

Inclusive and Exclusive Translations of ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Mark

Peter-Ben Smit*

1. Introduction

The translation of a word like the Greek ἄνθρωπος, occurring more than 40 times in the Gospel of Mark,¹⁾ offers an interesting challenge for gender-sensitive ways of translation. The root meaning of the word is “human being,” but it can clearly take on several different, more specific meanings, including “man” (“male human being”) or even “someone.”²⁾ Deciding on the appropriateness of these more specific renderings of ἄνθρωπος, especially translating the term as “man”, beyond its basic meaning of “human being” depends, of course, on the context in which the word is used. Beyond these

* Th.D. in New Testament Studies at University of Bern, CH. Professor of Contextual Biblical Interpretation at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam; Professor (by special appointment) of Ancient Catholic Church Structures, Utrecht University, NL; Research Associate, Faculty of Theology, University of Pretoria, SA. p.b.a.smit@vu.nl. A draft version of this paper was discussed in a class in “Bible Translation as Contextual Theology” at the Faculty of Religion and Theology in the Fall of 2022; I am grateful to Lars Kramer, AnneMarie Smith, Eleni Christou and Mia Aglieco for their input.

1) That is, in: 1:17, 23; 2:10, 27-28; 3:1, 3, 5, 28; 4:26; 5:2, 8; 7:7-8, 15, 18, 20-21, 23; 8:24, 27-31, 33, 36-38; 8:38; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:7, 9, 27, 33, 45; 11:2, 30, 32; 12:1, 14; 13:26, 34; 14:13, 21, 41, 62, 72; 15:3.

2) For a survey of possible meanings, see, for instance: the entry in the *Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon*, *ad loc.*, compare, for instance, the appertaining entry in *Thayer's Lexicon*, *ad loc.*

kinds of meanings, the term can also be used to denote someone as a human being and as different from non-humans in two ways, that is, as different from animals (e.g., Mark 1:17) and from God (e.g., 7:8; 8:33; cf. 12:14); this, however, is not the topic of this contribution. Rather, in this article, I argue that when translating the Gospel of Mark, gains can be made when translating the word more inclusively or gender-neutral in several places (i.e., as ‘human being’, ‘person’, or ‘someone’) than is currently the case in many translations, and that gains can also be made by translating the word exclusively in other places, that is, as “man” (“male human being”). These considerations have to do with the analysis of the context in which this word occurs.

Thus, in this article, we will deal with some specific examples, without touching upon all the occurrences of this word in the Gospel according to Mark, which serves as a case study here, as this would go widely beyond the intended scope of this contribution. The aim of this paper is to contribute to the discussion about translating inclusively or exclusively, which features the question of the translation of ἄνθρωπος. As Martin put it over 30 years ago, “Translators have regularly rendered anthropos as ‘man’, concealing women or rendering them invisible under a blanket of male linguistic hegemony.”³⁾ To start, we will consider a number of examples in which an inclusive translation would be preferable from a gender-sensitive perspective before discussing some examples where the reverse is the case, after which general conclusions will be formulated.

Through this investigation, this paper contributes to the broader discourse on gender and biblical interpretation, which, indebted as it is to emancipatory movements in society, academia, and faith communities, has both an ethical and a hermeneutical dimension. The ethical dimension concerns, for instance, doing justice to the presence of persons of all genders in the New Testament texts (rather than, e.g., hiding the possible presence of women in congregations, for instance, behind an exclusive rendering in translation of the inclusive plural ἀδελφοί; other examples abound).⁴⁾ The hermeneutical dimension concerns the

3) C. J. Martin, “Womanist Interpretations of the New Testament: The Quest for Holistic and Inclusive Translation and Interpretation”, *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 6 (1990), 41-61, 43.

