

mon Greek coin, the λεπτόν in 12, 42, and the attachment in 15, 16 to the common Greek term ἀλή, meaning "court," of the Latin πραιτώριον, but several dubious explanations of Aramaic words and phrases.

## B. EDITORIAL GLOSSES AND EXPLANATIONS

It is noticeable that in Mark we have explanations to the reader of things Jewish and Oriental. These usually take the form of parenthetical notes, obiter dicta, or of glosses superficially attached. These last may be termed "editorial," because they appear (so far as textual evidence avails) to be an authentic part of the original work. We have observed (with Zahn) that Red.-Marc. reproduces "with apparent pleasure" the Aramaic words of Jesus on great occasions such as the raising of Jairus' daughter (5, 41), the healing of the deaf-mute (7, 34), the prayer in Gethsemane (14, 36), and the parting cry from the cross (15, 34). This in itself would carry small weight, were it not that, unlike other evangelists who make less display of their linguistic attainments, Mark seems to consider an accompanying translation necessary for his readers' benefit in all cases save the most commonplace.<sup>1</sup> Even "abba" (14, 36) he finds it needful to translate as ὁ πατήρ (with Paul, Rom. 8, 15; Gal. 4, 6); while Matthew and Luke are content with the simple Greek equivalent, omitting the Aramaic (Matthew 26, 39 = Luke 22, 42; cf. Matthew 6, 9 = Luke 11, 2). How pedantic it would have sounded in Jerusalem or Antioch to translate *abba*!

It might be "decisive," as Zahn maintains, and at the same time more definite geographically, were it the fact that Mark

explains Greek by Latin: 12, 42, λεπτά δύο, ὃ ἐστὶν κοδράντης; and 15, 16, ἔσω τῆς ἀλῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον. . . . The discussions between Blass and Ramsay (*Expository Times*, X, 232, 287, 336) have only made it evident that it could not possibly occur to one who was writing for Greeks to explain the common expression δύο λεπτά by the word κοδράντης — a word to them much less familiar, to say the least. This is just the situation in Mark 15, 16. To support his assertion — which has no support whatever in the tradition —

<sup>1</sup> Only the Ephesian evangelist finds it necessary to translate βαββί and βαββονί (John 1, 38: 20, 16), "the Messiah" (1, 41), and significant proper names such as Siloam (9, 7), Gabbatha (19, 13), Golgotha (19, 17). Luke often uses νομοδιδάσκαλος instead of γραμματεὺς, and ἀληθῶς for "amen."

that Mark is a translation of an Aramaic book, Blass (*loc. cit.*) says that  $\delta \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \pi\rho\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  is a mistranslation of  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\eta$ , which there denotes not palace, but courtyard. The word has the latter meaning only in 14, 66.

But Professor George F. Moore cites exactly the same equation of coinage, 1 quadrans ( $\kappa\omicron\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ ) = 2 perutas ( $\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ), from a Palestinian Hebrew text of the second century;<sup>1</sup> and  $\delta \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \pi\rho\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  need not be a "mistranslation" of the comprehensive  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\eta$ ; it may merely serve for closer determination. Altogether the term *indecisive* would seem more suitable for these linguistic evidences.

The weak point of Zahn's argument appears when he is called upon as champion of the traditional authorship to defend the correctness of Red.-Marc. explanations. Thus the rendering  $\nu\iota\omicron\iota \beta\rho\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$  for the mysterious title  $\beta\omicron\alpha\nu\eta\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  applied to the sons of Zebedee in 3, 17, is still an unexplained puzzle. Neither ancient nor modern philology furnishes a real Aramaic equivalent.<sup>2</sup> Again in the (more authentic) scene of the trial before Pilate (15, 1-5) the expression  $\sigma\grave{\upsilon} \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is correctly understood as noncommittal. As the late Prof. J. H. Thayer has shown (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, XIII, 40-49) this phrase appears in Jewish writings in the sense, "So you say." In the (imitated) scene of 14, 61-65, the evangelist apparently takes it as a positive affirmation.

