

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:



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<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]

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*.

(1) *παρά* (with acc. of place).

	ad	iuxta	circa	secus	<i>aliter</i>
Matt. iv 18		<i>h f</i> vg		<i>a d h m²⁰⁰ c</i>	secundum <i>b</i>
xiii 1 *		<i>e h corb</i>		<i>abdff q fcvg</i>	
4		<i>he</i>		<i>abdffh q fcvg</i>	
19 <i>h</i>		<i>e</i>		<i>abdffh q fcvg</i>	
xv 29 <i>he</i>		<i>f</i>		<i>abdff qr cvg</i>	
30	<i>ffq</i> vg				[see below]
xx 30				<i>sanbdffh q fcvg</i>	super <i>rr₂</i>
Mc. i 16				<i>abdffl rfcvg</i>	
ii 13 <i>ea dffqr cvg</i>		<i>f</i>		<i>b</i>	
iv 1 <i>sanbdffqrscvg</i>					
4		<i>ea i</i>	<i>bd qrf</i> vg	<i>a ff c</i>	
15		<i>b q</i>	<i>dffi rfcvg</i>		
v 21 <i>ea</i>		<i>b fc</i>	<i>dffiqr</i> vg		
x 46 <i>h</i>		<i>a fvg</i>	<i>bdffi r c</i>	<i>q</i>	
Lc. vi 1 <i>e d</i>		<i>a</i>		<i>b ff lqrfcvg</i>	
2 <i>ea d</i>				<i>b ff lqrfcvg</i>	
vii 38 <i>e d fc</i>				<i>b ff lqr vg</i>	om. <i>a</i>
viii 5 <i>e d</i>		<i>a</i>		<i>b ff lqrfcvg</i>	
12 <i>e d</i>				<i>ab ff lqrfcvg</i>	
35 <i>bdfflqrfcvg</i>					ante <i>a</i>
41 <i>ab ff lqrfcvg</i>					[sub <i>d</i> (= <i>ὐπό</i>)]
ix 47 <i>d</i>		<i>fc</i>		<i>b ff lqr vg</i>	ante <i>e</i> , apud <i>e</i>
x 39 <i>ead c</i>				<i>b ff ilqrf vg</i>	
xvii 16 <i>eadff</i>					ante <i>b silqrfc</i> vg
xviii 35			<i>e</i>	<i>abdff ilqrfcvg</i>	

Matt. xv 30 (*ἐπιβαν αὐτοῦ*) *παρὰ* τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ: *he* have the simple dative (*pedibus*), *a c f corb* have *ante*; D reads *ὐπό* for *παρά*, followed by or following *b d*, which have *sub*.

Lc. ix 47 *παρ' ἐαυτῶ*: D reads *παρ' ἐαυτόν*, followed (?) by the Latins. There is no instance of *παρά* with acc. in S. John.

In Lc. viii 38 Ambrose has *supra*, in viii 41 *ante*, in viii 5, x 39, xviii 35 *secus*.

(2) *ἐπί*.

Matt. xiii 48 <i>ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγρὸν</i> ,	ad <i>he ab dffghqf</i>	secus <i>cvg</i>
xxi 19 <i>ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ</i>	super <i>d</i>	secus <i>e abffghqrscvg</i> Hilary
Lc. xx 37 <i>ἐπὶ τῆς βάρου</i>	secus <i>vg</i>	[<i>aliter</i> lat. vt.] ¹
xxiv 4 <i>ἐπίστησαν αὐταῖς</i>	iuxta <i>af</i>	secus <i>eb (ff) lqc vg</i>

(*d r* have the simple dative. *ff* has 'sicut'.)

¹ In Lc. xx 37, *vg* alone gives the modern interpretation, whereby *secus Rubum* means practically 'in the section of the Pentateuch called "The Bush".' The other Latins have—

M. significat quomodo dicit in rubo *dñs*. Cyp. 144 (*dñm* AW).

M. significavit in rubo quomodo dicit *dñm d*.

M. significavit super rubum quando dixerit ei *dñs* *ñs* dicens Ego sum *ds e*.

M. demonstraui uobis dicit de rubo *dñm a*.

M. ostendit sicut dixit Vidi in rubo *dñm ff il q (r) fc* (Cyp. W).

In other words *d* and Cyprian preserve the original, which is variously interpreted by *e, a, ff, &c.*

(3) *κατά*.

Lc. x 32	<i>κατά τὸν τόπον</i>	om. <i>e</i>	per <i>a</i>	ad <i>d f c</i>	<i>secus b f i l q r</i>	vg
33	<i>κατ' αἰθέρα</i>	secundum <i>e</i>	per <i>a</i>	ad <i>d</i>	<i>secus f i l q r f c v g</i>	

In the latter verse *b* is illegible. Ambrose has *secus*.