4) For a recent contribution by a male feminist scholar on ‘unhiding’ the presence of women, see: Ch. D. Du Toit, “A ‘Realistic’ Reading as a Feminist Tool: The Prodigal Son as a Case Study”,

observation that allowing the voices of emancipatory movements, self-consciously positioned as they are, to play a part in the conversation about Bible translation helps to unearth or rediscover dimensions of the text that have become less visible. This is, of course, a well-known dynamic, yet it bears emphasis.⁵⁾ In the course of this contribution, reference will be made to a number of translations; these have an illustrative purpose, and there is no intention of being exhaustive. Naturally, the scope of these examples is limited by the languages to which the author has access; the situation may well be different in other languages, especially such languages in which (grammatical) gender operates in a different manner than in, for instance, English, German, and Dutch.

2. Translating Inclusively

Among the texts in which ἄνθρωπος can be generically translated with gendered gain and hence in a gender-inclusive (or, at least, not in a gender-specific manner with an androcentric bias, i.e., as “man”) manner as “person” or “someone” are a number of narratives in which Jesus heals someone or liberates them from an unclean spirit. A first example is Mark 1:23 (καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτω); here it is not compelling to make this ἄνθρωπος emphatically a “man” (as, for instance, the new Dutch NBV21 translation of 2021 does). Neither the context nor the word usage itself give the impression that the gender of the person in question matters here (the only reason to think so would be a contrast story or combination story with the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law in 1:29-31, with then one miracle in the public domain with a man as the lucky one and one indoors with a woman as the focus, but this is not a compelling reason for stressing the maleness of the person in 1:23 more than the Greek ἄνθρωπος does). By the way, this way of translating does not directly mean that the person “therefore” can also be a woman; in fact, the gender of the person does not matter; it could just as well

HTS Theologese Studies/Theological Studies 78:4 (2022), 1-7.

5) For a recent plea for incorporating emphatically contextual perspectives into biblical interpretation, see, for instance: Peter-Ben Smit, Klaas Spronk and Kirsten van der Ham, “Contextual Biblical Interpretation: A Theological Necessity”, *Concilium* 2022:3 (2022), 15-24.

have said τις to say what the text says. That translation is therefore preferable: “... there was someone with an unclean spirit.”)

A similar occurrence is the case at the end of Chapter 2 and the beginning of Chapter 3. In 2:27, ἄνθρωπος occurs in Jesus’ statement that the Sabbath was made for the ἄνθρωπος and not the other way around. It makes little sense to translate ἄνθρωπος with “man” here (and most newer translations do not do so either). The continuation of the story at the beginning of Chapter 3 also uses ἄνθρωπος and does so to refer to a person with a shriveled hand. It is obvious that the word should be translated here as “someone”, “human”, or “person” (and so does the NBV21, using “someone” in 3:1). However, it is consistent to keep this person gender-neutral by also translating similarly in 3:3 and 3:5 and not referring to this person as “man” (which, for instance, the NBV21 does). It is an unnecessary explication of the gender of the person in question, which the text as such does not emphasize (despite the fact that the word ἄνθρωπος is masculine, grammatically speaking). A more neutral and less androcentric translation—for example, 3:3 “and he said to the one with the shriveled hand” (or with the older Dutch NBG translation of 1951, in somewhat cumbersome Dutch, “tot de mens”)—prevents this one-sided gender accent. Further, room is created to imagine this person as other than as a man (for example, as a woman), although the use of words in the text does not emphasize that either; yet, it does create broader possibilities for identification (without wishing to suggest that women can only identify with women in texts).

In both cases, one could also consider that the afflictions that these people suffer from belong to the less (clearly) gendered conditions; thus, they are first and foremost affected and impaired as human beings as such.⁶⁾ This consideration finds support in the observation that in 5:24-25 the person to be healed suffers from an ailment that, with good grounds, can be considered a gendered disorder and is therefore promptly described as “woman” (γυνή), even though the answer to Jesus’ question of “who” (τίς - gender neutral) emphatically presented as such (cf. again γυνή in 5:33) and also addressed by Jesus as such (θυγάτηρ in 5:34). Here, the text—and this is where the NBV21

6) An interpretation that is at least potentially problematic from the point of view of disabled perspectives, which cannot be addressed here; moreover, it may well be that the Gospel according to Mark has an anthropological ideal that does not harmonize with 21st century sensibilities regarding “ableness” and “disability.”

has been revised with respect to the NBV of 2004—would lose some of its expressiveness if the element of gender were reduced by translating θυγάτηρ as, for example, “my child”, or even by removing it altogether (as was the case in the NBV).

