Loanwords or Code-Switching?
Latin Transliteration and the Setting of
Mark's Composition

Christopher B. Zeichmann
University of Toronto | christopher.zeichman@mail.utoronto.ca

Abstract

The composition of Mark's Gospel is variously located in metropolitan Rome, Syria, and Palestine, with nothing close to a consensus emerging. This article takes up one particular line of argumentation for Markan provenance and provides it a clearer methodological and theoretical apparatus, namely the issue of Latin transliteration. Some commentators note that the prevalence of Latin suggests a Roman context, while others contend that Markan vocabulary is consistent with the Roman East. This article examines the distinctive ways in which Latin was transliterated in the aforementioned regions in epigraphs, papyri, and literary texts. Comparative work will indicate that Mark's use of transliterated Latin verges on incompatible with pre-War Palestine, is quite dissimilar from the city of Rome, but overlaps in significant ways with that of Syria and post-War Palestine. Though this argument is not conclusive about Markan origins in its own right, it may clarify the utility of the argument from Latinisms for future discussions.

Introduction

The location of Mark's composition is a matter of continuing debate, with three regions dominating the current discussion: the city of Rome, the region of Palestine, and the province of Syria.[1] A major component of arguments

---

[1] The word "Palestine" will henceforth refer to the region encompassing Galilee, Judaea, Batanaea, Ascalon, and the Decapolis. This encompasses much of the region in which Mark depicts Jesus' activity, but not all of it; Tyre and Sidon, though sites of Jesus's

favouring one or another region is the Gospel's use of transliterated terms from non-Greek languages, most often Latin and Hebrew/Aramaic — that is, Latinisms and Semiticisms.[2] On such a basis, scholars suggest that one of these languages is a familiar language for Mark, whereas the other represents a sort of "exotic tongue" for the author. For some scholars advocating a provenance in the city of Rome, Latinisms indicate the author's first-hand knowledge of the *lingua franca* of the Roman West, and Semiticisms may be the author's efforts to add some foreign flavour at relevant points of his Gospel; vice versa for advocates of the Roman East. However, there is little reason given to favour one or the other line of reasoning, as there is a propensity among commentators to rely on instinct when constructing these arguments; vocabulary is asserted to be more typical of one region than another not on the basis of comparison, but scholarly intuition.

The matter of bilingual transliteration is complicated by two matters. First, the fact that many supposed "Latinisms" and "Semiticisms" were fully or partially integrated into Koine Greek by the second half of the first century — that is, when Mark was likely composed. It is at this point that a word is no longer identifiably "Latin," "Aramaic," or "Hebrew," but simply understood as another ordinary Greek word that has its roots in another language. In English, for instance, use of the word "schadenfreude" does not necessarily indicate the speaker's deep knowledge of German, nor does "hallelujah" require familiarity with Hebrew. Second, biblical scholars have paid little attention to how Greek-writers and -speakers with low-level bilingualism (or trilingualism, for that matter) actually deployed transliterated terms from other languages in different geographic contexts. What Latinisms and Semiticisms did Greek writers located in Palestine, Syria, and Rome use in their writings and how did this differ from region to region? What vocabulary lent itself to transliteration rather than translation into a rough Greek equivalent?

This article will attempt to answer these questions, albeit limiting our attention to Latin — a large topic on its own. After briefly surveying Mark's

---

ministry, are within the bound of the province of Syria and thus excluded from the category. Note that this geographic region does not correspond exactly to the later Hadrianic province of Syria Palaestina or the modern states of Israel and Palestine; I use the term simply as a heuristic.

[2] Mark includes terms from other languages as well: κραβαττος *(2:4, 2:9, 2:11, 2:12, 6:55, see below)* from Macedonian, as well as ἀγγαρευω (15:21), γαζα (12:41 [2x], 12:43), and σανδαλιον (6:9) from Persian. All of these words were integrated to the Greek of Mark's time across the Empire, and so indicate little about the author.

Latinisms, the discussion will focus upon the distinctive use of transliterated Latin in Greek documents from the three regions commonly cited for Markan provenance: metropolitan Rome, Syria, and Palestine. These regions underwent different processes of Romanization, as is evident in the influence of Latin on local Greek dialects. From here, tentative conclusions will be drawn about the linguistic continuity Mark evinces with each of these areas — conclusions that this article will suggest may indicate greater or lesser likelihood of Markan composition at these sites within different time frames. Note that, for the sake of scope, this article will not discuss other areas of possible Latin influence on the language of Mark, such as morphology (e.g., the Latinized ending of Ἡρῳδιανοί) or possible Greek transpositions of Latin idioms (e.g., τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιέω as *satisfacere* in 15:15).[3] These other varieties of Latin influence are controverted and often unwieldy issues on their own, and so warrant greater space than can be afforded to them here.

