii. two individuals (the two brothers): The risen Jesus appears to

δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν (12), but the two are not individualized and so this probably does not fit this category.

iii. there are no examples of “the use of distributives (δύο δύο)” in 16:9-20.

17. Series of three (for the sake of completeness): The three different appearances of the risen Christ (9, 12, 14) would fit into this category. This would be comparable to the three people who accuse Peter of being a disciple of Jesus (14:66-72), cited by Neiryneck as an example of this category.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, Jesus’ comings and goings in Gethsemane would be similar (14:35-42).<sup>16</sup>

Within group B the examples of duality that occur within Mark 16:9-20 are quite striking. The only categories that do not have an example in 16:9-20 would be 9.i, 14, and 16. For 11.i the example offered may be questionable, but the structure cited seems to fit the criteria. The types of duality categorized in 9.ii, 10.i, 10.ii, 11.ii, 12, 13, 15, 17 can be paralleled in 16:9-20.

C. Correspondences within one pericope.

---

<sup>13</sup> Neiryneck, 103.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 108.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 112.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 111.

18. Correspondence in the narrative, as for instance reference to the exposition within the story (3:32,34 : ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος / περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλω καθημένους): Several examples of this kind of duality occur in Mark 16:9-20. The statement that Jesus ἀναστάς (9) is reflected in the exposition in v. 11 ὅτι ζῆ καὶ ἐθεάθη and the rebuke of the risen Jesus in v. 14 ὅτι τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγγεγερμένον. In this same section the verb ἐφάνη (9) is reflected in the repeated use of ἐφανερώθη (12, 14). Finally, there is the interplay between ἀπιστία / ἀπιστέω (11) and (οὐ) πιστεύω (13) and Jesus' rebuke in v.14b ὠνείδισεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. The resurrected Jesus appears to various people, but their testimony is not accepted as credible.

19. Correspondence between exposition and discourse, or direct speech, in the pericope (1:22,27 : ἦν...διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων / διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν) : There are no correspondences of this kind in Mark 16:9-20.

20. Correspondence between narrative (in general) and discourse (5:38,39 : θεωρεῖ θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας / τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε): The affirmation by Jesus in v. 17 that σημεῖα δε τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει is reflected in the exposition in v. 20 διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων. Neiryneck lists several examples of this form of duality in this order (8:5,6; 9:33,34).<sup>17</sup>

21. i. command and fulfillment (1:25,26 : ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἐξηλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ) :

The structure in vv. 15 and 20 fits within this pattern of duality. The command by the risen Jesus to the eleven occurs in v.15 in direct discourse (πορουθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε) has its fulfillment recorded in v.20 (ἐκεῖνοι δε ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ). Neiryneck's examples parallel this structure very closely.

ii. the execution of a command in indirect speech (4:39,40 :

ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιθῆναι / καὶ ἀνέπεσαν). There are no examples of this in Mark 16:9-20, nor are any given for Mark 11-13.

22. There is no example of duality in the form of request and realization (1:40,41 : ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαί με καθάρισαι / θέλω, καθάρισθητι ) in Mark 16:9-20. None are listed for Mark 11-13.

23. Direct discourse preceded by qualifying verb (1:25 : ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς / λέγων· φιμώθητι) : The use of ὠνείδισεν ... εἶπεν followed by direct discourse

---

<sup>17</sup> Neiryneck, 117.

in vv.14-15 would fit this category of duality. The vast majority of examples Neiryneck cites have a form of λέγειν. 4:39 uses the aorist εἶπεν.<sup>18</sup>

24. Quotation and comment (1:3,4 : φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ / ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ). No biblical quotations are cited in Mark 16:9-20 and so no examples of this kind of duality are present.

25. Double questions (12:14 :

ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὐ; δώμεν ἢ μὴ δώμεν;). No questions occur in Mark 16:9-20 and so there are no examples of this form of duality.

26. Correspondences in discourse, as between question and answer (2:7,10 :

τίς δύναται ἀθίεναι ἁμαρτίας... /

ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας): Direct discourse in Mark 16:9-20 is limited to Jesus' instructions to the eleven. There is no response in direct discourse to Jesus' command. So this form of duality does not occur in Mark 16:9-20.