Regardless of the situation of the gender-specific affliction referred to in the last paragraph, it is clear that by translating in a more inclusive, or better gender-neutral, way—that is, by not applying a gendered emphasis in the text in the target language where there is none in the text in the source language—there are gains to be made, at least as far as these examples are concerned.

A further and final example is the famous “man” (ἄνθρωπος) carrying a jar of water in 14:13 (ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων), who could just as well be a “someone” with an unspecified gender. Oftentimes, this person turns out to be a man in translations; in fact, this seems to be the standard, at least in the translations to which I have access,⁷⁾ and this understanding has given rise to a tradition in commentaries wrestling with the gender of the person involved, noting the oddity of man doing the work of a woman.⁸⁾ Linguistically, however, there is little reason to specify the gender of this person (also, αὐτῷ at the end of the verse does not specify gender but simply refers back to the grammatically

7) Exceptions exist, of course. Without providing an exhaustive list of them, both the Dutch (Roman Catholic) Willibrord translation of 1995 translates “iemand” (“someone”), the programmatically gender inclusive *Bibel in gerechter Sprache* (2006) translates “Person”, which has, in German, the additional effect of substituting a grammatically feminine word designating “someone” for the Greek and grammatically masculine equivalent.

8) How deeply ingrained the notion that the ἄνθρωπος here is a “man” is indicated by even Taylor’s remark, in the context of a study that looks for “hidden women” in the Gospel of Mark, that “gender is strikingly skewed” here, given that a man occurs who is doing a woman’s work. See: J. E. Taylor, “‘Two by Two’: The Ark-etypal Language of Mark’s Apostolic Pairings”, *The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 58-82, 73. Without giving a full survey of available exegetical opinion, the oddity of a man carrying water is treated variously by commentators, all on the assumption that one is dealing with a male here. For instance, E. Boring, *Mark: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 385-387, does not comment on the matter at all, which is probably the most minimalist solution. A more maximalist interpretation is the one offered by P. Williamson and M. Healy, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 281: “Jesus’ instructions seem to indicate a prearranged signal. Ordinarily, carrying water jugs was a woman’s task. Apparently Jesus has arranged for this man to be waiting for the disciples, and when they see him they need not say anything but simply follow him.” The same interpretative strategy is also pursued by, for instance, E. J. Schnabel, *Mark: An Introduction and Commentary* (Westmont: InterVarsity, 2017), 352, and R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 364-365.

masculine ἄνθρωπος). This lack of particular emphasis may also be indicated by the rewriting of the verse in Mat 26:18, which has πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα (“so-and-so”), thereby moving gender even further into the background (Luke 22:10 maintains ἄνθρωπος). The question as to how the disciples could have recognized the person in question if a public transgression of gender roles is not its identifying characteristic can be answered by pointing to the arrival of two disciplines of Jesus in combination of place (on an entryway of the city), the water jar, and the coming forward of the person with the water jar to meet them. The verb ἀπαντάω that is used in Mark 14:13 means more often than not that someone comes forward to meet someone else rather than that someone is met (passively) by another person.⁹⁾ In other words, Jesus does not so much instruct the disciples to pick someone from the crowd, but rather tells them that the person who will meet them will be carrying a water jar.

Returning to the focus of this contribution, in Mark 14:13, the inclusive translation of ἄνθρωπος is very well possible, makes an interpretative riddle disappear, and also opens up the narrative for the presence of a woman, or, at the very least, avoids emphasizing the gender of a person in translation where this is not stressed in the source text. This does not mean that the person carrying the water jar could not have been a male, but it does mean that this is not stressed by Mark and that it is not necessary to make a point of it in interpretations of this verse. This last observation can be expanded in at least one way—that is, by pointing to the role of ambiguity in biblical texts and their translations. Whereas in some cases, explicating things that remain implicit in texts may be necessary, for instance, because certain culturally specific information is needed to make sense of an expression or scene (e.g., translating ἔθνος as “non-Jewish people” rather than as simply “people”, and so on), in other cases, an explication might be misleading or, at least, narrow the interpretative options that a text offers. Of course, a desire for lucid and transparent translations, which offer clarity as to what the text “really means”, exists, but, as Bauer has argued forcefully, this