Corpus of Markan Latinisms

Commentaries on Mark commonly list the following terms as Greek transliterations of Latin.

> *grabatus* = κραβαττος, *"mat" (2:4, 2:9, 2:11, 2:12, 6:55)**
> *modius* = μοδιον, peck measure (4:21)
> *legio* = λεγιων, "legion" (5:9, 5:15; Mark: πολλοί [5:9])
> *speculator* = σπεκουλατωρ, "military scout" (6:27)
> *denarius* = δηναριον, Roman coin (6:37, 12:15, 14:5)
> *pugnus* = πυγμη, "fist" (7:3)
> *sextarius* = ξεστων, quart measure (7:4)
> *census* = κηνσος, "capitation tax" (12:14)
> *Caesar* = Καισαρ, *"Caesar" (12:14, 12:16, 12:17 [2x])**
> *quadrans* = κοδραντης, Roman coin (12:42; Mark: λεπτὰ δύο)
> *vae* = ουαι, *"woe" (13:17, 14:21)**
> *flagello* = φραγελλοω, "to flog" (15:15)
> *praetorium* = πραιτωριον, "governor's residence" (15:16; Mark: αὐλή)

---

[3] E.g., R.H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 1044; A. Winn, *The Purpose of Mark's Gospel: An Early Christian Response to Roman Imperial Propaganda* (WUNT II 245; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 80-82; B.M.F. van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary,* trans. W. H. Bisscheroux; (LNTS 164; London: T&T Clark, 1998) 33-35; B.M.F. van Iersel, "De thuishaven van Mark," TvT 32 (1992) 125-142; A.Y. Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) 99-100.

    centurio = κεντυριων, "centurion" (15:39, 15:44, 15:45)

    The words marked with an asterisk fall squarely into the first category noted above: terms that were widely understood as "Greek" among Greek-speakers in the first century CE, despite the possibility of an etymological grounding in Latin. For instance, κραβαττος is included above because it is often treated as a Latinism by scholars, despite reasons to be dismissive of its significance to our discussion. First, the word does not actually derive from Latin, nor did it come to Greek through Latin. Rather, it is a Macedonian word and came to Greek through Macedonian, not Latin. Second, κραβαττος was in use among Greek writers before there was significant influence of Latin upon the language — even before the word's first known use in Latin.[4] Similar arguments may be applied to Καισαρ. I have argued elsewhere that Mark does not use the word Καισαρ as a title, but as a name, usage that was common in Greek texts during the Principate throughout the Empire.[5] If it is a name and not a noun, then it is not usefully categorized as a Latinism. οὐαί is rarely treated as a Latinism, though Bas M.F. van Iersel does so without comment.[6] The term is attested in Hellenistic Jewish texts before there was much Latin influence (e.g., *LXX Num 21:29; Amos 5:13; 3 Kgdms 13:30;* cf. *Arrian, Epict. 3.19.1),* so it is difficult to understand van Iersel's reasoning in the absence of argument. Thus, the presence of these particular terms indicates little of substance about the setting of Mark's composition.

    There is also the issue of the extent to which Mark's Latinisms are translatable. Some of Mark's Latin words — especially monetary and measurement terms — do not have a precise equivalent in Greek, but could be converted into more or less comparable values (e.g., a quart is roughly equal to a litre, a yard is roughly equal to a metre). I do not wish to downplay the significance of measurable terms in Mark, but offer a preliminary observation that if, say, a Greek text notes a loan with an interest rate of κατὰ μῆνα ὡς τῶν ρ' δηνα[ρ]ων δηναρο[ν ἕ]ν ("one denarius per 100 per month"; P.Yadin 11), the transliteration of the Latin word denarius can only be taken as an indication that

---

[4] *F.T. Gignac, A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods: Phonology, Volume 1 (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell' antichità 55; Milan: Cisalpino Goliardica, 1976) 192; J. Kramer, Von der Papyrologie zur Romanistik* (APF *30;* Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011) 241-251.

[5] C.B. Zeichmann, "The Date of Mark's Gospel Apart from the Temple and Rumors of War: The Taxation Episode (12:13-17) as Evidence," *CBQ* 79 (2017) 422-437, at 426-428.