Under the head of *secus* = *κατά* comes the use where it does not express place, but 'according to'. This use and this alone, so far as I know, is found in African writers, e.g. Tertullian *De Anima* § 55 'quodsi Christus Deus, quia et homo mortuus secundum Scripturas et sepultus *secus* easdem'. It is not found in the Bible, unless Lc. xx 37 vg be counted an example, but it is characteristic of the curious and ancient Latin text of the *Assumption of Moses*, e.g. i 10, ii 2, 5.

A glance at the above Tables will bring out several points of interest. *Secus* never occurs in *k*, and only three times in *e*, so that we may safely conclude that in these three places *e* does not faithfully represent the African text, or indeed the original wording of the Latin version. *Circa* is almost entirely confined to the later European text of S. Mark—it is, in fact, as characteristic of that text as *summus sacerdos* for ἀρχιερεύς,—but (again like *summus sacerdos*) there is no trace of it in African documents. The reason for its sudden appearance from Mc. iv 4 onwards may be connected with the variations in the latter part of iv 1, where a European revision, attested by *a* and *d*, and partly by *q* and *vg*, substitutes *circa mare* for *ad litus* and *in litore*. The use of *circa* with its convenient vagueness of meaning in this verse may have suggested its subsequent employment as a rendering of *παρά*. However this may be, the only place that *circa* occurs in an African text is Lc. xviii 35 *e*, where the whole mass of European documents have *secus*. The true 'African' equivalents for 'by the way-side' are *ad uiam* and *iuxta uiam*.

The main deduction which I think we are justified in drawing from these Tables, at least as a working hypothesis, is that when we find *secus* in a Latin document (except in the sense of 'according to') the document is either non-African and not earlier than the fourth century, or the text where *secus* occurs has been corrupted. An illustration of the first alternative is the Latin text of the *Book of Jubilees*, in which *secus* (= *παρά*) often occurs: I do not doubt therefore that this Latin text is not older than the fourth century. On the other hand, the Latin version of Clement has only *secus* meaning 'according to', and therefore may be quite ancient. An illustration of the second alternative, where *secus* has wrongly invaded an African text, is to be found in *De Montibus Sina et Sion* § 9, where Ps. i 3 is quoted according to Hartel (App. p. 115) with the ordinary phrase *secus decursus aquarum*,

¹ *Secus uoluntatem Dei* (Morin 217). This is not the only point of contact between the Latinity of Clement and that of the *Assumption of Moses*.

on the authority of his codices M and T. But the late Munich MS μ , together with the tenth-century Oxford MS which Dr Sanday calls O_1 , have *iuxta tractus aquarum*, and this is no doubt the original reading of the *De Montibus* and the true African equivalent for *παρὰ τὸν διεξόδου τῶν ἰδάρων*.

F. C. BURKITT.

PHILO'S INTERPRETATION OF LEVITICUS XVIII 18.

IN Archdeacon O. D. Watkins's learned treatise on Holy Matrimony (London, 1895) it is categorically stated (p. 653 note) that 'Philo had no doubt that the Mosaic Law prohibited marriage of two sisters *even when one was dead or divorced*', and reference is made to Philo: *De Specialibus Legibus* Lib. iii c. 5 p. 304 M (= Cohn v p. 157). This statement seemed so surprising, in face of the ordinary Jewish interpretation that I have re-examined the passage in question, and have come to the conclusion that this interpretation of the passage is wrong, and I have the permission of Archdeacon Watkins to add that he is now convinced that it is wrong.

The particular sentence is indeed ambiguous and probably needs emendation, but the tenor of the whole context is conclusive. The chapter runs thus:—

'Moses does not allow the same man to marry two sisters, either contemporaneously or consecutively, even if he have put away (*ἀπεωσμένος*) the one he married first.' Then follows the sentence on which Archdeacon Watkins relied, which I leave untranslated for the moment:—*ζώσης γὰρ ἔτι τῆς συνοικουσίας, εἴτε καὶ ἀπηλλαγμένης, εἴαν τε χηρεύῃ εἴαν τε καὶ ἑτέρῃ γαμηθῇ, τὴν ἀδελφὴν οὐχ ὁσιον ἰπέλαβεν ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ἡτυχηκίας παρέρχεσθαι*—'thereby clearly teaching that it is not right to violate the just rights of relationship, or for the new wife to take advantage of the misfortunes of one who is so closely united to her by birth, nor to give herself airs thereon or pride herself on being courted by her sister's enemies and on courting them in return. For from such circumstances spring bitter jealousies and implacable rivalries, bringing in their train countless crops of evils. It is as bad as if the members of the body were to break loose from their natural harmony and interdependence and to rise in war one against the other, the result of which is incurable diseases and death; and sisters, even if they are separate members of a family, are at least linked and united one to another by nature and a common kinship.'

Now it seems clear (i) that the whole context implies that the first wife is still alive, the argument being based upon the danger of quarrels