Forms of duality in this grouping tend to follow specific forms of discourse, i.e. direct speech, questions, commands, etc. If these structures do not occur in Mark 16:9-20, then these forms of duality will not occur. Although examples of these forms of duality occur throughout this gospel, there are still large segments of narrative in which they are absent because the narrative does not call for these forms of discourse within those textual segments. However, we have found examples of 18, 20, 21.i, and 23, but no examples of 19, 21.ii, 22, 24, 25, and 26.

D. The Structuring of the gospel:

27. Inclusion within individual pericopes :<sup>19</sup> Mark 16:9-20 can be construed as a single pericope. The initial triple post-resurrection (ἀναστάς (9)) appearances culminate in Jesus' commissioning of the eleven. Once this is completed, Jesus then "was taken up" (ἀνελήμφθη (20)) into heaven, with the note that the disciples responded obediently to Jesus' command. The signs that Jesus prophesied in vv. 17-18 occurred as they proclaimed the gospel (v.20), "because the Lord was working together and confirming the word." It is possible to see the note in v.19-20<sup>20</sup> as forming an inclusion with the reported resurrection in v. 9

28. Sandwich arrangement of pericopes : There is no example of a sandwich arrangement in Mark 16:9-20.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 123.

<sup>19</sup> I continue to use Neiryneck's wording to define the categories of duality.

<sup>20</sup> Perhaps the μέν...δέ construction in vv. 19-20 should be interpreted as a contrastive formation – on the one hand...on the other hand, showing how the two major 'characters' – the Lord Jesus and the eleven – resolve their differences and bring the mission of Jesus to its destined level of implementation.

29. Parallelism in sayings :

the “parallelismus membrorum”, synonymous and antithetic parallelism (one example of climactic) : The statement by Jesus that

ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθῆς σωθήσεται

ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται (16)

is an example of antithetic parallelism, a common feature of Jesus’ teaching as Neiryck notes.<sup>21</sup> An argument might also be made that the list of signs provided in vv.17-18 might be classified as a form of parallelism, given the repeated use of third person plural future verb forms and the tendency to place the verbs at the end of the clause.<sup>22</sup>

30. Doublets in Mark (pericopes, logia and repetition of formulae). The repeated, climactic accounts of resurrection appearances and the response of the eleven to the resultant testimonials would fit this category of duality (vv.9-14).

Within this final classification of duality examples of 27, 29 and 30 were identified, but none for 28.

One might differ over the categorization of specific examples, but generally examples of slightly more than 60% of the different categories of duality defined by Neiryck can be found in Mark 16:9-20. Is this the same rate of occurrence that we find in other passages of similar length and narrative focus in this Gospel? If we take Mark 5:1-20 and Mark 14:1-26 what is the rate of occurrence of categories of duality within these somewhat discrete segments of narrative? Are they similar or different to what we have found for Mark 16:9-20?

While it is difficult to make an exact comparison, both 5:1-20 and 11:1-26 show the same ratios of occurrence (examples from 22 categories<sup>23</sup> are listed for both and none for 10 categories). In both narrative contexts examples of duality are strongest in the first 15 categories listed by Neiryck. When these results are compared in the same way with the data from 16:9-20, we have 17 categories of duality expressed and 14 categories not used. The variance between 5:1-20/11:1-26 and 16:9-20 is in the order of 15%. However, it must also be noted that the number of

---

<sup>21</sup> Neiryck, 133-134.

<sup>22</sup> It is instructive to compare the language of the first and last statements in this series with the note about the disciples’ ministry in 6:13. The language of 6:12 reflects the initial clause in v.20.

<sup>23</sup> In doing this calculation I counted the examples listed by Neiryck for each context in each category. He does not always distinguish in his examples the various ways in which a particular form of duality might be expressed, as he does in his descriptions on pages 33-37. In my analysis of Mark 16:9-20 I have used the more detailed descriptions he provides on pages 33-37. In my analysis of Mark 5:1-20 and 11:1-26, I merely counted the examples he listed under each category, without seeking to define these examples more specifically.

examples in each category of duality that occur within a narrative segment does vary significantly. For example, Neiryck lists 7 examples of temporal or local forms of duality in Mark 5:1-20 and 11:1-26, but probably only one occurs in 16:9-20. Similarly examples of a compound verb followed by the same preposition occur 5 times in 5:1-20 and 4 times in 11:1-26, but only once in 16:9-20. If the general categories of duality that Neiryck identifies are used for sake of comparison, then 16:9-20 shows some difference from segments of narrative regarded as Markan, but also a significant degree of similarity.

