

never cher maître Salvovery Reixach
et mes remerciements pour vos aimables comptes-rendus
ma respectueuse affectueuse
P. L. Couchoud

[Reprinted from THE CROZER QUARTERLY, January, 1928]

WAS THE GOSPEL OF MARK WRITTEN IN LATIN?¹

By PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD

Paris, France

Translated by MORTON S. ENSLIN

AT the head of many manuscripts of the Gospels is found a note to the effect that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew (ἐβραϊστί), the Gospel of Mark in Latin (ῥωμαιστί), those of Luke and John in Greek (ἐλληνιστί).² In the subscription to the Syriac Vulgate (*Peshitta*), to the Harclean Syriac, and to several Greek manuscripts³ it is stated that the Gospel of Mark "was written in Latin at Rome: ἐγράφη ῥωμαιστί ἐν Ῥώμῃ." My purpose is to see if this information regarding the original language of the Gospel of Mark is correct.

The Roman origin of this Gospel is accepted by the majority of critics.⁴ Even if Greek was known to many folks of all classes in Rome, Latin was, meanwhile, the language usually spoken. Normally a work composed at Rome and intended primarily for Romans should be in Latin.

It is true that the oldest documents of the Roman church which have come down to us, the Epistle of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apologies of Justin, are in Greek. But the Epistle of Hermas is addressed to Greeks. Hermas was apparently a Greek slave. Greek was the mother tongue of Justin, while the emperors to whom he was writing had a Greek cabinet. These cases by no means prove that Greek was the only language, nor even the chief, of the Christian groups of Rome.

¹ *L'Évangile de Marc a-t-il été écrit en Latin? Revue de L'Histoire des Religions*, pp. 161-192, 1926. The privilege of publishing in English translation has been graciously extended by the author and original publisher to the CROZER QUARTERLY. The author has extensively revised and added to the original French article. Chapters VI and XIV are part of the new material.

² H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed., Göttingen, I, p. 297 [51].

³ Among others, two manuscripts of the Barberine Library of Rome (really the Vatican Library), viz. 160 (Sod. ε 213) and 161 (ε 1005) according to H. B. Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 3rd ed., London, 1920, p. xli.

⁴ See especially B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (Harvard Theological Studies), 1919.

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



135626

Was the original Mark in Greek or in Latin? This can be determined only by an examination of the text. Nor will a cursory glance suffice.

In 1914 H. C. Hoskier, amazed by the strange disagreements of the Greek texts, proposed the hypothesis that the Gospel had been written in two languages at the same time. On this hypothesis the author would have produced simultaneously two editions, one Latin and one Greek.⁵ This hypothesis is only a compromise. To suppose that a translation had been made at the first moment, for which there was no shadow of proof, would require that one of the two texts was the original, the other the translation.

The task is to make a comparison of the oldest forms of the Latin and of the oldest forms of the Greek which have come down to us.

Among the Latin the oldest, unquestionably, are those designated by the letters *k* and *e*.

k Codex Bobiensis (4th or 5th century) in the National Library of Turin. It contains the second half of Mark VIII-XVI except for a few lacunæ in chapter VIII. Edition J. Wordsworth and W. Sanday (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, no. II) Oxford, 1886. New collation by C. H. Turner and F. C. Burkitt (*Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1903). Photographic edition, Turin, 1913.

e Codex Palatinus (5th century) in the episcopal palace at Trente. It contains Mark I: 21-VI: 9 (a few lacunæ) and short fragments of chapters VII-XIII. Edition C. Tischendorf, *Evangelium Palatinum Ineditum*, Leipzig, 1847. Studied by H. J. Vogels, *Evangelium Palatinum*, Münster, 1926.

These two manuscripts give essentially the same text. It is called "African" because it is that used by St. Cyprian in

⁵H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B and its Allies*, London, 1914, Part I, pp. 126, 172. M. Robert Stahl was the first to draw my attention to the possibility of a Latin original for Mark.

the middle of the third century,⁶ and rightly, although its African origin may not actually have been proved. It is the only one that it is profitable to compare with the Greek text. The other Old-Latin versions have retained some traces of the "African" text but have been manifestly conformed to the Greek. For them the question of priority does not arise.

The Latin text which will be examined is that of *e* for Mark I: 21-VI: 9, that of *k* for Mark VIII: 9-XVI: 8. Those parts of the Gospel which are wanting in these two manuscripts will not be considered.

For the types of Greek texts the oldest appear to be the ones which manuscripts B, D, and W give:

B *Codex Vaticanus* (4th century) in the Vatican Library. Edition Vercellone and Cozza, Rome, 1868. Photographic edition *Codices e Vaticanis Selecti*, iv, *Novum Testamentum*, Milan, 1914.

D *Codex Bezae* Graeco-Latin (5th or 6th century) in the Library of Cambridge University. Photographic edition *Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis*, vol. ii, Cambridge, 1899.

W *Washington Manuscript* (5th century) in the Library of Congress (Washington, D. C.). Collation by H. A. Sanders, *The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels (University of Michigan Studies IX)* New York, 1912. Photographic edition 1913.

The texts given by these three manuscripts present in Mark differences far more numerous and striking than in the other Gospels. We shall see that they give the impression of having been derived from independent Greek versions which have been more or less corrected, the one by the other.⁷

Because of this interchange of corrections it occasionally happens that a primitive reading is preserved in later manu-

⁶ This has been proved by W. Sanday, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, no. ii, pp. xlii-xlvii; and by H. von Soden, *Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*, Leipzig, 1909, pp. 106-220.

⁷ The last eleven chapters of W have been corrected rather more than the first five.

scripts whose ancestors have also suffered correction, and in fact more than the others, but of a different type. Of these I will mention only two:

θ *The Koridethi Gospels* (7th or 9th century) at Tiflis. Edition of G. Beerman and C. R. Gregory, Leipzig, 1913.

ψ *Codex Laurensis* (8th or 9th century) on Mt. Athos (Laura). Edition of K. Lake *Texts from Mt. Athos (Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, vol. v, part ii)*, Oxford, 1902.

In the case of two versions set in contrast, one Latin, the other Greek, it may seem a simple matter to decide which is the original, which the translation. As a matter of fact it is by no means easy. The Greek and Latin imitate each other very closely. The scrupulous weighing of selected passages and listing of general characteristics are required.

At the very beginning one thing must be said. The copyist of *k* was grossly ignorant. It is perfectly evident that he understood very little of the Latin he had before him and as a scribe was totally inexperienced. In every line he makes mistakes past belief. He writes: *verum in quo oritur* for *vermis non moritur*, *regnus* for *petrus*, *feribas* for *scribas*, *nuptis* for *vultis*, *filia* for *folia*, *nomen* for *non enim* or for *pater*, *et sum* for *tuum*, *in tribus* for *inscriptio*, *inprobitas* for *hærebit ad*, *illi monet* for *illo omnes*, *si mulier* for *similiter*, etc. It has not been my object to remake the critical edition of *k* which has been provided by Hans von Soden (*Das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians*, Leipzig, 1909, pp. 429-449). I have followed as a rule the critical text of von Soden. Accordingly, in my first example I have given *servis suis* instead of *discipulis suis*, *domus* instead of *domui*, *utrum* instead of *verum*, *gallorum cantu* instead of *gallorum gallo*, von Soden's corrections which no one will challenge. And for my own part I propose the correction *dixit* instead of *dixi* which the manuscript gives.

I. THE PARABLE OF THE PORTER

At the end of Chapter XIII the Latin has a little parable the sense of which has been lost in the Greek:

XIII: 34-37 *quomodo homo peregrinans reliquit domum et dedit servis suis potestatem, uniuscuiusque opus suum, et ostiario praecepit ut vigilet, sic vigilate quia nescitis quando dominus domus venit, utrum vespera an nocte media an gallo-
rum cantu an mane, ne veniens subito inveniat vos dormientes; quod autem uni dixit, omnibus vobis dico.*

B⁸ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφείς τὴν οἰκίαν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ δοῦς τοῖς δούλοις ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἕκαστῶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ θυρωρῶ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, ἢ ὀψὲ ἢ μεσανύκτιον ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ πρωτῆ· μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐξαίφνης εὔρη ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας. ὃ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσιν λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε.

The Latin has two words which are not represented in the Greek: *sic* and *uni*.

In the Latin the parable is limpid. Its meaning is determined by the correlation of *quomodo* and of *sic*, its instruction by the contrast of *uni* with *omnibus*. "As a man left his home to go on a journey and gave authority to his slaves, to each his task and gave orders to the porter to watch, *so* watch (ye), for you do not know when the master of the house will come, at even, at midnight, at the cock-crowing, or in the morning: lest coming unexpectedly he find you sleeping. What he said *to one alone*, I say *to all* of you." Here what in the parable is said to the porter alone is said to all.

In the Greek the meaning is vague and confused. There is a general impression that the translator had failed to read or appreciate the word *sic*, or else that a copyist had corrected *οὕτως* into *οὖν* without noticing its correlation with *ὡς*. The result

⁸ The variants of D and of W do not affect the sense.

is that the first member of the comparison is detached from the second and forms a separate phrase: "(It is) as a man . . . watch *therefore*, for you do not know . . ." The *therefore* introduces a conclusion where it should reveal a comparison.

Another error has impaired the meaning. *Dixit* has been read *dixi*. This last point is not conjecture, for the manuscript reads *dixi*. The correction is easy because of the word *uni* which can be applied only to the porter. The error *dixi* passed over into the Greek. The translator has not corrected *dixi*, and, since the word *uni* no longer had any meaning, he suppressed it and replaced it by $\delta\mu\tilde{\nu}$: "What I say *to you*, I say *to all*." The conclusion of the parable is thus displaced by a generalization which, oddly enough, does not appear to have been conceived in connection with Mark's text but with Luke XII: 41 where Peter asked: "Lord, do you speak this parable for us or for all?" and did not obtain any answer.

H. B. Swete (*The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 3rd ed., London, 1920, p. 319) evolves from the fragment the lesson: "Watching was not to be limited to the $\theta\upsilon\rho\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$; all must keep vigil till He returned." This natural meaning, however, is in the Latin (with the reading *dixit*) and is not in the Greek.

The Latin provides an orderly little picture which the Greek breaks up into three fragments.