[6] Van Iersel, *Mark*, 34.

the transaction occurred in that unit; it would simply not make sense to use δραχμή or another Greek currency in this context because the loan did not occur in that denomination. The extent to which that is the case in Mark will be addressed below. That said, a second issue arises in Mark's translation of Latinisms, wherein the author seems to assume his reader was unfamiliar with certain Greek terms and may clarify them by Latin translation. Several commentators have observed that Mark 12:42 clarifies that λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἔστιν κοδράντης ("two lepta, which is a quadrans") and Mark 15:16 notes that soldiers led Jesus ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον ("into the palace, which is a *praetorium*"). Why is Mark's wording significant? Martin Hengel notes that Plutarch, by contrast, explains the Roman *quadrans* for his Greek readers by means of the lepton — τὸ δὲ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νομίσματος κουαδράντην ἐκάλουν ("the smallest ['lepton'] bronze coin is called a quadrans"), the inverse of Mark's translation/transliteration.[7] Hengel and others contend that this is evidence that Mark was writing from Rome, where Roman coinage was more familiar than the provincial coinage of Judaea. That is, it is not the presence of a simply untranslatable term in itself that is taken to indicate a Roman provenance, but it is part of an argument wherein the author indicates a preference for a rough Latin synonym over a very precise Greek term.

The issue of translatability is also acute in the case of πραιτώριον. Mark uses the Latin word *praetorium* to explain the Greek word αὐλή. This has led some commentators to surmise that Mark's intended readership was more familiar with the Latin terms than the Greek equivalents. Thus, William Lane writes:

> It is particularly significant that twice common Greek expressions in the Gospel are explained by Latin ones [λεπτὰ and *quadrans* 12:42; αὐλή and *praetorium* 15:16]. The first of these examples is particularly instructive, for the *quadrans* was not in circulation in the east. The presence of latinisms and of technical terminology confined to the west is harmonious with the tradition that Mark was written in Rome.[8]

It would be remiss if a third translation/transliteration that is rarely commented upon were omitted here, namely Mark's clarification that λεγιων

---

[7] M. Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark,* trans. J. Bowden (Philadeliphia: Fortress, 1985) 29; Plutarch, *Cic.* 29.4 (though Hengel lists it as 29.5).

[8] W.L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 24.

means πολλοί (5:9, 5:15), when in fact τάγμα was a far more precise Greek term for it. However, in both the case of αὐλή and λεγιων, the supposed equivalents may be less translation and more *interpretatio ad sensum*: the demon's name is "Legion" and may imply that they are many and αὐλή may serve in a manner like a *praetorium*. How these three translation/transliterations relate to low-level bilingualism and the setting of Mark's composition will be assessed below.

The present article works on simplified models of Markan provenance, leaving aside possibilities that the author of Mark was a Judaean denizen writing from Rome or a refugee of the Jewish War forced to migrate from Palestine to elsewhere in the Empire.[9] This limited scope may be a useful heuristic insofar as it restricts our inquiry to the author's geography of linguistic knowledge, thereby setting aside questions of intended audience. The assumption here is that even if Mark were, say, living in Rome and writing for Palestinians, the Gospel's vocabulary will ultimately be reflective of the author's knowledge and not the audience's. That is to say, Mark presumably did not have knowledge of geographic disparities in vocabulary discussed here, but was aware that Latin was more common in Italia and urban centres, whereas Semitic languages were more prevalent in the Levant.

The Character of Markan Latinisms

During the first century of the Common Era, Latin held a significant status as a language, and its spread was attributable largely to the steady expansion of the Roman Empire's borders and the cultural capital associated with Latin as a prestige language. One way that this dissemination has been understood is through th*e* concept of "linguistic imperialism," an idea significant in the study of sociolinguistics since the pioneering monograph by Robert Phillipson.[10] Phillipson's study concerns the English language and its continual hegemony via colonial perpetuation. The influence of his theoretical work on classical studies has mostly been incidental, as the applicability of his insights depends on processes of domination specific to the use of the English language (e.g., emphasis on monolingual education, favouring native speakers for teaching). Several of these factors are quite alien to ancient discourse on Latin dominance, not least due to the fact that the Roman Empire was able to maintain hold on its frontier provinces not despite but because of its ability to tolerate ideological and linguistic diversity. Thus, the absence of an educational state apparatus by which youth become inducted to the imperial language was not an issue, as Greek

---

[9] E.g., Collins, *Mark*, 2-10.

[10] R. Phillipson, *Linguistic Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

continued to be a *lingua franca* well after the conquest of the Roman East, likely playing a role in the eventual division into the Eastern and Western Empire.