9) See, for example, Luk 17:12 (lepers approaching Jesus: καὶ εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τινα κώμην ἀπήντησαν [αὐτῷ] δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες), or also Sir. 31:22; 33:1, the use of the verb with a dative in Mark 14:13 (i.e., ἀπαντήσῃ ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος) agrees with these instances (in Luk 17:12 the personal pronoun in the dative may have been omitted) and also indicates the flow of the movement: the “someone” is the one meeting (and presumably identifying) the disciples, not the other way around.

hermeneutical desire is also colored by epistemological urges stemming from the Enlightenment, whereas in other settings, ambiguity may be valued more highly.¹⁰⁾ This should make one at least hesitate when crafting translations that are more explicit, for instance, concerning the gender of actors in the text, in the target language than in the source language. Allowing the gender of a person to remain unspecified in a translation might well be a good fit with what did or did not matter to the authors of the source texts and avoid highlighting, usually, male agency and presence at the expense of, most frequently, female presence and agency.

3. Translating Exclusively

Somewhat less intuitively, gains can also be made in translations—and some also make them—by translating ἄνθρωπος in an exclusive manner, that is, by using the English equivalent “man” in the sense of a “male person.” In at least two cases, this seems to be a profitable course of action, and both can serve as a caution against “automatically” opting for an inclusive manner of translating, both in general and concerning ἄνθρωπος in particular.

First, in Mark 10:9, Jesus’ pronouncement ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω occurs in the context of a discussion among men about the way in which unilateral divorce ought (or ought not) be seen as permissible, a real point of contestation in early Judaism.¹¹⁾ However, Jesus’ statement is often translated as referring to humans in general—this is even the case in the programmatically gender-inclusive *Bibel in gerechter Sprache* (“Was Gott zum Paar verbunden hat, soll ein Mensch nicht trennen”). Besides the setting being a discussion among men (Pharisees and Jesus) in public (the public sphere being seen as a “male space”), it also has its starting point in a question that refers explicitly to what men are allowed to do (vis-à-vis of women): εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολύσαι (10:2). Enhancing the atmosphere of male competitiveness is the note that this question was asked in order to test Jesus (πειράζοντες αὐτόν, v. 2).

10) See: Th. Bauer, *Die Kultur der Ambiguität*, Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen, 2011, *passim*.

11) See for this and what follows: P.-B. Smit, “Man or Human? A Note on the Translation of “ἄνθρωπος” A in Mark 10.1-9 and Masculinity Studies”, *The Bible Translator* 69 (2018), 19-39.

When the exchange progresses, the word ἄνθρωπος makes an appearance in verse 7: ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα. The quotation, also in its present context (as stressed by a later part of the textual tradition), clearly has a male human being in mind here, and an according translation suggests itself. If this is the case, however, then verse 9 would also require a translation of ἄνθρωπος as “man”, rather than as “human being.” Otherwise, it does not follow logically from verse 7 and does not really provide an answer to the question about male behavior in verse 2. A more exclusive translation would be preferable here. The result, to be sure, can also be seen as accentuating the text somewhat differently, as Jesus’ pronouncement now focuses more on restraining the male exercise of power over women (c.q. of husbands over their wives) than on divorce as such (which is not the point anyway; the specific case of unilateral divorce is what is at stake here).¹²⁾

The second case to be discussed here is a little more complex (and less clear). It concerns the Roman centurion’s statement that ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν (15:39).¹³⁾ Some translations opt for a translation with the meaning “human being” here, while others opt for specifying gender by translating “this man” or “dieser Mensch” to use English and German examples. Although the