II. SLEEP ON, AWAKE

At the conclusion of the Gethsemane scene the Greek and Latin have a very real difference. Twice Jesus has gone apart to pray; twice returning he has found his three companions asleep:

XIV: 41-42 et venit tertio et, ubi adoravit, dicit illis: dormite iam nunc, ecce adpropinquavit qui me tradit. et post pusillum excitavit illos et dixit: iam hora est, ecce traditur filius hominis in manus peccatorum, surgite, eamus.

Δ και ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· καθεύδετε λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος καὶ ἡ ὥρα. ἰδοὺ παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀμαρτολῶν· ἐγείρεσθε, ἀγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδίδων με.

Β ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα

Of the twelve words in the Latin: *ecce adpropinquavit qui me tradit et post pusillum excitavit illos et dixit* the last seven are not represented in the Greek at all; the first five, while in the Greek, are in another position three sentences farther on. In return, the Greek has ἀπέχει (τὸ τέλος) which is not represented in the Latin.

In the Latin two times are indicated. First Jesus says: Sleep on! After a moment (*post pusillum*) he awakes the sleepers: Arise, let us be going! In the Greek he says in the same breath: Sleep on, awake, let us be going!

Which is the original form? Apparently the former. It is not natural to say in the same breath: Sleep on, awake! The separation of the two commands should be primitive, the bringing of them together, secondary.

We can settle this point because we have an external witness. About 180, two centuries before our most ancient manuscripts were penned, Irenæus wrote: "*Inveniens eos dormientes dominus primo quidem dimisit, significans patientiam dei in dormitione hominum, secundo vero veniens excitavit eos et erexit.*" "And when, in the first instance (*primo quidem*), the Lord found the disciples sleeping, he let them sleep to indicate the patience of God in regard to the slumber in which men lay; but coming the second time (*secundo vero*), he awaked them and made them stand up."⁹ This passage proves that Irenæus read the words: *et post pusillum*

⁹ *Haer.* IV, xxii, 1. Due to error C. H. Turner, *Novum Testamentum S. Irenæi*, Oxford, 1923, p. 42, refers this passage to the Gospel of Matthew, XXVI: 45-46, where "Sleep on, awake" are joined as in the Greek Mark. A. Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, II, 2, Berlin, 1905, p. 156, has correctly seen that the passage in Irenæus refers to our Latin (*k*) Mark.

excitavit illos et dixit, which are not represented in the Greek and which exist only in *k*. *Irenæus* quoted the text having the two times. This text, of which *k* is the only witness, was therefore read about 180. The Greek has no attestation so old.

It is necessary to account for the displacement in the Greek of *ecce adpropinquavit qui me tradit* and for the absence in the Latin of ἀπέχει (τὸ τέλος). One very simple explanation will account for these two facts.

It is possible to detect the way in which the confusion arose. A peculiarity of the Greek lies in the words: ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος in D, ἀπέχει in B. This is a notation for the copyist which has crept into the text.

The word τέλος is inserted in manuscripts for the guidance of the copyist. An instructive example is shown in folio 290 of D where we read: (Mark II: 22) καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι ἀπολοῦνται: τέλος: Right at this point many manuscripts add: ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκούς καινούς. The word τέλος, inserted by a corrector, informs the copyist that that is the real *end* of the phrase and that no addition is necessary.¹⁰

The twelve words wherein the divergence between the Latin and the Greek is so pronounced are preceded by *iam nunc* and followed by *iam hora est*.

In the first part of the Latin text a translator has skipped¹¹ from *IAM nunc ecce adpropinquavit . . .* to *IAM hora est ecce . . .* His mistake was made the easier by the repetitions: *ecce . . . ecce; traditur . . . tradit*. He has translated *dormite IAM hora est ecce traditur* by skipping *nunc ecce adpropinquavit*, etc. Then he observed the omission. He translated the end of the mutilated sentence (*ecce adpropinquavit qui*

¹⁰ Compare D folio 288b, Mark I: 45, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν: τέλος: . At this point manuscript 579, (Sod. € 376) of the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris adds: καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον. There too the word τέλος indicates that nothing need be added.

¹¹ These skips from one word to the same word later repeated (du même au même) are well known. L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale*, Paris, 1911, p. 133, cites the following phrase from Quintilian: "nec quod virtus est utique, iustitia est, at quod non est virtus utique non potest esse iustitia," where one copyist has skipped from *quod* to *quod*, another from *utique* to *utique*.

me tradit), and placed his addition at the end of the passage. He indicated this error by the note: ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος, this is not the *end* (of the phrase). Actually the *end*: ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν is thus set at some distance from ἀναπαύεσθε.

D (or his archetype) did not understand this note. He copied it without a break at the place where he read it: ἀναπαύεσθε· ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος.¹² He has left the words: ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν, etc., misplaced at some distance from where this note would put them.

B understood τὸ τέλος as a note and did not copy it. But he did not understand ἀπέχει and copied it. He placed an ἤλθεν before ἡ ὥρα to make sense. In this context the little intrusive ἀπέχει is quite devoid of intelligible sense. Through the centuries it has triumphantly resisted the efforts of the commentators.¹³

To summarize, a notation intended for the copyist (ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος) has made its way into the text. This is the reason that ἰδοὺ ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν is misplaced in the Greek and that ἀπέχει (τὸ τέλος) is not represented in the Latin.

This is a beautiful case where it is necessary to revert to the Latin to reduce the confusion of the Greek.

There is an exactly opposite case where τὸ τέλος, originally a part of the text, has been treated by the copyist as a simple *nota*:

XIII: 29 in proximo et in foribus est finis. BD ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύρας (τὸ τέλος omitted).

The Latin makes sense. In the Greek the verb suffers from the lack of a subject.

¹² Similarly in the Latin manuscripts the *d'* standing for *deest* (sign of a lacuna) occasionally has crept into the text in the form of *id*.

¹³ One of the most recent, E. Klostermann (*Das Markusevangelium*, 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1926) makes *καθεύετε* have the ironic meaning: "Are you still sleeping?" and ἀπέχει "Enough!" But this meaning of ἀπέχει is very rare, and τὸ λοιπὸν hinders taking *καθεύετε* as interrogative.

III. JESUS' CRY

The strange misunderstanding made possible by Jesus' cry (Heli, Elijah) on the cross is clear only in the Latin account:

XV: 34-35 exclamavit voce magna: heli heliam etzaphani, deus meus, deus meus, ad quid me maledixisti. et quidam eorum qui aderant, cum audissent, aiebant: helian vocat.

D ἐφώνησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· ἦλει ἦλει λαμὰ σαφθανεὶ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον· ὁ θεὸς μου, ὁ θεὸς μου εἰς τί ὠνειδίσας με; καὶ τινες τῶν παρεστώτων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον· Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ οὗτος.

B ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· ἐλωὶ ἐλωὶ λαμὰ ζαβαφθανεὶ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνεύμενον· ὁ θεὸς μου εἰς τί ἐγκατέλειπές με; καὶ τινες τῶν ἐστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον· Ἴδε Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ.

Whatever the Hebrew words may be which the words *Heli heliam etzaphani* pretend to transliterate, it is with regard to this transliteration that the author has conceived the misunderstanding of the people who say: *Helian vocat*.

In the Greek of D the words are corrected after the Hebrew but the resemblance between ἦλει and Ἡλίαν is less close. In B ἐλωὶ ἐλωὶ is a more learned correction after the Aramaic; this brings Jesus' cry in line with occasional Aramaic words which are attributed to him elsewhere in the Gospel. But there is no resemblance between ἐλωὶ and Ἡλίαν; the misunderstanding becomes impossible.

The meaning given to Jesus' cry by the Latin: *deus meus, deus meus, ad quid me maledixisti* is a curious combination of Ps. XXII: 1 (*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*) and Deut. XXI: 23 (*He that is crucified is accursed of God*). This meaning is exactly in line with Paul's teaching: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us; for it is written: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Gal. III: 13). Jesus, hanging upon a tree, is

expressly cursed by God (*me maledixisti*). Thus is realized in conformity with the Pauline mystery, what was proclaimed in another place in the Gospel (X: 45), that the death of Jesus would serve as the price of purchase (*pretium, λῶτρον*).

In D ὠνειδίσας is a weak translation of *maledixisti*, understood to mean: *thou hast reproached me* instead of *thou hast cursed me*. This is a mistranslation not of the Hebrew but of the Latin.^{13a} As for B, he restored the text of Ps. XXII: 1 (ἐγκατέλιπες, *thou hast forsaken me*), and accordingly lost the profound significance of the passage.

In contrast to the stupid folk who thought that Jesus was calling Elijah is the centurion who comprehended the mystic force of Jesus' cry. He recognizes that Jesus cried: *My God, my God* because he is truly the son of God.

XV: 39 cum vidisset autem centurio . . . quia sic exclamavit, dixit: vere hic homo dei filius est.

Θ ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὅτι κράζας ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν . . .

D ἰδὼν οὕτως αὐτὸν κράζαντα καὶ ἐξέπνευσεν

B ἰδὼν ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν

The words *sic exclamavit* are essential. By Jesus' cry the centurion recognizes that Jesus is God's son. The Latin gives the real meaning.

The Greek texts lose the point. Θ translates adequately the prefix *ex* of *exclamavit* which expresses the completed action¹⁴: κράζας ἐξέπνευσεν, but he omits οὕτως which is indispensable for the meaning. D translates accurately: οὕτως αὐτὸν κράζαντα, but by way of correction he receives ἐξέπνευσεν from another manuscript. This intrusion produces a monstrous construction. B takes ἐξέπνευσεν but omits κράζας which is the key to the passage. The centurion's confession seems to have

^{13a} The readings of Colbertinus c: *exprobrasti me* and of Vindobonensis i: *me in opprobrium dedistis* are Latin retranslations of ὠνειδίσας με.

¹⁴ See Barbelenet, *De l'aspect verbal en latin*, Paris, 1913; and A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, Paris, 1924, p. 284.

been prompted not by the cry which Jesus uttered but rather by the speediness of his death. This is practically meaningless.

IV. ELIJAH HAS COME

Another passage about Elijah is also massacred in the Greek. Jesus is asked if Elijah must not come *first*, that is before the Son of Man. The objection apparently is that John the Baptist in whom some see Elijah has been killed and consequently has not prepared the ways as he should in accordance with the prophecy of Malachi. Here is Jesus' response:

IX: 12 helias primo disponit omnia quia scriptum est super filio hominis ut multa patiatur et inludetur. sed dico vobis quia helias venit et fecit quanta oportebat illum facere, sicut scriptum est super eum.