There are nevertheless insights to be gained from Phillipson's model, as explored in the work of Joseph Farrell. Many Latin authors wrote for the imperium desired and expected to see the language spread to the Empire's far reaches. This has been termed the "Vergilian model" of Latin, wherein it becomes a universal language due to its majestic potency. Joseph Farrell points to Ovid for an example of how elite perceptions of Latin domination change when moved from the core to the periphery of the Empire.[11] Best known for his poem *Metamorphoses* written in the city of Rome, Ovid predicts that his epic "will be recited wherever Roman power extends over conquered lands" (15.877), a sentiment not uncommon among elite writers, including Martial and Vergil. Though Ovid held favour among the powerful for many years, he was banished in 8 CE by Augustus to the city of Tomis in the province of Moesia, in modern-day Romania. Here his relationship to Latin changed significantly. Ovid composed now-lost poems in the provincial language Getic, worried that he was losing fluency in Latin, and frequently mused on the absurdity of writing about Latin so far from Rome. Farrell is careful to note the ideological work being done by Ovid's "myth of exile," wherein Latin's greatness is threatened by an overwhelmingly numerous peregrine Other — a rhetorical move that would become common in situations where Latin speakers could not take their language's dominance for granted, especially during the later Empire when it saw significant decline.

While there is much to be gained by considering Latinisms through the optic of "linguistic imperialism," more pertinent for our purposes is the work of J.N. Adams, who has produced a monumental volume on Latin bilingualism during the Principate.[12] Classicists, Adams notes, have long been interested in the use of Latin in other languages, but were heavily biased in their analyses toward elite writers — Latin learners of Greek — and depended upon anecdotal evidence as opposed to primary sources like papyri and epigraphs. Biblical scholars attempting to ascertain Markan provenance often depended upon the work of such classicists and so have inadvertently replicated this bias in their own publications; one can simply assume that the Latin character of Rome led to

---

[11] J. Farrell, *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times* (Roman Culture and Its Contexts; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 1-6.
[12] J.N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

the use of Latinisms in a way that the provincial culture of the East did not. As with Ovid above, Adams observes that anecdotal statements in ancient literature concerning other languages serve ideological purposes, whether polemical or otherwise. Adams' emphasis on non-elite primary sources is helpful in the case of Mark, a document commonly believed to come from sub-elite strata, for whom Latin is evidently familiar on some level, though not the preferred language of composition.[13]

Though not explicitly invoking the work of Phillipson, Adams proffers another insight with his notion of Latin as a "language of power." Noting that Rome was content with Greek as a *lingua franca* of the eastern part of the Empire, the language of Latin in itself nevertheless evoked certain forms of Roman power. This operated in two contrasting ways. First, Latin might indicate a form of prestige on behalf of the writer. A fascinating example can be found in *CIL* 3.125 from Egypt: Κλ(αύδιος) Κλαυδιανὸς οὐετ(ρανὸς) Θεοφάνου leg(atus) p(ro) p(raetore) ex leg(ione) III K(yrenaica) ἐποίησεν τὴν στήλην ἰδίαις αὐτου. This inscription has several interesting features, not least of which is the sole use of Latin for military rank. Note also the transliterated abbreviation of *veteranus* and the Hellenized abbreviation of Cyrenaica with the letter kappa. One might compare this with a set of familial epitaphs (*AE* 1984.893-895) from Cappadocia; the epitaphs are in Greek with the exception of the veteran father's, whose inscription is bilingual in Latin and Greek. In both texts, an author with low-level Greek-Latin bilingualism deployed Latin as a way of showcasing distinctively *Roman* social capital.[14]

The other way in which Latin functioned as a language of (Roman) power is code-switching to terms socially encoded as Roman and thus consequently most familiar in the Latin language. Representative of the phenomenon described above is *P.Mich.* 7.434+*P.Ryl.* 4.612: this marriage contract was written in Latin by an author whose command of that language was limited. Many of the dowry items were simply Greek words transliterated into Latin — the author had no reason to know the corresponding Latin terms as his

---

[13] Some scholars, however, see Mark as the product of an author fluent in a wide array of high-level Greek literature, e.g., M. Reiser, *Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums im Licht der hellenistischen Volksliteratur* (WUNT II 11; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984); D.R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

[14] Latin did not hold a monopoly on prestige in Latin-Greek bilingualism. Adams (*Bilingualism*, 91) notes that doctors in the Roman West often used Greek — and even specifically Ionic Greek — to evoke the heady and Hippocratic origins of their profession.

familiarity was limited to more "official" words. There was no reason the author would have previously known the Latin word for "earring," so Latin transliteration of the Greek term had to make do.[15] In this case, code-switching corresponds to competence: legal terminology, coinage, and similarly Romanized domains of discourse comprised the vast majority of the author's knowledge of Latin.

