

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



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



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

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

'CHIEF PRIESTS' IN THE LATIN GOSPELS.

In the American *Journal of Theology* for 1907, p. 500, Dr Nestle has an interesting Note on the Gospels in the Latin Vulgate. Dr Nestle propounds the theory that S. Jerome did little more than cursorily revise a current text, and that this current text was of great antiquity, each Gospel the work of a separate translator, whereby he says 'it is clear that the text-critical value of it is greatly enhanced, seeing that the translation goes back into a time when the Gospels were not yet united into one collection'. For the proof of this surprising statement Dr Nestle appeals to the way in which the same Greek word is translated differently in the several Gospels. His instances are ἀρχιερεύς, παρακαλεῖν and ἐπιτιμᾶν. I propose to examine the first in some detail, because a statistical method is eminently appropriate for technical terms, the rendering of which do not depend upon the context.

Dr Nestle says: 'Take ἀρχιερεύς. It occurs in Matthew 25 times; in Mark, 21 times; in Luke, 15 times; in John, 21 times. It is rendered *pontifex* in Matthew, Mark, and Luke but once, among 61 cases; in John *everywhere*, except in the first passage (vii 32), where the Vulgate has *principes* and seems to have read ἀρχοντες instead of ἀρχιερείς. Is this again accidental? Or does it prove diversity of translators? It is obvious that the translation of John is due to another hand than that of the rest.

'But that also Matthew, Mark, and Luke were not translated by the same man is shewn by the fact that in Matthew the regular translation of ἀρχιερεύς is *princeps sacerdotum*, and in Mark *summus sacerdos*. In Matthew there is not a single deviation from *princeps sacerdotum*; in Mark *summus sacerdos* appears 16 times (among 21), and is replaced by *pontifices* in xv 11, because the preceding verse ended in *summi sacerdotes*, and it would have sounded very badly to go on again *summi sacerdotes*; in xiv 35 by the simple *sacerdotes*, because *summus sacerdos* had occurred already in the same verse; by *princeps sacerdotum* in ii 26, x 33, xi 18. But these are such exceptions as prove the rule.'

Of course, if Dr Nestle means no more than that the Vulgate Gospels are not entirely a new translation from the Greek, but a revision more or less thorough of some 'Old Latin' text, then we shall all agree with him. My object in this Note is to point out that the phenomenon noticed by Dr Nestle in the Vulgate is found in most Old Latin texts as well, and to suggest that they are best explained as more or less partial revisions of all Four Gospels, not always it may be assumed with the help of a Greek Codex. If Dr Nestle's theory be true for any known Latin text, it will be true for the African Latin.

First of all it may be worth while mentioning that *ιερεὺς* is regularly rendered by *sacerdos* in all texts. The only exception in the Gospels is Mc. i 44, where the Vulgate supports τῷ ἀρχιερεὶ in agreement with 13 &c. (the 'Ferrar Group') and 33, but against all other Greek MSS and all Old Latin texts. As this Latin reading must surely be due to Jerome himself, it is interesting for our purpose to note that the rendering is *principi sacerdotum*.

In the following Tables the symbol for a MS indicates that it has the rendering prefixed to the head of the column in which it stands. *l* is only cited for Lc. and Joh. ; *n*, except where cited, may be assumed to be lost. *k*, the leading MS of the African (i. e. Cyprianic) text, is only extant for the first half of Matt. and the latter half of Mc. *e*, the other predominantly African MS is (roughly speaking) lost wherever *k* is extant ; it is also lost for the whole of Matt. xxv, xxvi, and xxvii. *b* is missing for the concluding chapters of Mc.