B¹⁵ 'Ηλίας ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῇ. ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ 'Ηλίας ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.

The meaning of the two Latin sentences is clear. The first explains the prophecy of Malachi. Yes, Elijah makes all things ready *because* the Son of Man must suffer and be mocked. It is Elijah's task accordingly not to prepare the glory but the sufferings of the Son of Man. The second says that Elijah actually came and did everything that he should have done in accord with the Scripture thus interpreted. The death of John the Baptist is a preparation. The same idea is developed in chapter XII of the Revelation where a *witness* who repeats the miracles of Elijah is killed before the arrival of the Son of Man.

Obviously this passage has suffered two corruptions which have destroyed the meaning in Greek.

QUIA has been copied or read QUID. The explanation

¹⁵ The variants of D and W do not affect the meaning.

quia scriptum est has become a question: *quid scriptum est . . . ?* πῶς γέγραπται ; which is to be understood: *How was it written that . . . ?* This question makes havoc of the sentence. The relationship of Elijah with the Son of Man becomes incomprehensible.

The other mistake has taken place in the Greek: ἐποίησεν ὄσα ἄφελον (*fecit quanta oportebat illum facere*) has been changed to ἐποίησαν ὄσα ἠθέλον (*they did what they wished*).¹⁶ The verb has no subject. It sounds as if it were concerned with the murderers of John the Baptist. But the meaning is far from right. The essential note, namely that John the Baptist did just what he should have done, is lost. And the end of the sentence *in accord with what was written concerning him* lacks point. It certainly is not in accord with a prophecy that they have done to John the Baptist "what they wished."

The Latin makes sense. The Greek is hopelessly obscure. Here the superiority of the Latin is striking. The Latin is manifestly original.

V. GEHENNA AND SALT

Here is another passage where the Greek is corrupt to the point of unintelligibility. The meaning is given by the Latin.

It is the end of the discourse on the expulsions. If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter the Kingdom of God mutilated than with all thy members to fall into gehenna. . .

IX : 47-50 . . . in gehenna incidere ubi ignis non extinguetur et vermis non moritur, omnis autem substantia consumitur. bonum est sal, sed si sal fatuum, fatuum fuerit in quod illud condistis. habetis in vobis pacem, pacati estote in invicem.

¹⁶ ἐποίησεν instead of ἐποίησαν is preserved by Θ.

D ἔλθειν εἰς τὴν γέενναν ὅπου ὁ σκόληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται· πᾶσα γὰρ θυσία ἀλλὴ ἀλισθήσεται. καλὸν τὸ ἄλας· ἐὰν δὲ ἄναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε; ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλα καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις.

B πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται

Θ πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀναλωθήσεται καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀλλὴ ἀλισθήσεται

Ψ πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἀναλωθήσεται

The Latin is perfectly coherent. In the terms of the figure it deals with the necessity which may arise in the Church when excellent members must be expelled. Even the eye must at times be plucked out. Even perfectly good salt becomes flat; then all the food is spoiled. The important thing is to preserve peace. Therefore, pluck out the eye rather than "fall into gehenna, where the fire is not quenched, where the worm dieth not,"¹⁷ but where every substance is consumed. Salt is good, but if the salt is tasteless everything will be¹⁸ tasteless in which¹⁹ you put it. Have peace in yourselves^{19a}; be at peace one with the other.²⁰

It is an easy enough matter to count up the mistakes and changes which have arisen in the Greek.

1. The words *omnis substantia consumitur* have been translated in two different ways. Literally: πᾶσα οὐσία ἀναλωθήσεται, *every substance will be destroyed*. Freely, according to the meaning: πᾶς πυρὶ ἀναλωθήσεται, *every (individual) will be destroyed by the fire*.

But ΘΥΣΙΑ (*substance*) has been read ΘΥΣΙΑ (*sacrifice*). The error was very easy, for the only difference between the

¹⁷ This quotation is from Is. LXVI: 24. The Greek changes the order (worm before fire).

¹⁸ The original text was doubtless: "si sal fatuum fuerit, fatuum erit . . ." The error is accounted for by the repetition *fatuum fatuum*.

¹⁹ *In quod* for *id in quod*. Cf. XIV: 70, *qui stabant* for *ei qui stabant*; XIV: 20, *qui tinguet* for *is qui tinguet*, etc.

^{19a} *Habetis* is probably an imperative; as *adferitis* for *adferite* (H. Roensch, *Itala und Vulgata*, Marburg, 1875, p. 294).

²⁰ *In invicem*, an idiom of the spoken language. Cf. *quaeritis in invicem* (*Codex Bezae*, Latin, John XVI: 19).

words is the dot in the θ . This introduced the unexpected note of sacrifice. A learned corrector desired to find some meaning. He discovered that every sacrifice must be salted, according to Leviticus (II: 13, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta\omega\acute{\rho}\omicron\nu\nu \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \delta\lambda\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$). Accordingly he corrected $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ to $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \delta\lambda\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ because in the following sentence it is salt that is discussed.

Once $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ had been corrected to $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ this correction made its way into the other translations. And $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ became the enigmatic $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ whose meaning is hopelessly lost.²¹

θ and Ψ have combined the two translations. θ is a witness for the translation, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, and Ψ for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (for $\omicron\delta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$) $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.

I have pointed out how one may pass from the Latin to the Greek. May one pass from the Greek to the Latin and consider that $\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ became $\omicron\delta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, translated *substantia*? No, because $\delta\lambda\acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ is not represented in the Latin. The priority of the Latin would appear certain. The idea that every substance is consumed in gehenna is natural. On the contrary the Greek is "one of the most difficult passages to interpret in the N. T."

2. Furthermore *fatuum fatuum* was taken to be a copyist's repetition. The reading was simply *fatuum fuerit* ($\xi\acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$). In line with his reading *in quod* was understood as an interrogative ($\xi\nu \tau\acute{\iota}\nu\iota$) and *condistis* was read *condietis* ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$). The sentence is intelligible, but its meaning has been entirely changed: *if the salt becomes tasteless, with what will you season it?* This sentence is very obscure in its context. On the contrary the Latin is in perfect harmony with the context. The tasteless salt makes tasteless everything it touches, as the offending hand, foot, eye corrupt the whole body.

²¹ "This is confessedly one of the most difficult passages to interpret in the N. T. In the first place, it seems necessary to connect $\pi\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ with $\pi\acute{\upsilon}\rho$ v.48, and $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ in v.49 with $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ in v. 50. And it is this connection with what precedes and follows that makes trouble." E. P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark*, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 180.

3. Finally *pacem* was changed to *panem* which in turn was corrected to *salem*²² because of the fatal nearness of the word salt. This is no conjecture. In *k* the reading is *panem*. The word *pacem* is easily restored because of the context *pacati estote*. Perhaps a corrector wrote *salem* above *panem* because salt has just been spoken of. *Salem* has passed over into the Greek. This was then translated: ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλα (or ἄλας), *have salt in yourselves*, which is an abstruse precept the meaning of which is not evident to me and which has not the slightest connection with *be at peace one with another*. On the contrary, the Latin: *habetis in vobis pacem, pacati estote invicem* provides a rhythmic and even rimed conclusion.

In brief, salt has caused two mistakes. It has spread itself beyond its own sentence. It has unduly "salted" what precedes and follows.

VI. THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS

To the examples which I have furnished Professor Alfarcic, of the University of Strassburg, in a letter to me adds another very important one, viz: the exquisite scene of the resurrection of Jesus:

XVI: 4 subito autem ad horam tertiam tenebrae diei factae sunt per totum orbem terrae et descenderunt de coelis angeli et surgente in claritate filio dei^{22a} simul ascenderunt cum eo et continuo lux facta est. tunc illae accesserunt ad monumentum. . .

The Greek has nothing corresponding to those thirty-eight words.

It looks as if in Greek several lines had been skipped between τῷ μνημείου (v. 3) and εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον which was to translate *ad monumentum*. This would be a skip from one word to

²² *Salem* for *sal*, a neuter accusative formed like a masculine accusative. Cf. *marem, retem, ossum* in Codex Veronensis (*b*). Edition E. S. Buchanan, Oxford, 1912, p. xiii.

^{22a} Turner's reading.

the same word later repeated. The resurrection of Jesus would have been straddled.

Is the passage which exists only in *k* original? Professor Alfarc thinks it is:

“The initial *subito*,” he says, “and the *continuo* are entirely in accordance with Mark’s style. The mention of the third hour is also quite in keeping with his usage (cf. XV: 25, 33, 34). In addition he gives to Jesus the title *Son of God* (I: 1), and he has just made the centurion give this title to Jesus (XV: 39).

“In addition he also represents the angels coming from heaven to gather the elect (XIII: 27).

“It is understood that having brought miraculous darkness at Jesus’ death (XV: 33), he brings a miraculous light at his resurrection, making it come forth from the sudden darkness.

“The passage, finally, provides an explanation of the presence of an angel in the tomb. Without this explanation there is a real blemish.”

These arguments of Professor Alfarc seem to me convincing. The account of the resurrection of Jesus is original. The text of *k* alone has saved one of the most important passages of the Gospel.

VII. ERRORS IN READINGS

When a manuscript, which itself is a copy, is translated it is well-nigh inevitable that errors of reading slip in, due either to the mistake of the copyists or to the haste and carelessness of the translator himself. The bad reading is at once revealed if there is another translation extant which escaped it. The following are examples:

ACCEPIETIS read ACCEPISTIS by BW: XI: 24 *credite quia accepietis* D θ πιστεύετε ὅτι λήμψεσθε BW ὅτι ἐλάβετε (absurd).

ADPROPINQVARET read ADPROPINQVANT by B: XI: 1 *cum adpropinquaret* D ὅτε ἤγγιζεν B ὅτε ἐγγίζουσι.

TENENS read TENDENS by DW: I: 31 *tenens manum eius* B κρατήσας τῆς χειρός (the sick woman's hand) DW ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα (Jesus' hand).

CVSTODIEBANT read CRVCIFIGEBANT by B θ (*crucifixerunt*, used immediately before): XV: 25 *custodiebant illum* D ἐφύλασσον αὐτὸν B θ ἐσταύρωαν αὐτὸν (although Jesus was already crucified).