The question is into which of these categories Mark falls. Is a provenance in the West suggested by Mark granting Roman prestige to Greek terms via the translation/transliteration phenomenon noted above (λεπτὰ δύο = *quadrans,* αὐλή = *praetorium*)? Or should one side with the suggestion of Helmut Koester and others that an eastern provenance is consistent with the fact that the Latin terms transliterated in Mark are exactly the sort of words one encountered anywhere a "garrison was stationed and Roman law was practiced"?[16] To assess this, this article will consider code-switching among sub-elite Greek writers in each of the regions suggested for Markan provenance.

Greek Use of Latin in Palestine

The use of Latin in Palestine is directly related to the presence of the Roman legions associated with the Jewish War and the post-War occupation. Almost no Latin text survives from pre-War Palestine; even though various treaties between Palestinian kingdoms and the emperor were presumably composed in Latin, they are all lost to time. Instead, Latin that can be confidently dated to this era seems to be largely limited to *tituli picti* on imported goods intended for Herodian royalty and stamped handles on amphorae — that is to say, foreign script that found its way into Palestine through importation.[17] Transliterated Latin is hardly any more common in Greek texts of the pre-War period: the

---

[15] See the discussion of low-level Latin competence and code-switching in Adams, *Bilingualism*, 305-308.

[16] H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* (FF; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 2.167; cf. H.C. Waetjen, *A Reordering of Power: A Socio-Political Reading of Mark's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 13; H. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* 3rd ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999) 88-89; W.H. Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 129; W.G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament,* trans. H.C. Kee; revised ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975) 70; J. Marcus, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *JBL* 111 (1992) 441-462, at 444-445.

[17] *Tituli picti*: e.g., Masada 795-851; A. Ecker, "The Greek and Latin Inscriptions from the Herodian Palaces at Jericho and Cypros," in *Hasmonaean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Volume V: The Finds from Jericho and Cypros,* eds. R. Bar-Nathan and J. Gärtner (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2013) 305-313. Amphorae: Masada 946-950.

Sayings Gospel Q, probably composed in either Galilee or Gaulanitis sometime 50-65 CE,[18] also seems to be lacking Latinisms. The International Q Project includes three in their critical text: κοδράντης (*quadrans*; Matt 5:26, but Luke 12:59 prefers λεπτόν), μίλιον (*mille*; Matt 5:41, no Lukan parallel), and ἀσσάριον (*as*; Matt 10:29 and Luke 12:6) — thus, only the last of these is doubly attested and moderately certain as present in Q. Though there is much debate about the extent to which Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew were used in Palestine during the first century of the Common Era, there is little doubt that Latin was extremely rare until the War's outbreak. It is unlikely, to say the least, that a text with as many Latinisms as are found in the Gospel of Mark would have been composed in Palestine before the Jewish War.

Palestine, however, changed from a Latin-obscurity region to a Latin-minority region during the Jewish War. In both military and civilian writings, regardless of language, a detectable surge in Latin usage and Latinisms is evident. Many of the reasons for this shift are obvious, but some deserve elaboration. First, even though the province of Judaea, the kingdom of Batanaea, and the Decapolis had military presence prior to the Jewish War, these forces were entirely provincial and composed of non-citizens: Judaea's military comprised the *cohortes et ala Sebastenorum* recruited from Caesaraea Maritima and Sebaste; the soldiers from Agrippa II's kingdom of Batanaea were largely recruited from within that domain; and the Decapolis, as best we can tell, comprised Thracian auxiliary cavalry.[19] Importantly, even though the Judaean soldiers and those in the Decapolis were technically under Roman employment, they were not Roman citizens and were not particularly acculturated to the niceties of Romanness: surviving military epigraphs from each of these regions is entirely Greek before the War, archaeological finds indicate consumption habits

---

[18] The existence of a now-lost Christian Gospel now known as "Q" is hardly a consensus, but is accepted by most New Testament scholars. On Q's provenance, see W.E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001) 157-164; J.L. Reed, "The Social Map of Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. J.S. Kloppenborg (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995) 17-36; P. Richardson, *Building Jewish in the Roman East* (SupJSJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2004) 73-90; J.S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000) 171-175.