One additional factor that Neiryck proposes is that in many cases the duality does not create redundancy, but in fact shows “the progressive double-step expression that is a more general Markan characteristic.”<sup>24</sup> This conclusion arises particularly from his examination of “temporal and local statements, double questions, antithetic parallelism and the use of *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua*...”<sup>25</sup> It is the case that we find examples of temporal duality, antithetic parallelism and the use of *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua* in Mark 16:9-20. Do these examples also demonstrate this kind of “progressive double-step expression?”

1. Temporal duality: 16:9 *πρῶτὴ πρώτη σαββάτου*. This double temporal statement parallels *πρῶτὴ ἑννευχα λῖαν* (1:35).<sup>26</sup> With respect to 1:35 Joel Marcus comments: “another of Mark’s double time expressions in which, as in 1:32, the second part makes the first more precise:...”<sup>27</sup> If *πρῶτὴ* does signify 3 – *ἄμ*, then the additional phrase *πρῶτὴ σαββάτου* identifies which day and how the action in the participle is related to the Jewish Sabbath. The double expression is clearly not redundant, but rather the second term gives greater precision to the first.

2. Antithetic Parallelism: The example in 16:16 is clear:

ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθὲς σωθήσεται  
ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται.

In Mark’s narrative both *δέ* and *ἀλλά* are used with almost equal frequency to introduce the antithesis.<sup>28</sup> J. Jeremias cautiously proposed that “we may speak of a preference for antithetic parallelism on the part of Jesus.”<sup>29</sup> Neiryck notes that “in Mk, the editorial character of the

<sup>24</sup> Neiryck, 71-72.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 71.

<sup>26</sup> In both cases the dual temporal expression modifies the participle *ἀναστός*. In 16:9 the participle has first place in the syntactical order, whereas in 1:35 it follows the temporal expressions.

<sup>27</sup> Joel Marcus, *Mark 1 – 8 A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 27 (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 201.

<sup>28</sup> Consider the use of *δέ* in 12:44; 13:31; 14:7,38 and the use of *ἀλλά* in 13:11, 20.

<sup>29</sup> J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology. Volume One. The Proclamation of Jesus* (London: SCM Press LTD., 1971), 20.

narrative passages with οὐ...ἀλλά (i.45; v.19; v.26[?]; vi.52) is widely acknowledged.”<sup>30</sup> Yet, we have δέ used here in an antithetical statement. There certainly is progression in the ideas being expressed, even though an antithetical progression.

3. The use of *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua*: one example occurs in 16:14-15.

καὶ ὠνείδισεν τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν...καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες....

The progression ὠνείδισεν...καὶ εἶπεν followed by direct speech parallels the example Neiryck cites from Mark 4:39:

ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, Σιώπα...

The example in 16:14-15 follows a pattern discerned by Neiryck in which the initial verb “gives a first characterization of the following speech.”<sup>31</sup> If this is the case, then the *oratio recta* is coloured as part of the “scolding” that Jesus gives to the Eleven for their ἀπιστία and defines a progression that moves from describing the response of the Eleven that Jesus criticizes, to the kind of response that he affirms and desires. The implication seems to be that if they do not respond in obedience to this further direction, Jesus’ disapprobation will be even stronger. This initial exploration into these particular categories of duality located in Mark 16:9-20 reveals that they are the same kind of “progressive double-step expression” that Neiryck defines in Mark 1 – 16:8.

A cautious conclusion would be that 16:9-20 displays approximately the same degree of stylistic duality that is expressed in Mark 1-16:8. The general perspective in Synoptic Studies seems to be that Matthew and Luke do not incorporate duality, but rather tend to eliminate it. If this is true, then duality would seem to be a Markan characteristic. So the occurrence of duality in 16:9-20 might suggest that Mark 16:9-20 was written by the same person who authored Mark 1 – 16:8. The fact that many of the same kinds of stylistic duality occur in Mark 16:9-20 perhaps indicates that more care should be taken in using stylistic arguments to dismiss 16:9-20 as non-Markan.<sup>32</sup> Neiryck observed in reference to Mark 1 – 16:8 that “after a study of these data one has a strong impression of the unity of the gospel of Mark.”<sup>33</sup> If duality is present to much the same degree in 16:9-20, then this may cause us to express more cautiously our conclusions about the relationship that this segment of text may have to the Markan narrative.