ACCENDITVR(VR can be in ligature) read ACCEDIT by B: IV: 21 *numquid accenditur lucerna* W μήτε καίεται ὁ λόγος D μήτι ἀπτεται B μήτι ἔρηγεται (daring personification).

COEPIT read COIECIT by B: XIV: 72 *coepit plorare* D θ ἤρξατο κλαίειν B ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν (meaning very obscure).^{22b}

NEMINIDIXERIS read NEINTROIERIS by B: VIII: 26 *nemini dixeris in castello* D μηδενὶ εἶπης εἰς τὴν κώμην B μὴ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσεέλθης (a bizarre prohibition). The prohibition laid on the blind man who has just been healed not to speak to any one in the village is more natural than the prohibition not to enter the village.

Again the bad reading is in all the Greek manuscripts either because the fault arose from the Latin archetype or because through the work of correctors variants were removed. Examples:

INIVRIAM read INVIDIAM: XV: 10 *per iniuriam tradebant eum* διὰ φθόνου παρεδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν (inferior meaning).

^{22b} For Theophylact ἐπιβαλὼν means *having veiled the head*. Attempts have also been made to translate it: *having thought*, or *having laid hold of the word*, or *having escaped*. I think that COEPIT may have been read COIECIT: *conicio* or *coicio* (*manus*) rendered by ἐπιβάλλω (τὰς χεῖρας) to put (one's hands over one's eyes). In 11 of the 18 occurrences of ἐπιβάλλω in the N. T. it has for its complement τὰς χεῖρας or τὴν χεῖρα. It is also possible that ἐπιβαλὼν may be, as Euthymius points out, a synonym for ἀρβάνος. In this case the two forms ἤρξατο κλαίειν and ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν would be understood as two independent translations of *coepit plorare*.

PERCVTIEBANT read PERCIPIEBANT: XIV : 65
alapis eum percutiebant D *ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἐλάμβανον* (B *ἐλαβον*).

GRABATTO read QVADRATO: II: 3 portantes in grabatto paralyticum *παρλυτικὸν φέροντες αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων*.

DISSVPAVIT read DISTVRBAVIT: IX: 26 clamavit et dissupavit eum, et exivit de eo . . . *κράζας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράζας ἐξῆλθεν*.²³ In the Latin it is Jesus who utters the cry and routs the spirit. In the Greek it is the spirit who utters the cry; nevertheless it has just been stated twice that he is dumb.

HAEC read FECIT: XIV:8 quod habuit haec praesumpsit et unguentavit . . . B *ὁ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν προέλαβεν μυρίσαι*. In these two texts under comparison it is to be noted that *ἐποίησεν* is not represented in the Latin and that *haec* is not represented in the Greek. This is my reason for feeling that HAEC was read FECIT which produced four successive verbs. In the Latin the woman sacrificed²⁴ everything that she possessed to anoint Jesus. She did far more than the widow who cast a *quadrans*, a day's support, into the Temple money chest. The Greek provides two enigmas. What is the force of *ὁ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν*? Of *προέλαβεν μυρίσαι*? A meaning—but an intricate one—may be found: *the woman has done what she had (in her power to do)*; she has anointed my body for burial *in the nick of time*. Actually it is rather too soon! The failure to read HAEC correctly has entailed a wrong meaning for *praesumpsit*. D and W had the good reading *ὁ ἔσχεν αὐτὴ προέλαβεν*, but the absurd *ἐποίησεν* has got into their text.

The bad reading may come from a word accidentally skipped (or illegible):

(*Confortamini* skipped) XIII: 9-10 . . . *ad testimonium illis et in omnes gentes, sed confortamini, prius enim oportet*

²³ Cf. IX: 20 *conturbavit* B *σύνεσπάραξεν*.

²⁴ It is extremely difficult to bring out the real force of the French *la femme a prélevé tout son avoir*. Not only has she used her present possession but has mortgaged her future. (Translator.)

praedicari evangelium DW εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι D and W, while not reading *confortamini*, have read *sed* (δὲ). B skipped *sed* as well (as *confortamini*) which resulted in transferring εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη from the first sentence to the second, completely changing the meaning.

Other bad readings have arisen from the Greek itself in one manuscript while another was keeping the reading conformable to the Latin:

ANEPHEISAN read ANESEISAN by B: XV:11 persuaserunt populo D ἐπεισαν τῷ ὄχλῳ W ἀνέπεισαν τὸν ὄχλον B ἀνέσεισαν (aroused).

ΕΝΑΓΚΑΛΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ read ΠΡΟΣΚΑΛΕΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ by D: X:16 complexus illos B ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ D προσκαλεσάμενος (more common word).

ΠΡΟΣΧΕΡΟΝΤΕΣ read ΠΡΟΣΤΡΕΧΟΝΤΕΣ by B: IX:45 gaudentes salutabant eum D προσχέροντες (for προσχαιρόντες) ἡσπάζοντο αὐτόν B προστρέχοντες (an attractive correction).

ΘΕΛΕΤΕ read ΛΕΓΕΤΕ by B: XV:12 quid vultis faciam regi iudaeorum? DW τί θέλετε ποιήσω τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Ἰουδαίων; B τί ποιήσω λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα Ψ τί ποιήσω ὃν λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα (Ψ improves B but entirely changes the meaning).

ΑΜΑ read ΑΛΛΑ and ΠΟΛΛΑ changed to ΠΛΟΙΑ by B: IV:36 simul multi erant W ἄμα πολλοὶ ἦν B ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν (ἄλλα entails πολλά, interpreted πλοῖα on account of the preceding πλοῖον). These *other boats* were produced from a dehiscent letter M. There is no further mention of them in the account.

Sometimes the modification of the Greek was passed on to different manuscripts which served as seed-plots for ours:

ΕΤΥΠΤΟΝ read ΕΝΥΠΤΟΝ XV:19 percutiebant eum ἐτυπτον αὐτόν καὶ ἐνυπτον αὐτῷ (two different readings having been combined).

ΑΑΑΕΙΝ read ΕΑΑΑΕΙ VIII:31-32 occidi et post tertium diem resurgere et cum fiducia sermonem loqui
 ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι, καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει.

Here the error produces a serious misconception. Jesus is announcing that he will die, will be raised again, and *will speak the word openly*. This is in contrast to the secrecy which he continually has imposed (I: 25, 44; III: 12; V: 43; VIII: 26, etc.) and which he is about to bid them guard until the time of his resurrection (IX: 9). After the resurrection the secret will be divulged. This is one of the key passages of the Gospel.²⁵ Tatian and the Sinaitic Syriac version understood the meaning aright (τὸν λόγον λαλήσει). The Greek manuscripts which read ἐλάλει are contradicted by the rest of the Gospel. Jesus *was* not still speaking openly. On the contrary he had just forbidden his disciples to say that he was the Christ (VIII: 30). He was not announcing *openly* his resurrection. On the contrary it was to cause great surprise (XVI: 8).

Certain errors are of hearing rather than of reading. Frequently in fact the text was dictated aloud to many copyists.

For example, ἐπεισαν heard ἐποίησαν by Θ: XV: 11 persuaserant populo ut D ἐπεισαν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἵνα Θ τὸν ὄχλον ἐποίησαν ἵνα

αἰτίαν heard ἀλήθειαν (pronounced probably *alithian*) by BD: V: 33 dixit quid esset facti W εἶπεν πᾶσαν τὴν αἰτίαν B Θ εἶπεν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

ἐκείνη heard καινή by B: I: 27 doctrina haec B διδαχὴ καινὴ D ἡ διδαχὴ ἐκείνη ἢ καινὴ (agglomerate).

κώμας καὶ πόλεις heard κωμοπόλεις by B: I: 38 eamus ad castella et civitates Δ (*Codex Sangallensis*) ἄγωμεν εἰς τὰς κώμας καὶ πόλεις B εἰς τὰς κωμοπόλεις.

²⁵ See F. C. Burkitt, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, 1901, p. 112: ". . . the central thought, therefore, of the prediction is less the resurrection from the tomb than the renewed freedom for the Gospel after the great struggle. . ."

In the thirty-two cases of notable divergences between the Latin and the Greek which have been analyzed so far it is easy to explain the divergence on the basis of the Latin. For the most part it is impossible to explain it on the basis of the Greek.

VIII. AMBIGUOUS FORMS OF THE LATIN

The Latin has certain peculiar ambiguities which are such as to cause the translator to stumble.

For example, certain verbs have the same form in the present and perfect: *venit, invenit, ascendit* should be translated sometimes: *he comes, he finds, he ascends*, at other times: *he came, he found, he ascended*. The context alone indicates which is to be chosen. A slavish translator can make a mistake in such cases.

The following are cases where a perfect has been taken for a present, sometimes dragging one or two other verbs with it over to the present:

XIV: 16-18 (paraverunt . . .) venit (. . . dixit) BD (ἡτοιμάσαν) ἔρχεται (. εἶπεν). A present between two aorists.

III: 31 venit mater eius et fratres (et . . . miserunt) D ἔρχεται ἢ μητέρα (καὶ ἀπέστειλαν) B ἔρχονται (καὶ ἀπέστειλαν). Present, aorist.

XIV: 66-68 venit (. . . dixit . . . negavit) BD ἔρχεται (. λέγει ἠρνήσατο). Two presents, aorist.

V: 22-24 venit quidam (. . . cadens . . . abiit) D ἔρχεται προσέπεσεν ὑπῆγεν B ἔρχεται (. πίπτει ἀπῆλθεν). Present and two aorists, or two presents and aorist.

III: 13 ascendit (. . . advocavit . . . venerunt) BD ἀναβαίνει (. προσκαλεῖται ἦλθον or ἀπῆλθον). Two presents, aorist.

XIV: 37 venit . . . invenit (. . . dixit) BD ἔρχεται εὐρίσκει (. λέγει). Three presents. A little farther (XIV:

40) *invenit* (. . . *fuerunt*) is correctly rendered by the aorist: *εὑρεν* (. . . . ἦσαν).

The perfect passive *collecta est, facta est* may be felt to be a present on account of *est*:

IV: 1 *collecta est turba* D *συνήχθη ὁ ὄχλος* (aorist) B *συνάγεται* (present).

IV: 37 *facta est tempestas* D *ἐγένετο λαίλαψ* (aorist) BW *γίνεται* (present).

The Latin perfect covers the ground at the same time of the Greek aorist and perfect. The translator is obliged to choose:

XI: 17 *fecistis eam speluncam latronum* D *ἐποιήσατε* (aorist) B *πεποιήκατε* (perfect).