[19] See *Gerasa* 199-201; *AE* 2003.1818a-b. Against those who read Mark 5:1-20//Luke 8:26-39 as an allegory about the military occupation of Gerasa or the Decapolis, there is no reason to suspect a "legion" garrisoned in or near that city before the Jewish War (cf. *Gerasa* 52, 130, 171).

out of touch with those of the citizen legions, and so on.[20] However, with the Jewish War, *legio X Fretensis* occupied the city of Jerusalem. Legions, unlike the *auxilia*, required its soldiers to be citizens, and accordingly the vast majority of military papyri and epigraphs from the beginning of the Jewish War until the outbreak of the Bar Kokhba Revolt are Latin. Thus, even though legionaries may not have been born in the city of Rome or its immediate vicinity, they were far more attuned to Roman culture than were the pre-War auxiliaries; the military presence also shifted from one of a local policing force to an army of occupation. Moreover, these soldiers were more heavily integrated into the Palestinian economy than were the auxiliaries, due to the massive increase in the number of soldiers combined with their role in filling the economic vacuum left by the demise of the temple cult.[21]

Second, the Jewish War resulted in a series of shifts with Judaea's provincial status. When Judaea was annexed by Rome upon the death of Agrippa I in 44 CE, it was either a sub-province of Syria or an imperial procuratorial province in its own right with an equestrian governor. The permanent presence of a legion after the War necessitated an administrator of appropriate rank to govern them, now a legate of senatorial rank. Consequently, Judaea shifted to an independent province with praetorian governor during the War, eventually requiring a governor of consular status in 120 CE. The new government entailed a heftier bureaucratic apparatus, comprising administrators with reduced interest in appeasing a rebellious peregrine population. Consequently, even coinage shifted from Greek language to Latin and depicted

---

[20] The evidence regarding the language of the military is evident upon perusal of the forthcoming *Database of Military Inscriptions and Papyri of Early Roman Palestine* [www.ArmyOfRomanPalestine.com]. On social and cultural differences between the pre- and post-War military garrisons of Palestine, see C.B. Zeichmann, *The Roman Army and the New Testament* (Fortress: forthcoming).

[21] See the excellent study by J.P. Roth, "The Army and the Economy in Judaea and Palaestina," in *The Roman Army and the Economy,* ed. P. Erdkamp (Amsterdam: Gieben, 2002) 375-397. Cf. O. Stoll, *Zwischen Integration und Abgrenzung: Die Religion des Römischen Heeres im Nahen Osten. Studien zum Verhältnis von Armee und Zivilbevölkerung im römischen Syrien und in Nachbargebieten* (Mainzer althistorische Studien 3; St. Katharinen: Scripta Mercaturae, 2001) 380-417; H.M. Cotton, "The Impact of the Roman Army in the Province of Judaea/Syria Palaestina," in *The Impact of the Roman Army (200 BC–AD 476): Economic, Social, Political, Religious, and Cultural Aspects,* eds. L. de Blois and E. Lo Cascio; Impact of Empire 6 (Leuven: Brill, 2006) 393-407.

imperial portraits, going against earlier numismatic accommodation of Jewish and Samaritan aniconism.

Third, legal practices took on an increasingly Roman character, even in rural regions. The papyri discovered at Wadi Murabba'at indicate that a complex mixture of Roman, Hellenistic, Jewish, and Nabataean law were practiced in the Judaean desert in the early post-War period.[22] Before this time, Jewish law seems to have been the dominant legal force, at least outside of regional metropoles. These, along with numerous other factors, entailed a surge in the use of Latin and Latinisms among texts produced in the region.

Helmut Koester's suggestion that the terms used in Mark could be found anywhere a Roman (legionary) garrison was found and law was practiced has substantial merit in the case of Palestine. We might observe that other post-War Palestinian Greek texts regularly transliterated these same Latin words, including *denarius*,[23] *centurio*,[24] *legio*,[25] and *modius*.[26] This lexical domain is also consistent with transliterations of *veteranus* in *Gerasa* 52, *AE* 1994.1783, Mur113, *SEG* 46.1949, and *IGLS* 15.34, as well as *decurio* in *IGLS* 15.107. It is precisely words that are encoded as Roman *in a post-War context* (i.e., mostly military, monetary, administrative, measurement, legal terms) that are transliterated in these texts and in the Gospel of Mark. At the level of lexicon, the Latinisms in Mark are consistent with a post-War Palestinian provenance, but unlikely before the War.