<i>ἀρχιερεὺς</i> pontifex	sacerdos	princeps sacerdotum	summus sacerdos	(other renderings)
Matt. ii 4	<i>k</i>	<i>abdfc</i> vg		
xvi 21	<i>e</i> (<i>Iren</i>)	<i>abdfc</i> vg (<i>Tyc</i>)		
xx 18		<i>abdfnfc</i> vg		pr. et sacerdotibus <i>e</i>
xxi 15		<i>cabdfffc</i> vg		
23		<i>cabdfffc</i> vg		
45		<i>ebdfffc</i> vg		[<i>hiat a</i>]
xxvi 3, 14, 47,		<i>abdfffc</i> vg		[<i>hiat e</i>]
51, 57, 58, 59,				v. 59 princeps <i>a n</i>
62, 63, 65				
xxvii 1		<i>abdfc</i> vg		[<i>hiat e</i>]
3	<i>Cyp</i>	<i>abdfc</i> vg		"
6		<i>abdfc</i> vg		"
12, 20, 41, 62		<i>abdfc</i> vg		"
xxviii 11	<i>e</i>	<i>abdfc</i> vg		<i>a</i> also has pr. sac. in an interpolation to xxviii 12.
Mc. ii 26		<i>q</i> cvg		<i>om. eabdfir</i>
viii 31	<i>f</i>	<i>ffiqrc</i>	<i>bd f</i> vg	principibus <i>a</i>
x 33	<i>k</i> (<i>a</i>)	<i>ffiqrf</i> cvg	<i>bd</i>	pont. sacerdotum <i>a</i>
xi 18	<i>k a</i>	<i>b qrf</i> vg	<i>dff c</i>	pr. et sac. <i>i</i>
27	<i>k</i> (<i>a</i>)	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>bd r f</i> vg	pont. sacerdotum <i>a</i>
xiv 1	<i>k a</i>	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>d irfc</i> vg'	
10	<i>k</i> (<i>a</i>)	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>d ir</i> vg	pont. sacerdotum <i>a</i>
43	<i>k</i>	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>a d rfc</i> vg	
47	<i>k</i>	<i>dffq c</i>	<i>a d</i> vg	
52 ^a	<i>k</i>	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>a d</i> vg	
53 ^b	<i>a</i>	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>om. k</i>
54	<i>k</i>	<i>ffq c</i>	<i>a d r c</i> vg	
55	<i>k</i>	<i>a ffq c</i>	<i>d r</i> vg	
60	<i>k</i>	<i>a ffq c</i>	<i>d</i> vg	
61	<i>k</i>	<i>q</i>	<i>d</i> vg	<i>om. affc</i>
63	<i>k</i>	<i>a q</i>	<i>dff c</i> vg	
66	<i>k</i>	<i>a q</i>	<i>dff fc</i> vg	
xv 1	<i>k</i>	<i>a q</i>	<i>dff c</i> vg	
3	<i>k a</i>	<i>dffq c</i>	<i>dff c</i> vg	
10		<i>a ffq c</i>	<i>d r</i> vg	for <i>k</i> , see below
11	vg (<i>k</i>)	<i>dff</i>		<i>om. ar</i>
31	<i>k</i>	<i>n ff c</i>	<i>d</i> (vg)	