I: 38 *ad hoc veni* W *ἐλήλυθα* D *ἐξελήλυθα* (perfect) B *ἐξήλθον* (aorist).

The Latin imperfect subjunctive may be rendered in Greek by the imperfect or aorist indicative. The Latin pluperfect subjunctive by the aorist, perfect, and even the present:

III: 11 *cum viderent* B *ὅταν ἐθεώρουν* (imperfect) D *ὅταν εἶδον* (aorist).

IX: 42 *bonum illi . . . ut suspensa esset mola . . . et missus esset* D *καλὸν . . . εἰ περιέκειτο . . . καὶ ἐβλήθη* (aorists) B *καλὸν . . . εἰ περιέκειται . . . καὶ βέβληται* (present and perfect).

Certain neuter nouns like *triticum*, wheat, which have the same form in the nominative and accusative may confuse the translator. This accounts for the strange case of a Greek nominative following two accusatives:

IV:28 fructum adfert: herbam . . . spicam . . . deinde plenum triticum B καρποφορεῖ . . . χόρτον . . . στάχυν εἶτα πλήρης σῖτος D χόρτον σταχύας εἶτα πλήρης ὁ σῖτος.

Some of the errors may more naturally have arisen in the frequent cases where the Latin Mark employs a form of the spoken language and departs from classical usage.

Thus it uses forms of the indicative²⁶ for the imperative: *offers* for *offer* (I:44), *habeti fidem* for *habetote fidem* (IV:40). In this latter case the force of the imperative has been lost. And the meaning absolutely prevents translation by the indicative. It is at the end of the account of the stilled storm. Jesus says: "Why are you fearful? Have faith!" One can hardly say to cowards: "You have faith." On this account a negative has been introduced: "How is it that you have no faith?" or: "Have you not faith yet?":

IV:40 (quid timidi estis?) Habete fidem. W πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε πίστην; BD οὐπω ἔχετε πίστην;

The Latin Mark uses *quomodo* in the sense of *quando*.²⁷ For example, IV:36: *quomodo fuit in navi* means *when he was in the boat*. This has not been understood:

IV:36-37 adsumpserunt eum. quomodo fuit in navi . . . facta est tempestas BD παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν, ὡς ἦν, ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ . . . The Greek makes *quomodo fuit* the equivalent of *ita ut fuit*, they take Jesus *as he was* in the boat. Could they have taken him in any other way? The phrase *as he was* is practically meaningless.

Cum with the subjunctive is used in a subordinate clause to express a fact: *factum est cum recumberent, it came to pass*

²⁶ Cf. H. Roensch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 2nd ed., Marburg, 1875, p. 294: *adfers* for *adfer*, *adferitis* for *adfert*.

²⁷ Cf. Roensch, p. 403: *quomodo tempus erat ut accenderet sacrificium*.

that they were reclining. This meaning of *cum* was recognized by B, but has escaped D:

II:15 factum est cum recumberent B γίνεται κατακλιῖσθαι ἀπὸν
(read *recumberet*) D ἐγένετο, κατακειμένων ἀπὸν,

On the other hand the phrase *dico quare* is not used by the Latin Mark for *dico quia*. Yet this was conjectured by one translator, while another correctly translated *quare* by *why*:

II:16 dicebant: quare manducat . . . ? D ἔλεγον· διότι
ἐσθίει B ἔλεγον ὅτι ἐσθίει

IX:28 dicentes: quare non potuimus . . . ? D ἰρώτων·
διότι οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν . . . ; W λέγοντες ὅτι οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν . . .

The ambiguity may exist not so much in the meaning of the individual word as in its relation to the context. Hesitation may be felt regarding the antecedent of a relative pronoun or the subject of a verb. Here are two examples:

X:13 offerebant infantes . . . discipuli autem corripiebant eos. (*Eos* are the children; the disciples rebuked them. B understands this.) B ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς (For D on the contrary *eos* are those who are bringing the children) D ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν.

XI:3 si qui nobis dixerit: quid facistis? dicite: domino necessarius est, et continuo eum dimittet.^{27a} (The subject of *dimittet* is clearly the person who is going to say something: *si qui* for *si quis*.²⁸ Jesus sends his disciples to fetch a young ass that is tied. If any one protests he will be told: The master²⁹ has need of him and *he* will let him go, *dimittet*. The

^{27a} The reading of Fleck and von Soden *dimittet* (MS *dimittit*) is required since the present *dimittit* provides a meaning no more appropriate to Jesus than to the master of the young ass. In the manuscript the letter *i* is often substituted for *e*: *Colligit* (collegit), *viniam* (vineam), *purpuria* (purpurea), *dico* (de eo), *cruci* (cruce), etc.

²⁸ Cf. VIII:34 si qui voluerit; XI:16 non sinebat ut qui circumferret vas.

²⁹ A word with double meaning: the owner of the young ass or Jesus in his role of Lord

Greek strangely enough makes *dominus* the subject of *dimittet*, and understands that Jesus is promising to return the young ass). εἶπατε ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστελεῖ πάλιν ὡδε. (The last two words which are added are the sign of a slightly puerile misinterpretation.)

The chief cause of ambiguity in a Latin text is the absence of the article. He who struggles to translate Latin into French or Greek must decide in the case of many nouns whether or not it is necessary to prefix the article. In this matter of articles the Greek Mark shows many cases of hesitation and error.

II: 7 dimittere peccata D τὰς ἁμαρτίας (to forgive the sins)
BW ἁμαρτίας (sins).

X: 21 distribue pauperibus D θ τοῖς πτωχοῖς (to the poor)
BW πτωχοῖς (to poor people).

XI: 21 cyrinaeum D τὸν κυρηναῖον (the Cyrenian) BW
κυρηναῖον (a Cyrenian).

XII: 40 comedunt domos viduarum B τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν
DW οἰκίας χηρῶν.

XIV: 47 rapuit gladium B τὴν μάχαιραν (his sword) DW
μάχαιραν (a sword).

XV: 12 quid . . . faciam regi iudaeorum? BW τὸν βασιλέα
(with the king) D βασιλέα (with a king).

III: 20 introivit in domum εἰς οἶκον (anarthrous); IX: 33
cum venissent domum, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ (with the article). Apparently without any reason.

XIV: 20 qui tinguet in paropside (apparently meaning: he who shall thrust his hand into *the dish* which is there, as D understood it) εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον (or into *a dish*, no matter which, just as B θ expressly say) εἰς τὸ ἐν τρύβλιον.³⁰

IV: 38 (Jesus is asleep in the boat on the bow thwart) in prora super pulvinum (since the word pulvinus has the more common meaning *cushion* it has been understood: *on a cushion*)

³⁰ No especial dish is indicated by this latter phrase; the important thing being that it is the same dish that Jesus had dipped into. (Translator.)

D ἐπὶ προσκεφαλαίον (or *on the cushion*) B ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον. But what cushion? ⁸¹

Occasionally the error is obvious. In the examples which follow the addition of the article is unjustified:

IX: 36 accepit puerum (he took a child) BW παιδίον (not *the* child since a child had not yet been mentioned) D τὸ παιδίον.

XV: 46 posuit eum in monumento (he laid him in a tomb, about which nothing had yet been said) BW ἐν μνημείῳ (not *the* tomb) D ἐν τῷ μνήματι.

VIII: 11 conquirere signum (to ask for a sign) BW σημεῖον θ σημεῖόν τι (not *the* sign) D τὸ σημεῖον.

In other cases, on the other hand, the omission of the article is unjustified:

IX: 31 filius hominis traditur (the Son of Man) BW ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (not a son of man) D υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.

II: 2 loquebatur verbum (he was speaking the Word) BW τὸν λόγον (not a word) D λόγον.

XV: 1 pontifices cum senioribus et scribis (the three orders of the Sanhedrin, viz. the chief priests, the elders, and *the* scribes) D τῶν γραμματέων (not *some* scribes) B γραμματέων.

Here are two cases where the use of the article produces a more important misinterpretation:

II: 18 erant discipuli iohannis et pharisaei ieiunantes (*some* disciples of John the Baptist and *some* Pharisees were fasting, probably a legal fast-day, *Yom Kippour*). Jesus is asked why it is that his disciples also are not fasting. Jesus' answer means that for Christians the Easter-fast (le jeûne de

⁸¹ *Bow* in Latin became *stern* in Greek: ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ, perhaps due to the influence of the verses of Homer: Od. XIII: 74-75:

νήδες ἐπ' ἰκριόφιν γλαφυρῆς, ἵνα νήγρετον εὐδοί,
πρύμνης.

Pâques) will take the place of the Jewish fast of *Kippour*. By the translation "the disciples of John and the Pharisees," the meaning becomes general and vague) οἱ μαθηταὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι

XV:7 fuit barabbas in carcere cum seditiosis qui in seditione fecerunt homicidium. (Barabbas was in prison with some rioters who had committed a murder in a riot of which as yet there had been no mention, and not in the riot as the Greek translators wrote) ἐν τῇ στάσει. This error in translation caused Robert Eisler and other exegetes to believe that Mark and his readers knew about a great riot which was known as the Riot as we speak of the War.

IX. LITERALISMS

Every translator is liable to carry over too literally an expression or idiom of one language into the other and thus to mangle the language into which he is translating. This is by no means rare in the Greek Mark.

IX:10 sermonem tenebant apud se (*sermonem tenere*, to hold conversation is a most common expression. But if one translates *tenere* mechanically by κρατεῖν, the same as in I:31: *tenens manum*, κρατήσας, one gets a strange result) τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτούς. What does τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν mean? In the N. T. κρατεῖν is used with παράδοσιν (Mark VII:3, 8; II Thes. II:15), with διδαχὴν (Rev. II:14). Is the meaning that the disciples kept in their memory the *word* of Jesus (about the resurrection), as Swete and Gould understand? They keep it poorly because they do not understand it. Or is that they *observed* the suggestion (not to talk about the transfiguration), as Allen and Klostermann understand? They will have occasion to observe it only when they are with others. In any case one cannot pass from τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν to *sermonem tenebant*, which has a meaning entirely different and perfectly clear.

XV:1 consilium fecerunt συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες (a bald

Latinism); III: 6 consilium faciebant W συμβούλιον ἐποιοῦντο D ποιοῦντες θ ἐποίησαν B avoids the Latinism: ἐδίδουν.