Greek Use of Latin in Syria
The Syrian experience of Rome and Latin differed notably from that of Palestine. Being a major imperial province upon its annexation in 64 BCE, with three legions and numerous *auxilia* garrisoned there, the Jewish War was not an especially significant moment in its relationship with Rome. If anything, the aftermath of the Jewish War led the role of Latin in Judaea to become more like

---

[22] L.H. Schiffman, "Reflections on the Deeds of Sale from the Judaean Desert in Light of Rabbinic Literature," in *Law in the Documents of the Judaean Desert,* eds. R. Katzoff and D.M. Schnaps; SupJSJ 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2005) 185-204.

[23] E.g., *P.Yadin* 11, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 27-30; Mur 114, 116, 121, with either the word itself or its symbolic designation ✳.

[24] E.g., *SEG* 40.1462, *IGLS* 16.1475, *AE* 2002.1547.

[25] E.g., *CIIP 2335, Mur114, AE 1994.1783, SEG 46.19490, IGLS 15.343*, T.M. Weber, *Gadara - Umm Qēs I: Gadara Decapolitana. Untersuchungen zur Topographie, Geschichte, Architektur und der Bildenen Kunst einer „Polis Hellenis" im Ostjordanland* (ADPV 30; Weisbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002) IS no. 15.

[26] E.g., *IGLS* 4.1304.

that of Syria: Judaea became a province of comparable status to Syria after the War; *legio X Fretensis* had been previously stationed in Syria and a large number of its soldiers hailed from that province; Judaea adopted Roman imperial coinage denominations that were already found throughout the East, etc. Whether or not a denizen of Syria was fluent in Latin, it had long been part of the culture via public inscriptions, coinage, legal terminology, and so on. Indeed, most of the Roman East — the regions conquered and annexed as major imperial provinces, anyway — had a fairly homogeneous relationship with Latin. Syrian evidence is thus helpfully understood as continuous with that of Anatolian provinces and Egypt, all evincing similar uses of Latin by provincial writers. In general, if a Latinism is attested in post-War Palestine, it is also found in Syria as well, often with greater frequency due to the larger number of inscriptions known in Syria. There are some instances where Markan Latinisms are attested in Syria, but not yet found in Palestine: πραιτώριον (e.g., *IGLS* 3.742), φραγελλόω (e.g., *SEG* 7.372), ξεστων (e.g., *SEG* 1.549), σπεκουλατωρ (e.g., *IGLS* 6.2980).

The linguistic situation of Syria is comparable to that of Palestine after the War, albeit with some important caveats. Most important is that Latin lacked the novelty in Syria that it had in Palestine. Consequently, spelling in transliteration tended to be standardized (depending on the literacy of the author, of course), transliterated terms were used with greater precision, and translation was often preferred over transliteration. Military evidence illustrates the case well. Numerous Greek inscriptions were posted by military veterans or in their honour. The Latin term *veteranus* had no synonym in Greek, leading to improvisation. In post-War Palestine, the term is consistently transliterated as οὐετρανὸς (e.g., *AE* 1930.98, 1994.1783, Mur 113, *SEG* 46.1949), due to a combination of the term's novelty and the distinctively *Roman* form of social capital it granted. Such transliteration is occasionally found in Syria and other Eastern provinces, but more noteworthy is the propensity to translate *veteranus* into existing Greek words, such as πάλαι στρατιώτης, variations on ἀπὸ στρατιώτης, παλαιστρατιώταις, or mixed-language phrasing wherein the Latin *ex* was followed by their title at retirement (e.g., ἐξ ἑκατονταρχίας).[27] If extended to Egypt, where

---

[27] πάλαι στρατιώτης (e.g., *IGR* 3.213, G.E. Bean and T.B. Mitford, *Journeys in Rough Cilicia in 1964-1968* [Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften 102; Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1970] no. 169). ἀπὸ στρατιώτης (e.g., *IGLS* 4.1315, *Iasos* 269, T.B. Mitford, "Inscriptiones Ponticae: Sebastopolis," *ZPE* 87 [1991]

papyri finds are more abundant, many more translations of *veteranus* could be cited. This exercise is easily repeatable with other common Latinisms found in Palestinian Greek epigraphy of the post-War period (e.g., *centurio*/κεντυρίων/ἑκατόνταρχος/the symbolic designations Ɔ and >, *decurio*/δεκουρίων/δεκαδάρχης).

Thus, Greek-Latin code-switching tends to occur somewhat less often in Syria (and the Northern Levant more broadly) than in Palestine and with a more limited vocabulary. This conclusion is entirely relative, though, and in general it would be difficult to distinguish between the code-switching of post-War Palestine and Roman Syria. The primary difference is simply that Palestinian texts tend to be more consistent in code-switching both in terms of frequency and specific rendering of Latinisms.