<i>ἀρχιερέω</i> pontifex	sacerdos	princeps sacerdotum	summus sacerdos	(other renderings)
Lc. iii 2 e		a(b) dff l q r f c VG		
ix 22 a		e b d f f l q r f c VG		
xix 47 (e) a		d f f i l q r f c VG		pont. au. sacerdotum e
xx 1 e a		d f f i l q r f c VG		[hiat b xix, xx]
19 e a		d f f i l q r f c VG		
xxii 2 e a		b d f f i l q r f c VG	Π ^{ms} (R)	
4 a		e b d f f i l q r f c VG		
50 a	l c	e b d f f i q r f VG		
52 a		e b d f f i q r f VG		
54 a	c	e b d f f i l q r f VG		primi sacerdotes c. om. l
66 a		e b d f f i l q r f c VG		
xxiii 4 a	c	e b d f f i l q r f VG		
10 a	c	e b d f f i l q r f VG		
13 a	(c)	e b d f f l q r VG	f	
23	f c	d	f	om. e a b f f l r VG
xxiv 20 a	e c	b d f f l r	f (vg)	[hiat q (and in xxiii 23)]
Joh. vii 32 ^a e	ab	a d f f q r f		om. d f f l q r f c VG
32 ^b l		a d f f q r f c		om. e b, principes c VG
45 e l VG		b f f q r f c	r	[hiat b]
xi 47 l VG	a	e a b f f f c	r	scribae d (errore)
49 l c VG		e a b f f f	(r)	princeps d [hiat q]
51 f l c VG		e a b f f f	r	" [hiat q]
57 VG	r	e a b f f f c		" [hiat l q]
xii 10		e a b f f (l) r f c VG		" [hiat q]
xviii 3 e VG		a b q r f c		[hiat d f f l]
10 VG		e a b f f r f c		pr. sacerdoti q [" d l]
13 f f c VG		a b q f	r	[hiat e d l]
15 ^a f f VG		a b q r f c		"
15 ^b f f c VG		a b r f		om. q "
16 f f c VG		a b q r f		"
19 f f VG		a b q f c	r	"
22 Cyp c VG		a b f f q r f		"
24 b f f c VG		a q r f		[hiat d l ad fin.]
26 e b f f c VG		a q r f		
35 e VG		a b f f q r f c		
xix 6 e VG	a	b f f q r f c		
15 b VG	e a	f f n q r f c		
21 VG	e	a f f		principes (iudaeor.) b q f c [hiat r]

One or two notes on special passages may be made before coming to the general conclusions.

Matt. xvi 21. Neither *sacerdotibus* in Iren. iii 18 nor *principes sacerdotum* in Tyconius 61 proves much, as both quotations appear to have been made from memory. But the latter passage at least proves that *princeps sacerdotum* was familiar to Tyconius in Africa about 380 A. D., even if it did not stand in his Bible.

Matt. xxvi 59. The occurrence of the simple *principes* in *a* and *n* is a good instance of the close connexion between these two MSS. It is of course a mere stylistic change, Caiaphas having been called *princeps sacerdotum* in the two preceding verses.

Mc. ii 26. ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρχιερέωσ is absent from all genuine Old

Latin texts: it is therefore important to notice that when ἀρχιερεύς is being introduced for the first time by the Vulgate and the late MS *q* the rendering is *principes sacerdotum*. This agrees with what was noted above for Mc. i 44 vg. No doubt *c* is here interpolated directly from the Vulgate, and *f* from the Gothic, as often elsewhere. The Gothic has here the simple *gudja*, used indiscriminately for 'priest' and 'high priest'.

Mc. x 33, xi 27, xiv 10. In all these places *a* has *pontifices sacerdotum*, which may fairly be regarded as evidence for an original *pontifices*, altered by a scribe who was more familiar with *principes sacerdotum*. Probably the simple *principibus* in Mc. viii 31 *a* has a similar origin.

Mc. xiv 53^b. The omission in *k* is due to 'like beginning'; it is clear that *pontif.* stood in its ancestry both in 53^a and 53^b. The simple *sacerdos* of *qr* is no doubt to be explained as Dr Nestle explains it (see above); just as *principes* in Matt. xxvi 59 *an* is short for *principes sacerdotum*, so *sacerdos* is here short for *summus sacerdos*.

Mc. xiv 61. There is some reason for thinking that ἀρχιερεύς was absent from the immediate ancestry of *d* and of *q* (see Tisch. ad loc.); if so, in replacing the word each MS keeps to its own usage.

Mc. xv 10, 11. There is much variation here, and the Greek text as printed is perhaps wrong (see below). In various ways B 1 & c. 565 700 (*k*) (*c*) *a r* syr. S arm boh all testify to the omission of ἀρχιερεύς either in *ver.* 10 or *ver.* 11. It is probable that *pontifices* in *ver.* 11 in the Vulgate is due to Jerome himself; if so, it suggests that considerations of style sometimes were preferred by him to considerations of consistency.