12) As it is well-known, the conversation about divorce (or the “sending away” of a partner) continues in vv. 10-12, albeit in a different setting (a house) and among different conversation partners (Jesus and his own disciples rather than Jesus and the Pharisees). What is striking is that these verses seem to assume that divorce is also an option for women (ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται, v. 12). Commonly, it is suggested that here a different socio-cultural background is involved, that is, Greco-Roman, rather than Jewish, as Roman law did provide for “bilateral” divorce, and that the two texts were combined redactionally (with the first having a more likely background in Jesuanic bedrock tradition than the second one). When reading the texts in sequence, however, it would seem that what is prohibited to the ἄνθρωπος qua “man” in v. 9 is now prohibited for both men and women. The ambiguity of the meaning of the noun ἄνθρωπος facilitates this development in the narrative. Although it must still mean “man” in v. 9, what is prohibited to a man is taken to be forbidden for humans at large in vv. 11-12.

13) This interpretation is, of course, based on an understanding of the centurion’s words in 15:39 that is not ironic or sarcastic; for a convincing argument regarding this, see, for example, H. K. Bond, “A Fitting End? Self-Denial and a Slave’s Death in Mark’s Life of Jesus”, *New Testament Studies* 65 (2019), 425-442, esp. 441-442. Different (and with a survey of the history of interpretation): N. Eubank, “Dying with Power Mark 15,39 from Ancient to Modern Interpretation”, *Biblica* 95 (2014), 247-268; Eubank understands the centurion’s statement as a double entendre, which, of course, both allows for a sarcastic centurion *and* the “real” meaning of what he says, which is an unintentional confession of Jesus’ identity.

first kind of translation can certainly be defended (and nicely brings together the dimensions of being human and God's son simultaneously), the second one might be more attractive when translating with a sensitivity to gender that includes an awareness of the role of constructions of masculinities. The reason for stating the latter is that the scene at the foot of the cross is highly gendered and has much to do with masculinity, even if women could also be (and were) crucified.¹⁴ The theatrical humiliation of Jesus as a male leader, the outcome of a confrontation with other male leaders, which certainly involved his being stripped of his clothing and may well have evoked associations with sexualized forms of abuse, also meant that Jesus was being stripped publicly—particularly in the “male” public sphere—of his identity as a credibly masculine figure, a status that he had certainly achieved throughout the gospel narrative.

Further, the centurion who comments on Jesus' demise is, in many ways, an archetypically masculine figure, leading to a scene in which one person who is emphatically gendered as masculine comments on another figure who has been stripped of his masculinity. Furthermore, he, the centurion, does so by means of an expression that is also highly masculine in character—that is, υἱὸς θεοῦ, an epithet that was used variously. In this context, although out of the mouth of a Roman officer, the phrase evokes the moments during which Jesus is identified as the son of the most high in the Markan narrative (besides the disputed reference to the same in 1:1, which is, however, making a text critical comeback, at least in the Münster Editio Critica Maior of Mark).¹⁵ The Roman officer's use of the term, however, also draws attention to the broader use of the term to refer to sons of deified persons, such as Titus, the son of deified emperor Vespasian, the duo having been responsible for the siege and sack of Jerusalem in 70 CE.¹⁶ The term does not just connote divine status (or association with it), but it is also quite emphatically a gendered masculine phrase. This political contrast is, of course, of interest; yet, here, its gendered dimension is of primary

14) See for the gendered (and sexualized) dimension of crucifixions, especially that of Jesus, for example, R. Figueroa and D. Tombs, “Recognising Jesus as a Victim of Sexual Abuse”, *Religion and Gender* 10 (2020), 57-75.

15) See: *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior, Vol. 1/2.1., The Gospel of Mark, Text* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2021), *ad loc.*

16) For a survey of the history of religions background of the expression, see: A. Yarbro Collins, “Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Greeks and Romans”, *Harvard Theological Review* 93 (2000), 85-100.

importance, as it is the third component of 15:39 that turns it into a heavily gendered affair, hinging on questions of masculinity. Taking all of this into account, it may well be preferable to translate ἄνθρωπος in an exclusively gendered manner, that is, by having the centurion say, “Truly, this man was son of God.”