The suspicion that Red.-Marc., while able to translate Aramaic for his readers' benefit, has no such mastery of the language as we must presuppose in a native or long resident of Jerusalem, is strengthened when we read the attempt in 15, 34-36, to interpret the parting "loud cry" of Jesus as a quotation of Psalm 22, 1. So extreme a representation of the mental agony of Jesus could not fail to evoke protest, and it is therefore quite intelligible that Luke should substitute the more acceptable Psalm 31, 5 ("Into thy hands I commit my spirit"). Both,

<sup>1</sup> The Baraitha on the coinage, Jer. Kidd. ed. Ven. f. 58 d, l. 25 ff., ed. Zitom. Kidd. f. 3 b near bottom; see also Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, II, 409, 674. This information forms one of a series of invaluable criticisms and suggestions for which the author desires to express his obligation to Professor Moore.

<sup>2</sup> On "Dalmanutha" (Mark 8, 10), A. Wright in his *Synopticon* remarks, "No satisfactory explanation of the word has been found." He commends that suggested by Rendel Harris (*Study of Codex Bezae*, p. 178) which makes it a misrendering of the Aramaic.

however, appear to be attempts to fill out with meaning the too bald statement of verse 37 that "Jesus expired with a loud cry." But in Mark this still stands (in spite of the duplication) alongside of verse 34. The Markan and Lukan Scripture quotations, therefore, are secondary and tertiary developments respectively. What Luke thinks of the Markan elaboration upon Psalm 22, 1, may be judged by his substitute in 23, 36-37. For Mark 15, 34-36, in which the incident of the cry is combined with that of the offering of vinegar (retained alone in John 19, 28), is full of difficulties. If it be one of the soldiers who offers the drink of posca, as commonly understood, how does the soldier come to be familiar with the Jewish belief in the coming of Elias? We may suppose him a local recruit familiar both with the language and the prophesied coming of Elias. But in that case how could he mistake the Aramaic words quoted as a call to Elias? The simplest escape is by supposing the quotation to have been made in Hebrew, which would give, in fact, Eli, Eli, lamah 'azabtani (אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָּה אֲזַבְתָּנִי), the first two words being mistakable by persons unfamiliar with Hebrew, but familiar (like the Aramaic speaking populace, and perhaps members of the locally recruited guard) with the legend of the coming of Elias. The Aramaic אֵלִי אֵלִי could hardly be mistaken for the prophet's name. The supposition that the utterance was made in Hebrew is therefore the natural resort of the  $\beta$  text which frankly substitutes  $\zeta\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$  (Dd)  $\zeta\alpha\beta\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$  (or  $\zeta\alpha\beta\alpha\chi\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ ?) (B,  $\tau$  i), or *zaphani* (k) for the authentic Aramaic  $\sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ . In fact in the  $\beta$  text Matthew also has Ἠλεί, though the rest of the quotation is given in Aramaic. Evang. Petri, rendering the cry ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις, also clearly presupposes the Hebrew. There is, accordingly, strong evidence that the original author of this explanation of the cry, which in the present form of the Gospel has made its way into the text, assumed that Jesus quoted the Psalm in Hebrew. The compiler of the Gospel as it now stands, Red.-Marc., considers, on the contrary, that here, as elsewhere, Jesus spoke in Aramaic. He therefore, gives the quotation in Aramaic, but not in such Aramaic as would be written were the story original with one familiar with this language. The two peculiarities which remain for expla-

nation are the following: (a) Here, as in two other cases of probably borrowed material (Mark 1, 2; 4, 29), but more unmistakably, the Hebrew text makes itself felt in the form of the quotation.<sup>1</sup> (b) The Aramaic itself is faulty, transliterating לְפָה שְׁבַרְתָּנִי אֵלֶיךָ אֵלֶיךָ as ἐλωὶ ἐλωὶ λαμὰ σαβαχθανεὶ according to Nestle's text. Even if we exonerate Red.-Marc. at the cost of transcribers, the errors must not only go back of all known witnesses to the text, but (at least in part) even back of Matthew's transcription. We must either construct a text out of whole cloth or hold Red.-Marc. responsible. If the evangelist himself wrote such Aramaic as this, the fact has a bearing on the question where Mark first circulated.