---

<sup>30</sup> Neiryck, 60.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>32</sup> Duality in Mark was first explored in connection with Synoptic relations and then later as a means to discern issues of tradition history in this gospel. This paper has only considered the stylistic question – whether 16:9-20 displays the same phenomenon of duality as found in Mark 1-16:8 and to the same degree.

<sup>33</sup> Neiryck, 37.

Appendix # 1 – Summary of Categories of Duality found in Mark 16:9-20

| Neiryneck's Category | Example in 16:9-20 | No Example in 16:9-20 | Possible Example in 16:9-20 |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1                    | x                  |                       |                             |
| 2                    |                    | x                     |                             |
| 3                    |                    | x                     |                             |
| 4.i                  | x                  |                       |                             |
| 4.ii                 |                    |                       | ?                           |
| 4.iii                |                    | x                     |                             |
| 4.iv.                | x                  |                       |                             |
| 4.v                  | x                  |                       |                             |
| 5                    | 4x                 |                       |                             |
| 6                    |                    | x                     |                             |
| 7.i                  |                    | x                     |                             |
| 7.ii                 |                    |                       | ?                           |
| 7.iii                |                    | x                     |                             |
| 8                    | x                  |                       |                             |
| 9.i                  |                    | x                     |                             |
| 9.ii                 | x                  |                       |                             |
| 10.i                 | x                  |                       |                             |
| 10.ii                |                    |                       | ?                           |
| 11.i                 |                    |                       | ?                           |
| 11.ii                |                    | x                     |                             |
| 12                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 13                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 14                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 15                   | 2x                 |                       |                             |
| 16.i                 |                    | x                     |                             |
| 16.ii                |                    | x                     |                             |
| 17                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 18                   | 3x                 |                       |                             |
| 19                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 20                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 21.i                 | x                  |                       |                             |
| 21.ii                |                    | x                     |                             |
| 22                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 23                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 24                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 25                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 26                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 27                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 28                   |                    | x                     |                             |
| 29                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| 30                   | x                  |                       |                             |
| Total                | 19                 | 18                    | 4                           |

Appendix # 2 – Comparison of Occurrences of Categories of Duality in Mark 5:1-20; 11:1-26 and 16:9-20

| Neiryck's Categories  | Examples in 5:1-20 | Examples in 11:1-26 | Examples in 16:9-20 |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1                     | 5x                 | 4x                  | 1                   |
| 2                     | 1                  | 1                   |                     |
| 3                     |                    |                     |                     |
| 4                     | 5x                 | 5x                  | 6x (+1?)            |
| 5                     | 4x                 | 2x                  | 4x                  |
| 6                     | 1                  | 1                   |                     |
| 7                     | 4x                 | 2x                  |                     |
| 8                     | 1                  | 2x                  | 1                   |
| 9.A                   |                    | 1                   |                     |
| 9.B                   | 2x                 | 1                   | 1                   |
| 10                    | 7x                 | 7x                  | 1(+1?)              |
| 11                    | 1                  | 1                   | 1                   |
| 12                    | 2x                 | 5x                  | 1                   |
| 13                    | 5x                 | 2x                  | 1                   |
| 14                    | 1                  |                     |                     |
| 15                    | 1                  |                     | 2x                  |
| 16                    |                    | 2x                  |                     |
| 17                    |                    |                     | 1                   |
| 18                    | 1                  | 1                   | 3x                  |
| 19                    | 2x                 |                     |                     |
| 20                    | 1                  | 1                   | 1                   |
| 21.i                  | 2x                 | 1                   | 1                   |
| 21.ii                 |                    |                     |                     |
| 22                    | 1                  |                     |                     |
| 23                    | 1                  | 1                   | 1                   |
| 24                    |                    |                     |                     |
| 25                    |                    |                     |                     |
| 26                    | 1                  |                     |                     |
| 27                    |                    | 2x                  | 1                   |
| 28                    |                    | 1                   |                     |
| 29                    |                    | 1                   | 1                   |
| 30                    | 1                  | 1                   | 1                   |
| Total # of Categories | 22                 | 22                  | 18                  |