Mc. xv 31. *n* may be regarded as a substitute for *a*.

Lc. xxii 50. The independent character of *c* in the last two-and-a-half chapters of Luke comes out well in these lists. Its marked preference for *sacerdos* as opposed both to the ordinary *principes sacerdotum* and to *pontifex* is borne out by *e* in Lc. xxiv 20.

Lc. xxiii 13, xxiv 20. Both ἀρχοντες and ἀρχιερεύς occur in the Greek of these verses, so that texts which normally would have *principes sacerdotum* were in a difficulty. In xxiii 13 *be l r* vg render ἀρχοντες by *magistratus* as in Lc. xii 58 lat. vt, while *ff* omits ἀρχοντες altogether, as do *a* (*b*) *ff l* in xxiv 20. The other alternative is followed by *f*, and in xxiv 20 by vg also, viz. to retain *principes* for ἀρχοντες and to get a fresh term for ἀρχιερεύς. The evidence of *c* makes it probable that *sacerdos*, not *pontifex*, stood in the earliest texts of these passages: had *pontifex* been used here it would have been allowed to stand side by side with *principes*.

It is probably a mere slip of St Jerome's pen that the best MSS of the Vulgate have *summi sacerdotum* in Lc. xxiv 20.

Joh. vii 32 is greatly confused in order, but the distribution of the Old Latin documents is essentially the same as in *ver.* 45.

Joh. xix 21. The Greek is οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, for which *sacerdotes Iud.* in *e* is a sufficient equivalent. Then *sacerdotes* was changed in the interests of literalness into *principes sacerdotum*, preserved in *a ff*, and then *sacerdotum* omitted for euphony in *b q f c*, the sense being clear. The Vulgate reading is doubtless a correction of the simple *principes*, the same term being chosen as in xix 6 and 15.

To turn now to the general question. There can be little doubt that in Mark, John, and the first twenty chapters of Luke *pontifex* is the constant 'African' rendering of ἀρχιερεύς, and that *princeps sacerdotum* only finds a place in *e* through occasional assimilation of its fundamentally African text to a more commonplace vocabulary. It is equally certain that *pontifex* has no place in the African text of Matthew, its place being taken by simple *sacerdos* (Cyp. 1/1, *k* 1/1, *e* 2/6). The evidence of *k* in Matt. ii 4 and of Cyprian 80 in Matt. xxvii 3 makes it certain that *sacerdos* alone must be accepted as an African equivalent to ἀρχιερεύς. It is therefore difficult to resist the conclusion that *sacerdos* is also the true African rendering in Mc. xv 31 (*k*), Lc. xxiv 20 (*e c*), Joh. xix 15 (*e a*). And if so, remembering the 'African' character of *c* in Lc. xxii, xxiii, and the non-African character of *e* in the same chapters, we need have little hesitation in accepting the evidence of *c* for *sacerdos* in Lk. xxii 50, (52), 54, xxiii 4, 10, (13), and I do not hesitate to add *ver.* 23 also.¹

Thus for the African text we find that the rendering of ἀρχιερεύς is *sacerdos* in Matt., *pontifex* in Mc. Lc. Joh., but with a tendency to lapse back again into *sacerdos* at the end of each Gospel. Possibly this may indicate that the Gospel of Matthew was translated separately and at an earlier date than the rest, but it might almost equally be regarded as the result of translating the Four Gospels in the order Matt. Joh. Lc. Mc. The difference of style between S. John and S. Matthew and the difference of context in which ἀρχιερεύς occurs in these Gospels, might produce a difference of rendering for this and other words, and the use of *pontifex* once established it might be continued in Lc. and Mc. *Sacerdos* and *pontifex* must have been regarded as practically equivalent, for in Cyprian's quotations from Ac. xxiii 4, 5, he has three times *sacerdotem* (*Dei*) in *ver.* 4, but *pontifex* in *ver.* 5.²

If the 'African' Latin be a translation of the full Gospel Canon it is not likely that the European texts, which on the whole appear to be

¹ That is, to accept καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων as a genuine 'African' reading. It must be remembered that *c* has been corrupted from the Latin Vulgate, not from the Greek 'Antiochian' Vulgate, and the Latin Vulgate omits these words.