4. Excurs — ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Of all the ways in which the noun ἄνθρωπος occurs in the Gospel of Mark, the most unusual one is the one in the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου that occurs, often as a clear (self-)designation of Jesus in 14 instances. Although there is little doubt that ἄνθρωπος here does not refer to “man” as a “male human being” but to “human being” as such, even though Jesus appears in many ways as a masculine figure, it is still a question as to what the expression wants to indicate. Clearly, the background of the expression is found in Jewish apocalypticism, especially in the scenario described in Daniel 7, where a figure appears bearing this designation. Both here and in other occurrences of the term in the tradition of Israel (such as 93 times in the book of Ezekiel), there is little reason to opt for a translation in terms of “male” rather than “human.” How (the historical) Jesus used the expression exactly and even what Mark intended to express with it is a matter of ongoing discussion;¹⁷⁾ yet, for the purposes of the present contribution, it is clear that translations should point to the “son of humankind” or the like (such as the German “Menschensohn” or the Dutch “Zoon des mensen” or “Mensenzoon”), rather than to the, in English overly familiar, expression “Son of man.”¹⁸⁾

17) In general, see: L. Bormann, “Der Menschensohn und die Entstehung der Christologie”, L. Bormann, ed., *Neues Testament: Zentrale Themen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2014), 111-128; with regard to Mark see, for example, the recent and succinct discussion by Reinhard von Bendemann, “Das Markusevangelium als Herausforderung für die Theologie”, *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament* 24 (2021), 23-39.

18) See also the argument of J. E. Taylor, “Ho Huios Tou Anthrōpou, ‘The Son of Man’: Some Remarks on an Androcentric Convention of Translation”, *The Bible Translator* 48 (1997), 101-109.

5. Concluding Observations

The above considerations lead to a number of concluding observations, both on the level of approach and method and on the level of content.

First, it has become clear that a gender-critical approach to the translation of a polysemic noun, such as like ἄνθρωπος can be very productive in as far as working toward a more inclusive translation is concerned. When considering the options for translating the word in a more or less gender-inclusive way—that is, as “human being”, as “someone”, or as “man” (“male human being”)—it appeared that, in a number of instances, there was reason to suggest a more inclusive, or, more precisely, a less gender-specific translation, to avoid creating a one-sided emphasis with regard to gender where none is needed. In other words, in a number of texts, translations use terms such as “man” rather than “someone” or the like, where this is not required. This can be seen as contributing to both a fair representation of the source text in the translation and as facilitating the reception of the source text in a manner that may well be easier for a broader spectrum of genders. This speaks to concerns regarding gender justice as well as to concerns related to making texts accessible (without suggesting, of course, that one can only identify with a person of the same gender in a text).

Second, it also became apparent that in other cases, somewhat counterintuitively, precisely a non-inclusive translation, that is, one that translates ἄνθρωπος as “man” in the sense of a “male human being”, is much to be preferred, precisely for reasons having to do with gender sensitivity. For instance, in Mark 10, it became clear that the criticism of male behavior that Jesus engages in by restraining the male ability to (unilaterally) divorce wives comes out best when translating ἄνθρωπος as “man” in the famous dictum, indicating that what God has brought together should not be rent apart by male agency. Further, the centurion’s comment about Jesus’ death on the cross, this ἄνθρωπος was Son of God, sheds more specifically gendered light on the death of the Son of God. Considering such cases might lead to new perspectives on the meaning of these texts and even substantially impact their interpretation.

Third, on the level of method, this also means that in attempting to translate in a gender-sensitive manner, automatism ought to be avoided, such as always

translating ἄνθρωπος as “someone”, “person”, or “human being.” Lack of attention to the literary context of the use of the term might, in fact, backfire on the attempt to translate gender sensitively, as texts dealing with specifically male behavior could be extended to deal with human behavior, such as divorce, in general, even if there is no good reason for assuming that it does. To this, it may be added that translations ought to exercise restraint in explicating the gender of persons in one way or another if it is ambiguous in the text itself, which is often the case whenever a word like ἄνθρωπος is being used. Allowing space for ambiguity may be somewhat counterintuitive for (at least some) Bible translators, yet it may suit aspects of the texts they are dealing with.