In Mark 7, 3-4 we have a further example of the evangelist's explanation of Jewish terms and practices. Montefiore and Abrahams indignantly repudiate as libellous this description of Jewish distinctions of "clean" and "unclean," and to this attitude of Red.-Marc. toward things Jewish as a pervasive feature of the Gospel we must return later. Meantime apropos of the expression κοιναῖς χερσίν of the source (verse 5 forms part of the material) we can but ask: How could any but readers remote from Palestine and Jewish customs require an explanation of the word κοινός employed in the technical sense? Not even Paul (Rom. 14, 14), or the author of Hebrews (2, 14; 9, 10, 29), finds it necessary to explain the terms κοινός, κοινούν, and the author of Rev. 21, 27 finds explanation equally needless. Luke, it is true, adds the synonym ἀκάθαρτος in Acts 10, 14; 15, 28, and 11, 8, 9; but Matthew in his parallel to Mark 7, 1-5 simply omits the entire explanatory digression, employing the term κοινούν in 15, 11, 18, 20, as if the meaning were self-evident. Red.-Marc., we observe, not only finds explanation needful for his readers, but shows at least lack of sympathy for things Jewish, if not alien ignorance, in the explanation he undertakes to furnish. In his introductory paragraph (7, 1-2) he first repeats with the explanatory gloss: κοιναῖς, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτους, the statement of his source (ver. 5), that "The Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why do thy disciples not walk

<sup>1</sup> See Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo*, 103,9 ad loc. The LXX has ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου, πρόσχες μοι, ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπες με.

according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with common (*κοιναῖς*) hands?"; thereafter he interjects a description of Jewish observances (vers. 3-4), whose tone can hardly be called respectful, even if "ablutions of cups and pots" do form part of Jewish ritual. Even when the sense is expressed by the Greek itself, as in *παρασκευή* (15, 42), Mark appends a paraphrase (*ὁ ἐστὶν προσάββατον*), and explains the sense of the transliterated *γέεννα* (9, 43, *τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον*).

### C. LOCAL GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

1. Explanations of Palestinian climate and geography are particularly significant of the location of the readers in East or West. Thus Mark 11, 13, *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων* invites our notice by the fact that the evangelist finds it needful to explain to his readers that Passover was "not the season of figs." Such information regarding the climate of Jerusalem might be required at Rome. It certainly could not be on any of the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean.

Other editorial explanations indicate not only such ignorance on the readers' part as is hardly to be imagined in Oriental circles, and not paralleled in Matthew or Luke, but also a condition of the evangelist's own mind, neither wholly well-informed nor sympathetic. It is inevitable from the beginning already made to push the enquiry beyond explanatory glosses, and seek in the body of the work for further indications of the geographical standpoint.

2. The great discourse on the Doom of Jerusalem (Mark 13), reproduced with some Q expansions in Matthew 24 and Luke 21, is a striking feature of the Gospel,<sup>1</sup> constructed, as the present writer has endeavored to prove,<sup>2</sup> on the basis of Q logia with special reference to the events of 67-70 A.D. (and hence later than 70), using the visions of Daniel to weld the whole into a typical apocalyptic eschatology. The author's prin-

<sup>1</sup> The only other long discourse of Mark is the chapter of parables. This also in the interpretation of Red.-Marc. is a preaching of judgment against the people of deaf ears. As Swete points out (Commentary, p. 74), the other long discourses of Mark are "delivered privately to the Twelve."

<sup>2</sup> Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVIII (1909), pp. 1-25.