² Cyprian 470, 671, 729. Augustine has *princeps sacerdotum*.

so much less primitive, are 'translations' of separate single Gospels. Is it not much more likely that they represent textual and linguistic revisions of the early forms of the African text?

On no theory is it easy to account for *summus sacerdos*. It is certainly not due to Jerome, for Jerome introduced *principes sacerdotum* in Mc. i 44, ii 26, and *pontifices* in xv 11. The distribution of evidence is made difficult to trace by the lacunae which occur in many MSS of Mark. *e* fails from viii 31, *b* from xiv 1, *i* from xiv 43, *f* from xiv 53^b-60 and from xv 1, not to speak of occasional failures in *r* and *q*. But enough remains to suggest that it was almost as frequent in *b* as in *d*. Here as elsewhere *b* represents tendencies which the Vulgate carries out more fully. The curious thing is that while all the European MSS have *summus sacerdos* for ἀρχιερεύς in Mc. several times, it never occurs in any 'African' document (for *c* when it agrees with vg ought not really to be classed as Old Latin at all), and hardly ever occurs outside Mc. The total lack of African support shews that it cannot be primitive: it must therefore be regarded as a correction for *pontifex*, not an independent translation of ἀρχιερεύς. When *k* leaves off using *pontifex*, the evidence for *summus sacerdos* at once shrinks, *c ff* (and once even *d*) going over to *princeps sacerdotum*.

It is difficult to realize the facts about the extant texts of the Gospels in Latin, and more difficult still to reconstruct their history. But I feel sure of two things: first, that our theories must start from the African texts, not from the Vulgate and other comparatively late revisions; and secondly, that the greater amount of variety in rendering found in S. Mark's Gospel corresponds to its comparative neglect for literary and liturgical purposes. In the other Gospels, especially S. Matthew, there was something of an ecclesiastical standard in vocabulary, which reacted, perhaps unconsciously, upon editors and scribes, but this restraining and standardizing influence was less felt when the text of S. Mark was being revised, either from a Greek MS or for stylistic purposes.

In conclusion, let me once more express my belief that such investigations as that which Dr Nestle has begun must not be based on the Vulgate, a text which has had too long and complicated a history for us to be able to divine that history by internal evidence alone. And we must take the evidence of the whole vocabulary of the Gospels. If we found that the earliest texts that have come down to us have regularly *felix* in S. Matthew but *beatus* in S. Luke as a rendering of μακάριος, and also *mundus* for ὁ κόσμος in the Synoptic Gospels but *saeculum* in S. John, then we might begin to wonder whether this difference of rendering does not correspond to a difference of place or date in the translations. But the evidence, in my opinion, does not point to such rigid original uniformity. *Saeculum* for *mundus* is really characteristic

of the 'African' text of S. John, but the evidence that even Cyprian had *mundus* in Joh. i is very strong, and it is hardly likely that different parts of the Fourth Gospel were translated into Latin by different hands. Finally, words like *turba*, *populus*, *multitudo* (as renderings of *ὄχλος*) are quite intractable to any theory of primitive uniformity. For reasons such as these I still believe that the appearance of *summus sacerdos* for *ἀρχιερεῖς* in the Vulgate text of S. Mark is the result of unsystematic revision of the 'European' texts of the Old Latin, not a primitive feature preserved unchanged from the age when the Gospels circulated separately.

Note on some Latin texts of Mark xv 10, 11.