VIII: 32 adprehensum eum προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν (a reproduction of the Latin but with a very different meaning. The Greek means *helping him*³² and does not at all conform to the context.)

IX: 21 a pueritia ἐκ παιδιόθεν. XI: 13; XIV: 54; XV: 40 de longiquo ἀπὸ μακρόθεν. Greek pleonasm perhaps due to the Latin.

XIV: 3 cum esset in bethania . . . et recumberet, ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν βηθανίᾳ . . . κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ. An awkward construction with two genitive absolutes.

IX: 28 cum introisset . . . discipuli eum interrogabant, εἰσελθόντες αὐτοῦ . . . ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν. An even more faulty construction, although examples occur.

The *ne* which in Latin after verbs expresses a prohibition or a fear is barbarously rendered in Greek: ἵνα μὴ:

V: 10 obsecrabat ne . . . παρεκάλει ἵνα μὴ

III: 12 corripiebat ne . . . ἐπετίμα ἵνα μὴ

IX: 9 praecepit ne . . . διεστείλατο ἵνα μὴδεν

VIII: 30 admonuit ne . . . ἐπιτίμησαν ἵνα μὴδεν

The Latin construction (*adesse nuntiatur*) where an infinitive serves as subject of a passive verb is brought over into Greek in this fashion:

V: 43 ut daretur manducare . . . δοθῆναι φαγεῖν.

The interrogation expressed by *si* with the subjunctive: *quaerebam sicca si posset piscis arena . . . vivere*³³ also tries to smuggle its way into Greek:

³² See M.—J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon s. Marc*, Paris, 1911, p. 207.

³³ Propertius II, 3, 5 cited by A. C. Juret, *Système de la Syntaxe latine*, Paris, 1926, p. 380.

XI: 13 venit videre si quid esset in illa D ἦλθεν ἰδεῖν ἐάν τι ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ (B corrects the solecism ἐάν ἐστὶν by εἰ ἄρα with the future, which latter construction seems to have been borrowed from the usage of Acts³⁴) B ἦλθεν εἰ ἄρα τι εὐρήσει. Θ achieves the really Attic construction ἦλθεν ὡς εὐρήσων τι.

In contrast to literalisms loose translations (*la traduction vague*) occur. A translator sometimes uses a favorite word without regard to the nuances of the text. For example, the Greek translator of the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian uses the verb ἀνεχοινώσατο to translate *detulit* as well as *consuluit*.³⁵

The Greek Mark does the same thing. He uses the intransitive verb *παρίστημι* impartially to translate *adesse* (IV: 29; XV: 35), *adsistere* (XIV: 47), *stare* (XIV: 70; XV: 39), and *circumstare* (XIV: 69).

X. PARAPHRASES

A translator is forced to do a little explaining of the text which he is translating. He adds words to complete the idea. Also as a general rule a translation is longer than the text translated.

In Mark's Greek are found attempts at exactness that evidence the redactor's hand:

V: 21 cum transfretasset D Θ διαπεράσαντος B adds *in the boat* for exactness: διαπεράσαντος ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ.

XIII: 15 non descendat B μὴ καταβάτω D (for greater precision) μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν.

IX: 31 occidit eum et resurget D καὶ ἀναστήσεται B insists: and *when he is killed* he shall rise again, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς ἀναστήσεται.

I: 42 continuo abiit ab eo lepra W εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα B adds . . . καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη (and he was cleansed). An unnecessary exactness.

³⁴ Acts VIII: 22; XVII: 27; VII: 1(D). See F. Blass, *Philosophy of the Gospels*, London, 1898, p. 197.

³⁵ In Eusebius, *H. E.* II, 2, 4 and III, 33, 3. Cf. Tertullian, *Apolog.* V and II.

V : 15 vident daemoniacum vestitum et suae mentis D adds *seated*: καθήμενον W emphasizes: *he who had the demon 'Legion,'* τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγεῶνα B combines them all.

VI: 4 non est propheta sine honore nisi in patria sua BD adds . . . καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. A rather pointless spinning-out.

Explanations:

IX: 38 vidimus quendam . . . qui non sequitur nobiscum et vetuimus illum B explains: *because he did not follow us.*

II: 23 coeperunt vellere spicas DW τίλλειν τοὺς στάχνας. B explains: *to make their way plucking . . . ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες*

XIV: 51 circumamictus pallam θ adds γυμνός BD ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ to explain that when the *palla* had been thrown off the young man ran off naked.

IX: 39 nemo est qui faciat virtutem in nomine meo et poterit male loqui de me W με κακολογήσαι BD ταχὺ κακολογήσαι με. This *quickly* limits the reach of the proverb.

V: 12 mitte nos in porcos: The Greek explains: *that we may enter into them, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.*

A clumsily concealed amphibology:

VIII: 24 video homines quasi arbores ambulantes (*as trees walking*) DW θ ὡς δένδρα περιπατοῦντες (*ambulantes* is ascribed to *homines*. An absurd meaning: *walking as trees!* B tries but without success to avoid this amphibology) B ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας.

An exactness of liturgical interest. At just what hour did the resurrection take place?

XVI: 2 mane D πρωτὶ ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου (*at sunrise*) B λίαν πρωτὶ ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου (*after the sun had risen*).

An intended explanation may produce a misinterpretation:

VIII: 38 qui me confusus fuerit et meos . . . (whosoever shall be ashamed of me and mine . . . The Greek translator thinks that it needs a word after *meos*; he supplies the rather pointless *words*) ὃς ἐάν ἐπαισχυνηθῆ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμούς λόγους The meaning is changed.

An addition itself may be changed as a result of a hard reading (*par mauvaise lecture*):

XV: 8 tota turba rogabat W Θ Ψ ἀναβοήσας ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι (The only way a crowd can implore is by uttering cries. By an easy change³⁶ ἀναβοήσας becomes ἀναβάς. The crowd instead of raising a cry goes up) D ἀναβάς ὄλος ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι B ἀναβάς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι.

Sometimes the phrase is rounded out piously in a conventional Biblical style:

XIII: 19 ab initio creaturae B (not D) ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἦν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός.

XIII: 20 propter electos B (not D) διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο.

V: 19 quanta tibi dominus fecit D ὅσα σοι ὁ κύριος πεποίηκεν καὶ ὅτι ἐλέγησέν σε B καὶ ἐλέγησέν σε.

Some of the suggestive additions reveal the translator's knowledge of the style and stereotyped phraseology of Luke:³⁷

XIV: 58 hic dixit BD ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος. Cf. Acts VI: 11 and 14: *we have heard him say* (Stephen).

³⁶ K. F. A. Fritsche, *Evangelium Marci*, Lipsiae, 1830, ad loc., pointed out the same confusion in the Septuagint in II Sam. XXIII: 9; II Kings III: 21; Hos. VIII: 9.

³⁷ See F. Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 196-211.

III: 22 dicebant BD οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον. Cf. Acts XXV: 7 *the Jews that had come down from Jerusalem* (to accuse Paul).

XV: 24 mittentes sortem B (not D) adds: *τις τί ἄρη*. Cf. Luke XIX: 15, D: *τις τί διεπραγματεύσαντο*.

IV: 19 oblectationes saeculi B (not D) adds: *καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμία*. But neither the words *ἐπιθυμία* and *λοιπός*, nor the construction of *περὶ* with the accusative occurs elsewhere in the Greek Mark, although all three are common in Luke.

XI. MULTIPLE FORMS OF THE GREEK

A comparison of the manuscripts B, D, and W reveals the fact that often the same word is represented in three different ways. Examples of this can be easily multiplied. It will be sufficient to give a few:

XIII: 11 illud W *ἐκεῖνο* D *αὐτό* B *τοῦτο*.

X: 46 mendicus W *προσαιτῶν* D *ἐπαιτῶν* B *προσαίτης*.

II: 4 accedere W *προσελθεῖν* D *προσεγγίσει* B *προσενέγκαι*.

XIV: 71 iurare W *ὀμνύειν* D *λέγειν* B *ὀμνύειν*.

XII: 14 interrogabant W *ἤρξαντο ἐρωτᾶν* D *ἐπηρώτων* B *λέγουσι*.

XI: 7 duxerunt W *ἄγουσι* D *ἤγαγον* B *φέρουσι*.

IX: 20 conturbavit W *ἐσπάραξεν* D *ἐτάραξεν* B *συνεσπάραξεν*.

X: 35 petierimus W *αἰτησόμεθα* D *ἐρωτωσόμεθα* B *αἰτήσωμεν*.

XI: 23 locutus fuerit W *λέγει* D *ἂν εἶπη* B *λάλει*.

XII: 41 cum sederet *ἔστώς* D *καθεζόμενος* B *καθίσας*.

IX: 6 quid responderet W *τί λάλει* D *τί λαλήσει* B *τί ἀποκριθῆ*.

XIII: 26 in nube W *ἐν νεφέλῃ* D *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν* B *ἐν νεφέλαις*.

IV: 31 cum (seminatur) W *ὁπότεν* D *ὅτι ἂν* (wrong translation) B *ὅταν*.

XIII: 30 quoadusque W *ἕως* D *ἕως οὗ* B *μέχρις ὅτου*.

IX: 21 (temporis) ex quo W *ἐξ οὗ* D *ὡς* B *ἕως*.

These changes are insignificant as far as the meaning is concerned. It is the number of them that makes them so

impressive. One can scarcely see how they could have arisen on the basis of a Greek original through the toilsome whim of copyists or correctors. Rather they resemble the little differences which different translations of the same original show. They suggest that there were many translations of the Latin Mark.

If instead of this the Latin Mark were translated from the Greek, it would be derived from one of the different types of this Greek. It would then be found to agree regularly with one type against the others. For example, it would regularly follow D and regularly deviate from B. Its affinities would betray its dependence.

The actual case is exactly the reverse. The Latin Mark occupies a central position so far as affinity for the Greek texts is concerned. It is sometimes one of them, sometimes another, which comes the nearest to it. It has no regular affinity. It is a simple task to draw up lists of equal length to prove conclusively that it (the Latin) stands equidistant from W, D, and B. We will be content here with a few examples:

Cases where the Latin is nearer to W than to B and D.

IV: 32 *crescit* W *αὔξει* BD *ἀναβαίνει*.

II: 12 *admirari* W *θαυμάζειν* BD *ἐξίστασθαι*.

