

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]

may compare the similar use of *ὀρθοπλοεῖν*, 'to have a good passage' and so 'to be successful' (see Liddell and Scott, new edition). On this analogy we might suggest that *ὀρθοποδεῖν* in this passage of the Galatians means not so much 'they do not pursue a straightforward (righteous) course in relation to' (Burton) or 'in accordance with' (Lightfoot, who remarks that *πρός* denotes not the goal, but the line of direction to be observed) 'the truth of the gospel', but 'they are not advancing towards the truth of the gospel'. The difference is not great, but it is at any rate of interest to find that yet another unique or rare verbal usage in the N.T. has its complement in the ordinary *κοινή* of the period.

C. H. ROBERTS.

PAPYRUS ROLLS AND THE ENDING OF ST MARK

IN discussions of the end of St Mark's Gospel, it has commonly been believed that the abruptness of its conclusion is due to the mutilation of the original autograph or of a very early copy from which all others were derived. That this was the belief from very early times is proved by the existence of the present 'shorter' and 'longer' endings; and although several eminent scholars have questioned this explanation, it is still so far the prevalent explanation that the following note may be of some interest as bearing upon it.

It has often been said, by those who believe the original ending to have been lost, that the loss may be due to the accidental destruction of the last leaf of the autograph MS. or a very early copy; and it has often been answered (by myself among others) that, as the original MS would have been a roll and not a codex, there would be no last leaf to be torn off, while the end of a roll, being on the inside, would not be exposed to damage. The first half of this argument still, I think, holds good; for although we now know that papyrus codices were in use in the first half of the second century, there is as yet no evidence of their use in the first century, and, in any case, there would be no occasion for the employment of anything except the normal roll form for so short a work as St Mark's Gospel. But of the second half of the argument I feel less sure. It has always been assumed that the reader, when he had finished a roll, rolled it back again before he replaced it on its shelf, so that the beginning was on the outside. Human nature being what it is, it seems to me more probable that he replaced it as it was, with the end on the outside, and left it to the next person who wanted to read it to roll it back to the beginning. This seems common sense, and it is confirmed by the habit of placing the title at the end of the roll and not at the beginning. The reader

of a roll would not want to wait till he had read to the end in order to know the name of the author and the title of the work ; and an intending reader would not want to unroll the entire roll in order to ascertain these facts. No doubt if the roll was provided with a *σίλλυβος*, it would not matter whether it had a title at the end or at the beginning of the roll itself ; but those little labels would be liable to be detached from their rolls, and it was an obvious precaution to inscribe the title on the roll itself, at whichever end was most serviceable. Therefore, since the title was habitually written at the end, this seems to be evidence that the roll was normally left with its end outside.

Whether this is the true explanation of the loss of the ending of the Second Gospel, or whether the ending was ever lost at all, I am not here concerned to say and I do not suppose it will ever be known ; but the considerations I have suggested have some bearing on the possibilities and at any rate may have some bibliographical interest.

F. G. KENYON.