1. The text of *a* may be thus restored from Irco's edition :

..... ATENIM		<i>sciebat enim</i>
..... ROPTER		<i>quod propter</i>
.... DIAM		<i>inuidiam</i>
... IDERUNT		<i>tradiderunt</i>
... UMPRIN		<i>illum prin-</i>
... ESSACER		<i>-cipes sacer-</i>
... UMQUI		<i>-dotum qui</i>
.... MTUR		<i>etiam tur</i>
... SUASE		<i>bae suase-</i>
.... UTMA		<i>-runt ut ma-</i>
GISBARABBA	(col. 2)	<i>-gis barabban</i>
DIMITTERET		<i>dimitteret</i>
ILLIS		<i>illis</i>

This agrees exactly with the reading of 565 700 and the Armenian, i. e. ¹⁰ ἦδει γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παρέβωκαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς,¹¹ οἷτινες καὶ τὸν ὄχλον ἔπεισαν ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς.

(565 and arm omit *μᾶλλον*. 700 has *ἀνέσεισαν* with most Greek MSS.)

The Irish MS *r* practically agrees with *a*, especially in the characteristic placing of *τὸν ὄχλον* before *ἔπεισαν* (*sic*). The grouping 565 700 *a r* arm is very curious, and should be taken into account in any attempt to estimate the origin of the special element of *a* in S. Mark.

2. *k* and *c* are best exhibited side by side.

k

¹⁰ sciebat enim quia per iniuriam
tradebant eum principes
¹¹ sacerdotes autem et scribae
persuaserunt populo
ut magis agerent
barabban dimitte nobis

c

¹⁰ sciebat enim quod per inuidiam
tradiderunt eum principes
sacerdotum¹¹ scribae autem
persuaserunt turbis
ut dicerent magis
barabbam dimitte nobis.

Here *k* and *c* have in common against all other texts the mention of 'scribes' and the ungrammatical oratio recta at the end. *Iniuriam* in *k* is a mere blunder for *inuidiam*, and I imagine that *agerent* is nothing more than a blunder for *dicerent*. In Mc. xi 18, xii 12 ὄχλος is translated by *populus* in *k* against the *turba* of other texts, otherwise it would be attractive to regard *populo* as a mistaken supplement and *scribae* as a corruption of *turbae* (dat. sing.). But it is impossible to equate *k* with *a*, so that this suggestion may be definitely rejected, and we must conclude with the remark, that the only instance of anything like *principes sacerdotum* in *k* occurs in a singularly confused and corrupted passage.

F. C. BURKITT.

SECUS.

What is the Latin for 'by the way-side'? It is instructive to a Christian scholar to find that his classical friends do not know the phrase *secus uiam*, which is the ordinary Vulgate equivalent for *παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν*, and further that this 'learned ignorance' is shared by the 'African' text of the Bible, though *secus* as a preposition is used by the Africans in other connexions.

Charisius the Grammarian says *id quod uulgus usurpat 'secus illum sedi', hoc est 'secundum illum, et nouum et sordidum est'*. This is about the middle of the fourth century. Towards the end we find *secus* freely employed by S. Ambrose of Milan, who says of the Good Samaritan (in *Luc* 1428 C) *uenit secus eum, hoc est, factus compassionis nostrae susceptione finitimus et misericordiae collatione uicinus*.

But it is not easy to find examples from earlier authors. I ought perhaps to add that the instances alleged in the older Latin Dictionaries for *secus* as a preposition are almost always unsupported by any MS authority, e. g. in Ennius (*ap. Lactant.*), in Quintilian viii 2, 20 and in Pliny *H. N.* xxiv 15 all the MSS read *secundum* not *secus*. In Cato *R. R.* § 21, 2 *utrinque secus* must be an adverb, as it is twice so used a few lines further on. In various texts of the Latin Gospels *secus* stands for (1) *παρά*; (2) *ἐπί*; (3) *κατά*.