V: 6 *adcucurrit* W *προσέδραμεν* BD *ἔδραμεν*.

III: 10 *curabit* W *ἐθεράπευεν* BD *ἐθεράπευσεν*.

XIV: 30 *negabis* W *ἀρνήσῃ* BD *ἀπαρνήσῃ*.

I: 27 *inpotentabilis* W *ἐξουσιαστική* BD *κατ' ἐξουσίαν*.

Cases where the opposite is true and the Latin is farther from W than from B and D.

IV: 4 *volatilia* BD *τὰ πτερινὰ* W *τὰ ὄρνεα*.

VIII: 23 *spuens* BD *πτύσας* W *ἐνπτύσας*.

II: 23 *transire* BD *διαπορεύεσθαι* W *πορεύεσθαι*.

- IX: 33 retractabit BD διελογίζεσθε W διελέχθητε.
 IX: 31 resurget BD ἀναστήσεται W ἐγείρεται.
 VI: 5 non illic ullum BD ἐκεῖ οὐδεμίαν W οὐκέτι.

Cases where the Latin is nearer to D than to B and W.

- XII: 14 capitularium D ἐπικεφάλαιον BW κῆρσον.
 XIV: 21 scriptum est D ἐστιν γεγράμμενον BW γέγραπται.
 XIV: 58 excitabo D ἀναστήσω BW οἰκοδομήσω.
 XII: 2 darent D δώσουσιν BW λάβῃ (entirely different).
 XVI: 4 revolutum D ἀποκεκλισμένον BW ἀνακεκλίσται.³⁸
 XII: 38 in docendo D διδάσκων ἅμα BW ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

Cases where the opposite is true and the Latin is farther from D than from B and W.

- III: 3 aridam BW ξηράν D ἐξηραμμένην.
 XV: 39 contra BW ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ D ἐκεῖ.
 XV: 16 colligunt BW συγκαλοῦσιν D καλοῦσιν.
 X: 12 relinquit virum BW ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα D ἐξέλεθη ἀπὸ
 ἀνδρός.
 XIV: 4 indignantes BW ἀγανακτοῦντες D διεπονοῦντο.³⁹
 XIV: 25 non bibam BW οὐ μὴ πίω D οὐ πρόσθω πίειν.⁴⁰

Cases where the Latin is nearer to B than to D and W.

- XVI: 8 tremor B τρόμος DW φόβος.
 XV: 27 crucifixerunt B ἐσταύρωσαν DW σταυροῦνται (or
 σταυροῦσιν).
 V: 6 adoravit illum B προσεκύνησεν αὐτὸν DW αὐτῷ.
 VIII: 34 venire post me B ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν DW ὀπίσω μου
 ἀκολουθεῖν.

³⁸ The word used by D shows his familiarity with Palestinian tombs; the stone was rolled by pushing it (ἀπο—). The word used by BW suggests, but wrongly, that the stone would be rolled by exerting a pressure from below (ἀνα—). Hoskier, I, p. 119.

³⁹ An uncommon word which is found again only in Acts IV: 2; XVI: 18. Blass, p. 201.

⁴⁰ An intentional Hebraism.

II: 8 continuo agnoscens B εὐθὺς ἐπεγνούς DW ἐπεγνούς (with out εὐθὺς).

I: 45 in desertis locis conveniebant B ἤρχοντο DW ἦν καὶ ἤρχοντο.⁴¹

Cases where the opposite is true and the Latin is farther from B than from D and W.

XI: 32 populum DW τὸν λαόν B τὸν ὄχλον.

XVI: 5 cum introissent DW εἰσελθοῦσαι B ἐλθοῦσαι

V: 14 exierunt DW ἐξῆλθον B ἦλθον.

XIV: 7 vobiscum DW μεθ' ὑμῶν B μεθ' ἑαυτῶν.

I: 25 exi de homine DW ἐξελθε ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου B ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

XII: 19 habuerit uxorem DW ἔχη γυναῖκα B καταλίπη γυναῖκα.

Comparison of these six tables makes it perfectly clear that the Latin is not derived from one of the types of the Greek but that these, on the contrary, are different types of Greek all of which are derived from the Latin. The advantage of a test of this type is that it is not made subordinate to personal judgment. It depends on lists of presence, absence, and concomitant variations.

XII. AGGLOMERATES

When numerous translations of a text are corrected one by the other, the result is that a correction instead of replacing the other reading is simply added to it. Two variant translations of the same phrase thus are found in juxtaposition. This is what is meant by an *agglomerate* (agglomérat). The presence and especially the number of the *agglomerates* allow one to distinguish between translation and original. Now no type of text of the Greek Mark is free from these double translations. All are freighted with agglomerates.

⁴¹ The intrusion of the verb ἦν in DW makes *in desertis locis* refer to Jesus: *he was in desert places and they came . . .*

In some cases one of the two simple translations is read in one manuscript and one in a second, and the agglomerate is revealed in a third. Such cases provide tangible evidence as to how the situation arose:

XIV: 21 (filius hominis) vadit B *ὕπάγει* D *παραδίδοται* W *παραδίδοται ὑπάγει*.

X: 32 admirabantur qui sequebantur illum D *καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο* Sahidic version *οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο* B *καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο· οἱ δὲ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο*.

XII: 44 misit totum quem habuit victum suum W *ξβαλεν ὄλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς*. Sinaitic Syriac version *πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ξβαλεν* BD *πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ξβαλεν, ὄλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς*.

More often one manuscript gives one of the two simple translations and another manuscript the agglomerate. The second simple translation may be conjectured:

VIII: 15 cavete D *βλέπετε* [other translation *ὁρᾶτε*] BW *ὁρᾶτε βλέπετε*.

IV: 39 obmutesce W *φιμόθητι* [other translation *σιώπα*] D *σιώπα καὶ φιμόθητι* B *σιώπα πεφίμοσο*.

I: 35 ante lucem W *ἐννυχα* [other translation *πρωί*] BD *πρωὶ ἐννυχα λίαν*.

X: 30 in isto saeculo D *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ* [other translation *νῦν*] B *νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ*.

X: 4 libellum repudii scribere Bθ *γράψαι* [other translation *δοῦναι*] D *δοῦναι γράψαι*.

I: 32 cum sol occidisset: Sinaitic Syriac version *ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος* [other translation *ὀφίας γενομένης*] BD *ὀφίας δὲ γενομένης ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος*.

V: 23 et vivet: Sinaitic Syriac version *σωθήσεται* [other translation *ἵνα ζήσῃ*] BD *ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ*.

I: 38 eamus ad proxima (castella) θ *ἄγωμεν εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας* [other translation *ἀλλαχοῦ*] BD *ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας*

.....

IV: 2 docebat illos dicens W ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων [other translation ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ] BD ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

Finally the mere comparison of the Latin and the Greek⁴² occasionally arouses the suspicion of an agglomerate which may be confused with a paraphrase:

XII: 41 honesti mittebant multa B πολλοὶ πλοῦσιοι ἔβαλλον πολλὰ (*multa* read *multi* in a translation).

II: 25 esuriit BD χρεῖαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπεινάσεν.

XIV: 41 dormite BD καθεύθετε καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε.

XIV: 61 tacebat D ἐσεῖγα καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη B ἐσιώπα καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο.

XIV: 68 nescio BD οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι.

I: 45 in desertis locis BD ἔξω ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις.

VIII: 11 conquirere (signum) συνζητεῖν αὐτῶ, ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ.

XIII. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Quotations from Mark are scarce in the early days of Christianity.⁴³ The most instructive are those made by Clement of Alexandria at the end of the second century:⁴⁴

V: 34 vade in pace. Clement ἀπελθε εἰς εἰρήνην BD ὕπαγε θ πορεύου. The verb used by Clement is not found in any known Greek manuscript.

X: 22 multas divitias et agros. Clement χρήματα πολλὰ καὶ ἀγρούς D χρήματα πολλὰ (without ἀγρούς) BW κτήματα πολλὰ (without ἀγρούς). The two words *et agros* which Clement used agree with the Latin and are not found in any Greek manuscript.

⁴² I. e., without any manuscript evidences such as the above examples provide. (*Translator.*)

⁴³ For example, the reconstruction of the New Testament of Irenæus by W. Sanday and C. H. Turner (*Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. VII), Oxford, 1923, contains but 4 pages for Mark while Matthew has 43, Luke 26, John 16. See above, p. 41, a quotation which proves that Irenæus read a Latin Mark.

⁴⁴ See P. M. Barnard, *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria (Texts and Studies V, 5)* Cambridge, 1899; and H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B and its Allies*, London, 1914, I, pp. 198-204.

XII: 30 de tota anima tua et de tota virtute tua. Justin and Clement ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου. All the Greek manuscripts⁴⁵ have three or four members. D puts ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου before *soul*. B intercalates, furthermore, ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου between *soul* and *strength*. Justin and Clement ignore the Greek manuscripts and go with the Latin.

X: 25 *facilius est camellum per cavernam acus introire* Clement quotes this passage four times: in the *Stromata* (II, 5) and in *Quis dives salvetur* (2, 4 and 26). It is noteworthy that each of the four times he quotes it in a different form and in disagreement with the Greek manuscripts. To render *facilius* once he uses ἐυχόλιως, once ῥᾶον, twice θάττον. Greek Mark has ἐυκοπώτερον (B) and ταχεῖον (D). To render *introire per* once he uses διεκδύσεται, twice εἰσελεύσεται, once διελεύσεται. Greek Mark has διελθεῖν (B) and διελεύσεται (D). For *cavernam* he uses τρήματος. Greek Mark has τρυμαλιᾶς (B) and τρυμαλίδος (D).

It is curious to find Clement quoting one passage of Mark in four different Greek forms without meeting the forms which do occur in the manuscripts.

From these examples it is evident that Clement of Alexandria followed the Latin text and was not acquainted with a settled (fixé) Greek text. If he desired to quote Mark he translated the Latin at that moment without looking to see whether he had made another translation for himself or whether there was another one in existence.

XIV. COUNTER-PROOF

Do the cases where the Latin would be a clear translation of the Greek disrupt the full and manifold evidence which shows the priority of the Latin Mark to the Greek Mark? An examination of the cases which may be alleged is necessary.

⁴⁵ Except 157 (Sod. c 207) which has ἰσχύος instead of δυνάμεως.

