

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

conclusion seems to be that 'Peter' was written neither very late nor very early, but in the same generation which witnessed the composition of Matthew and Luke, that is, in the last thirty years of the first century. On the whole it appears to be later than Matthew and Luke, and earlier than the Fourth Gospel, but no certainty can be claimed for this conclusion. We do not know how much to allow for the influence of the personal factor. 'Peter's' absurdities may be largely due to his credulity, John's developments to his genius, but on the whole what appears to be primitive tradition has survived to a larger extent in 'Peter' than in John.

A rough guess would suggest A. D. 90 as the date of the gospel, perhaps ten years earlier, possibly twenty years later, but the later date does not accord well either with the internal evidence, or with the respect which, if Justin knew it, the gospel enjoyed in the first half of the second century. The evidence considered as a whole seems to fix the year 100 as the *terminus ad quem*.

If this argument carries any weight it is evident that 'Peter' is a very important witness to the traditions of the resurrection, and that any attempt to reach a knowledge of the facts underlying the traditions must take his testimony into account. He had many faults, he was credulous, muddle-headed, incompetent, and possibly heretical, but he lived at a time when tradition was still fluid, and when the authority of the canonical gospels had not suppressed the memory of everything which they did not contain; it would be strange if he did not record some facts which are facts, and throw some light upon those events of which the canonical gospels provide unsatisfying and contradictory accounts.

P. GARDNER-SMITH.

εφοβουντο γαρ MARK xvi 8.

WITH the general question of the original ending of St Mark's Gospel this note makes no attempt to deal, but merely with the special point whether it is likely that a sentence should end with *εφοβοῦντο γάρ*. It was formerly usual to print a full stop after these words. WH substituted a colon, with asterisks following; Swete, in his edition, may have intended to do likewise, but no stop is actually printed, though asterisks follow. Baljon, Souter, and Nestle in the B.F.B.S. edition, have the full stop. Perhaps it should be mentioned that, according to Scrivener's facsimile (*Introd. to Crit. of N.T.*, vol. i, opp. p. 137) Cod. L has apparently the grave, Cod. B the acute accent.

Hort, in his *Introduction*, Appendix p. 46, wrote: 'It is incredible that

the evangelist deliberately concluded . . . a paragraph with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ . . . and practically repeats the statement ᾧ in the following page. Prof. Burkitt (*Two Lectures*, p. 28) says 'Not only the narrative, the paragraph, and the sentence, are each left incomplete, but even the subordinate clause seems to hang in the air.' Swete, in his edition, refers to these remarks, and what Hort calls 'incredible' he calls 'perhaps improbable'. Prof. Burkitt, again (*The Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 49, note), writes: 'In no case would the Gospel have originally ended with ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ. Ought we not, indeed, to print ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ . . . with a grave accent? It is very unusual to find clauses, much less paragraphs, which end with γάρ. Cf. Mk xi 18 and ix 6.'

It is hard to say exactly what constitutes a paragraph; but enough sentences ending with γάρ can be found to shew that there is nothing in itself suspicious about this. The necessary condition is simply that as γάρ regularly stands second, the rest of the clause must consist of a single word, either a verb, or implying a verb; and this clause must end a sentence, giving the reason or justification for what precedes.

We need not trouble with elliptic or colloquial remarks, as in Plato, nor with γάρ standing (exceptionally) later than second in the clause (cf. Ovid's use of *tamen*, *Fasti* ii 688, *uir iniustus, fortis ad arma tamen*: and *Trist.* I v 82).

Let us begin, then, with Homer *Od.* iv 612:—

Τοιγὰρ ἐγὼ τοι ταῦτα μεταστήσω δύναμαι γάρ.

iv 827 and v 25 are similar, giving 2nd and 3rd pers. sing.; as the plural would not suit the metre, the phrase is varied at x 69

δύναμις γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν.

In Aesch. *Agam.* 1564 we have μίμνει δὲ . . . παθεῖν τὸν ἔρξαντα θέσμιον γάρ. (See also *Choeph.* 374, *Eum.* 382, where, however, the text may possibly be doubted.)

In Eurip. *Med.* 1272, 1276, one child ends his line ὀλλύμεσθα γάρ, and (apparently) the other responds with . . . ἐν δέοντι γάρ. *Orestes* 251 ends line and clause with ἔξεστι γάρ. *Iph. Aul.* 1355 is a divided trochaic line,

ΑΧ. τὴν ἐμὴν μέλλουσαν εἰνὴν μὴ κτανεῖν. ΚΑ. δίκαια γάρ.

Achilles resuming his interrupted sentence in the next line. (Cf. Soph. *Trach.* 409.)

In the Greek Old Testament, Isa. xvi 10 πέπανται γάρ is dubious, as some (Lucianic) MSS add κέλευσμα. But xxix 11 is plain enough, οὐ δύναμαι ἀναγνῶναι, ἐσφράγισται γάρ. Also Genesis xviii 15, ἠρνήσατο δὲ Σάρρα λέγουσα Οὐκ ἐγέλασα. ἐφοβήθη γάρ. And xlv 3 καὶ οὐκ ἐδύναντο οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ. ἐταράχθησαν γάρ. (Here eight of Brooke and McLean's selected cursives, and two versions, add 'at his presence')

with Heb.) One of these Genesis examples contains the very verb used by St Mark, and the other is a sentence rather closely parallel to his.

It seems, then, that neither Homer, nor the tragedians, nor the translators of the O.T. into Greek, saw any objection to ending a sentence with *γάρ* if they had occasion to do so. The occasions, and consequently such sentences, are not very numerous; but that is all. Without wishing to suggest, or attempting to demolish, any theory as to the ending of St Mark's Gospel, I merely wish to point out that a sentence ending with *γάρ* is not without precedent. With any superstructure that might be raised on the foundation of the grave accent and the broken sentence, I have nothing to do; desiring simply to suggest that the foundation itself is scarcely secure.

One thing, however, seems to give a possible ground for thinking that some words may have followed the *γάρ* in this passage. The tense of the verb is imperfect, and this, more than anything else, gives something of a feeling that the matter is, perhaps, not finally closed¹ (as it is in most of my examples) with the *γάρ*. The effect of an aorist would have been much more conclusive. Such, at least, is my own impression; but Dr Thackeray, who kindly read through this paper in an earlier stage, is not inclined to agree. Still, I think it only fair to mention the point. At any rate, my object is mainly to urge, that, if in future editions of the text of St Mark this small change should be adopted, it should not be done without definite explanation of the reasons for it.

R. R. OTTLEY.

THE INTRODUCTION OF MONKS AT CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY.

At the close of his paper on 'The Early Community at Christ Church, Canterbury', in the last number of this JOURNAL,² Dr Armitage Robinson inclines to accept the tradition that the introduction of monks in the place of clerks was effected by Archbishop Ælfric after his return from Rome with the pallium in 997. As the evidence for this is exceedingly scanty, it seems worth while to supplement it by the following observations.

The *Regularis Concordia Anglicae Nationis*, a body of regulations drawn up about the year 970 for the use of the English reformed monasteries, directs that, on the death of a monk, a letter should be

¹ I suppose that this is what Prof. Burkitt (quoted above) means when he says 'even the subordinate clause seems to hang in the air'.

² *Supra*, p. 240.