Lastly, all of this makes a modest contribution to understanding Mark’s use of the term ἄνθρωπος, which, as it became clear, covers a range of meanings, from “someone” in general, by way of “human being” as different from animals (fishes in the case discussed here), “human being” as different from God, and the very specific use of the term in the expression “Son of Man”, to, indeed, “man” in the sense of “male human being.”

<Keywords>

Gospel of Mark, gender, inclusivity, translation, ἄνθρωπος.

(투고 일자: 2023년 1월 30일, 심사 일자: 2023년 2월 24일, 게재 확정 일자: 2023년 4월 18일)

<References>

- Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior, Vol. I/2.1., The Gospel of Mark, Text*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2021.
- Bauer, Th., *Die Kultur der Ambiguität*, Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen, 2011.
- Bendemann, R. von, “Das Markusevangelium als Herausforderung für die Theologie”, *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament* 24 (2021), 23-39.
- Bond, H. K., “A Fitting End? Self-Denial and a Slave’s Death in Mark’s Life of Jesus”, *New Testament Studies* 65 (2019), 425-442.
- Boring, E., *Mark: A Commentary*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Bormann, L., “Der Menschensohn und die Entstehung der Christologie”, L. Bormann, Hg., *Neues Testament: Zentrale Themen*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2014, 111-128.
- Du Toit, Ch. D., “A ‘Realistic’ Reading as a Feminist Tool: The Prodigal Son as a Case Study”, *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 78:4 (2022), 1-7.
- Eubank, N., “Dying with Power Mark 15,39 from Ancient to Modern Interpretation”, *Biblica* 95 (2014), 247-268.
- Figueroa, R. and Tombs, D., “Recognising Jesus as a Victim of Sexual Abuse”, *Religion and Gender* 10 (2020), 57-75.
- France, R. T., *The Gospel of Mark*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Martin, C. J., “Womanist Interpretations of the New Testament: The Quest for Holistic and Inclusive Translation and Interpretation”, *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 6 (1990), 41-61.
- Schnabel, E. J., *Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*, Westmont: InterVarsity, 2017.
- Smit, P.-B., Spronk, K., and van der Ham, K., “Contextual Biblical Interpretation: A Theological Necessity”, *Concilium* 2022:3 (2022), 15-24.
- Smit, P.-B., “Man or Human? A Note on the Translation of ἄνθρωπος in Mark 10.1-9 and Masculinity Studies”, *The Bible Translator* 69 (2018), 19-39.
- Taylor, J. E., “‘Two by Two’: The Ark-ctypal Language of Mark’s Apostolic Pairings”, J. E. Taylor, ed., *The Body in Biblical, Christian and Jewish Texts*, London: Bloomsbury, 2014, 58-82.
- Taylor, J. E., “Ho Huios Tou Anthrōpou, ‘The Son of Man’: Some Remarks on an Androcentric Convention of Translation”, *The Bible Translator*

48 (1997), 101-109.

Williamson, P. and Healy, M., *The Gospel of Mark*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.

Yarbro Collins, A., “Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Greeks and Romans”, *Harvard Theological Review* 93 (2000), 85-100.

<Abstract>

**Inclusive and Exclusive Translations of ἄνθρωπος
in the Gospel of Mark**

Peter-Ben Smit
(Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

This paper discusses the question of a more or less inclusive translation of the noun ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Mark. An analysis of a selected number of occurrences of this noun in this gospel shows that it would be desirable to translate it (more) inclusively in many cases, while in some other cases, the desired gender justice that (often) drives the quest for more inclusive translations is, in fact, better served by means of an exclusive translation, regardless of how counterintuitive this may seem. Thus, it is argued that an overarching gender sensitivity when translating this term is even more necessary than a more or less automated, inclusive translation of the term. Beyond discussing the selected texts in which ἄνθρωπος occurs, the paper also makes a modest contribution to researching this word's meaning in the Second Gospel.