The use of certain Greek words in the Latin Mark: *scandalum*, *scandalizare*, *discolum*, *diaconos*, (*mons*) *eleon*, *anastasis*, *gazofilacium* is no more significant than the use of certain Latin words in the Greek Mark: *κεντυρίων*, *λεγίων*, *σπεκουλάτωρ*, *δηνάριον*, *κοδράντης* (*quadrans*), *ξέστης* (*sextarius*), *φραγελλῶ* (*flagello*), *πρωτόριον*. In Rome and the large bilingual cities Latin and Greek existed side by side and were often interchanged. They borrowed from each other, they contaminated each other. Inscriptions in the catacombs show that words and even the very alphabets were interchangeable. Accordingly, a Greek original is not to be inferred from a few Greek words nor a Latin original from a few Latin words.

All the Greek words which figure in the Latin Mark are found in the Septuagint. It is possible that their introduction in the Latin was due to the liturgic usage of the Jews.^{45a} Behind *σκάνδαλον*, *scandalum*, one is not to detect the Greek "tumbler" (*gâchette*) but the Hebrew word which *σκάνδαλον* translates.

Dicere quia (IX: 26), *videre* or *audire quia* (IX: 25; X: 47), *legere quoniam* (XII: 29) are not translations of the Greek. They are cases of vernacular. Tertullian uses *quia* 13 times and *quoniam* 3 times as the equivalent of the conjunction *que*.^{45b} In Petronius we find: *dixi quod comedit* (46, 4); an old hag says: *vides quod aliis leporem excitavi* (131, 7). According to A. C. Juret (*Système de la syntaxe latine*, Paris, 1926, p. 317) *quia* instead of *quod* in sentences of this kind is old Latin.

Coepit . . . iurare quia: non novi hominem istum (XIV: 71) is a popular idiom as is the corresponding Greek phrase. *Quia* is used here to introduce direct discourse. One detects here a trace of its original meaning, namely, an old neuter plural accusative of *qui*.

^{45a}On this point see D. S. Blondheim, *Les parlers judéo romans et la vetus latina*, Paris, 1925.

^{45b}G. Mayen, *De particulis Quod, Quia, Quoniam, Ut pro acc. cum infinitivo post verba sentiendi et declarandi positis*, Kiel, 1889.

The Latin Mark is very careless in the matter of gender. This is also evidence of the popular speech. Roensch (*Itala und Vulgata*, pp. 276f.) cites in addition: *civitatem qui dicitur, escam quem nescitis, hora in quo, viduam qui misit, omnem opus, regnum venientem, certamen qualem vidistis*, etc. In the Latin Mark we find: *granum qui . . . minor cum sit fit maior*. This is not due to the scribe seeing the Greek *κόκκος ὄς*. Rather it is the Greek *κόκκον ὄς μικρότερον ὄν* which arose from carelessness regarding the gender of *granum*.

The most curious disregard of genders is: *quod est mandatum primum? . . . haec prima est . . . deinde secunda similis . . . maius his alius mandatum non est* (XII: 28-31). Here we see all three genders used with *mandatum*. The Greek *ἐντολή* would explain the feminine but not the masculine.

Dominantur earum, potentantur eorum (X: 42) are Grecisms which came into use through the influence of the Septuagint. Tertullian says: *numquam dominaturi eius* (Apol. 26).

Visus est illis helias (IX: 4) with the dative instead of *ab* with the ablative is an idiom often employed by Cicero (*audita tibi*), Tacitus, Tertullian, etc. (Roensch, p. 436). *Fuerunt conloquentes* (ibid) is a periphrastic construction akin to *audiens sum*, which is old Latin and classical (Juret, p. 72).

Hoc factum est ei (IX: 21), a passive with the dative of the recipient of the action, is Latin and is not to be explained as a copy of the Greek.

Contristatus super illum sermonem (X: 22), *admirabantur super sermonem eius* (X: 26) are popular idioms and do not presuppose *ἐπι* with the dative. *Super*, meaning *by reason of*, occurs in familiar speech. We find it with the ablative in Plautus (*super Euclionis filia rem tenes*), in Cicero's letters (*hac super re*), in Apuleius (*famam super quondam Demochare*). Here the accusative takes the place of the ablative which is not classical but nevertheless is a far step from *ἐπι* with the dative.

In nullo potest exire nisi orationibus (IX: 29) is popular and does not strongly suggest the Greek. The instrumental ablative is here preceded by *in* as in the familiar *in hoc signo vinces*.

Novissime habet (V: 23) is Latin like *male habet* (he is ill), *habet invitius* (he is opposed), *habet tranquillius* (he is tranquil). This is the Greek ἐσχάτως ἔχει which is a Latinism.

Restitutus est ut videret (VIII: 25) is a good Latin idiom like *arboribus consita* *Halia est ut pomarium videatur* (Varro).

Sequitur nobiscum (IX: 38) is not a "tracing" of ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῶν. It is ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν, the reading of Codex Regius (L) and Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (Φ), which is copied from the Latin.

Gaudentes (IX: 15) is most appropriate of the men who had been sad at seeing the disciples unable to perform a miracle and who rejoiced at seeing Jesus. *Expavit* depicts a movement of great surprise.

Dilexit illum (X: 21) is appropriately used after the man who is seeking eternal life has answered that he has observed all the commandments since the time of his youth. The verb means either Jesus chose him, or esteemed him, treated him with distinction, loved him, with a hint of choice or approval. *Dilexit illum* does not yield an inch to ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν, even if the latter be given the meaning *he embraced him*.

Misit minuta duo quod est quadrans (XII: 42) is ^{not} a mere pleonasm. *Minutum* is not a unit of Roman currency, nor is there any Roman coin valued at half a *quadrans*. (The *quadrans* was divided into three "ounces"). The meaning is: she cast two little coins of the value of a *quadrans*.

Non sapis quae sunt dei (VIII: 33) is most appropriate after Peter's silly flutter at the mention of the Passion. *Sapis* is not to be understood as coming from φρονεῖς which is, on the contrary, less apt.

Arescit (IX: 18), he becomes stiff, is good Latin and fits in very well with the description of an epileptic fit. It is intelligible without recourse to the Greek ἐξηραίνεται.

Seminatio for *semen* (IV: 26) is not a copy of *σπόρος*. Words in *-atio* are characteristic of the phraseology of the Latin Mark: *excusatio* (XII: 40), *exc^{sema}entio* (XIII: 14), *generatio* (*fructus* XIV: 25), *baptizatio* (VIII: 28), *blasphematio* (XIV: 64).

Docentia (XI: 18) is not a copy of *διδασχῆ*, but is akin to many feminine nouns in *-ntia* (Roensch, pp. 49-52). These nouns are as a general rule based on a present participle: *nascentia*, *sufficientia*, *sustinentia*, *apparentia*, *errantia*, *expavescentia*, *erubescencia*, *fraudentia*, etc. Tertullian uses *discentia*.

Cena pura (XV: 42) is not a mutilation of *παρῆσθενή*. It was a common term for Friday in use by Latin-speaking Jews. (Tertullian, *Ad Nat.* I, 13; Augustine *In Johann.*, 120, 5; *Sermones* CCXXI). It passed from the Jews to the Christians. It persists in the Sardinian dialect where Friday is called *Kenápura*, *Kenábura*.^{45c} According to a passage of Festus^{45d} *cena pura* was a pagan ritual term. It apparently signified a meal in preparation for the mysteries, characterized by abstaining from certain dishes. It is curious that the Latin-speaking Jews took over this term to designate the preparation for their Sabbath. Had they likened in some way or other the celebration of the Sabbath to that of the mysteries?

In short, the counter-proof does not weaken in the slightest degree the evidence, either as a whole or in detail, which unites in proving that the Latin Mark is the original, the Greek Mark the copy.

CONCLUSION

This assembly of evidence proves that the Gospel of Mark was written in Latin as the subscriptions say. The reason a Greek version of Mark was put in the New Testament was

^{45c} Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. etym. Wörterb.*, §1806, quoted by Blondheim, p. LX.

^{45d} P. 230b, ed. Müller, Leipzig, 1839, quoted by Blondheim LIX.

that it was convenient to have the whole collection in the same language.

Many Greek versions superficially harmonized were made of the original Mark. To seek to bring them back to a Greek archetype is wasted effort. The "critical" editions of Westcott and Hort, of Nestle, of von Soden in so far as they depart from B produce an artificial text of Mark which never existed. It would be far more critical to edit separately B, D, and W as the Old Syriac version and the Peshitta have been edited separately. There was no original Greek of Mark. The original is Latin.

The Gospel of Mark was probably written in Rome in that group of the Christian community which spoke Latin and for that group. The works of George La Piana⁴⁶ show the increasingly important position this group assumed in the course of the second century, one of its members, Victor, even succeeding to the episcopate in 190. In the third century Hippolytus who speaks Greek is an anachronism. The Latin group contained many Africans. It possessed their tendencies. The Gospel of Mark was the doctrinal manifesto and liturgical handbook of this group.

The Greek versions were apparently made in Egypt. W shows the effect of hobnobbing with the Coptic. B is allied to the oldest Coptic version.⁴⁷ D has some bad readings which appear to have been due to abbreviations in use in the Egyptian papyri.⁴⁸

D was carried to the occident where it was translated back into Latin at the time a Latin version of the complete New Testament was made. The original Latin text, however, is not

⁴⁶ *Il problema della chiesa latina in Roma*, Rome, 1922; *La successione episcopale in Roma e gli albori del primato*, Rome, 1922; *The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century*, Harvard Theological Review, July, 1925.

⁴⁷ See W. Bousset, *Textkritische Studien zum N. T.*, Leipzig, 1894. H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B*, pp. 79-87. (G. Horner) *The Coptic Version of the N. T.*, Oxford, 1921. H. A. Sanders, *The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels*, New York, 1912, Introduction. In B and W are to be observed some Greek words peculiar to Egypt, as ἐξάνια (IX: 8).

⁴⁸ See Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, *A Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 2nd ed., London, 1912, p. 96.

completely lost. It was read by Saint Cyprian. It has come down to us in large part in Codex Bobiensis and Codex Palatinus.

Two lines of Saint Jerome give a good résumé of the history of the Gospel of Mark: "Mark at the request of the brethren at Rome wrote a brief Gospel . . . Taking the Gospel which he had composed he went to Egypt."⁴⁹ Is this the history of the author? At any rate it is of the book.

⁴⁹ *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*. Quoted by Hoskier, I, p. 202.