Greek Use of Latin in Metropolitan Rome

Rome and the province of Italia were the cultural hub of Latin, an important fact for scholars advocating a Roman provenance for Mark. Though Greek was certainly used in that region, at least some Latin competence was assumed of its denizens. Consequently, Latin code-switching in Greek texts differs significantly from that of the Roman East.

First, the vocabulary of Latinisms differs immensely. For instance, the Packard Humanities Institute has catalogued some 60 inscriptions using the word λεγιών/λεγεών from the Levant, whereas Italia only attests 12. This could be repeated for any number of other terms, and for a simple reason: if someone living in Rome wanted to write about legions, centurions, and legal matters, Latin was the language to do it in, not Greek. Consequently, the few instances where these terms are found in Greek texts from Rome, they tend to be written by authors from outside the Capital city (e.g., κεντυρίων in *P.Mich.* 8.491). When Greek writers of Rome wished to discuss bureaucratic and administrative matters, they tended not to transliterate Latin terms, but to simply go bilingual. Numerous examples could be cited, but a funerary inscription illustrates the issue well:

> D(is) m(anibus) T(erentiae) Marciae co(n)iugi dulcissme
> Ter(entius) Zoticus dignae et merite fecit cum qua uixit
> m(enses) XI, hec que uixit ann(os) XXI et m(enses) VI λέγει δὲ

181-243, at no. 14). παλαιστρατιώταις (e.g., *MAMA 9 List* P37, *P.Dura.* 26, *P.Vet.Aelii* 10). ἐξ ἑκατονταρχίας (e.g., *AE* 2004.1373).

Ζωτικὸς ὀμνύων ἀληθῶς· Μαρκία μόνη καλὴ καὶ σεμνὴ καὶ πρὸ πάντων σοφή. et Myrineti lierte eius dignississme fecit.[28]

The "official" information of the epitaph is entirely in Latin, though the personal words of Terentius Zoticus are articulated in Greek.

Because Greek was most often associated with the lower-classes in Rome, the words transliterated differ from the military-administrative terms of the Roman East. For instance, λ(ε)ιβερτῖνος = *libertinus* is not uncommon in Italia (e.g., *SEG* 29.929, 35.101, *IGUR* 616, 718, 818, 980), but virtually unknown in Syria and Palestine (but see Acts 6:9). This indicates a great deal about the types of social capital associated with the Latin language among Greek speakers in Rome as opposed to the Eastern provinces.

Second, Greek-Latin code-switching tends to commonly occur at the level of "tags" — that is, brief formulaic phrases (in English, e.g., "amen," "hors d'oeuvre," "carpe diem"). While Greek-Latin transliteration is largely limited to individual words in Palestine and Syria, in Rome they are more common as recognizable phrases. In Greek texts from the province of Italia, *dis manibus* becomes δ(ε)ις μανιβους (e.g., *IG* 14.698; *IGUR* 367, 380, 434, 570, 616, 793, 890, 901, *SEG* 48.1274), *Aedes Iovis Optimi Maximi Capitolini* becomes Διὶ Καπετωλίωι (contrast Διὸς Κορυφαίου in, e.g., *IGLS* 3.1184, *SEG* 35.1521 from Syria; cf. Pausanias *Descr.* 2.4), or dating via Greek transliteration of the Roman calendar. This is also the case in the opposite direction: many Latin texts from Rome use Greek tags (whether in Greek or Latin script). Adams notes many examples from the city of Rome, a handful of which are quoted here:

> Note, for example, *IGUR* 294 (Greek inscription with *dis manibus* at the end), 298 (long Latin epitaph, followed by ἀνθρ<ώ>πινα), 308 (Latin epitaph followed by transliterated Greek: *eupsychi <tecnon, udis athan>atos* = εὐψυχι τέκνον, οὐδις ἀθάνατος), 310 (as 308, but the Greek tag, with τέκουσα rather than τέκνον, is in Greek script), 489 (Latin epitaph, followed by χαῖρε, καὶ σύ), 564 (Latin epitaph, followed by νόθε μευ εὐψύχι), 728 (Latin epitaph, followed by *Palladi, tauta* = Παλλάδι, ταῦτα), 762 (Προκόπι, ταῦτα), 804 (Latin epitaph, then Ἀφροδείσιε χαῖρε, καὶ σύ), 852 (θ(ειοῖς) χ(θονίοις) instead of *dis manibus*, then

---

[28] *IGUR* 718. See the discussion of the phenomenon and this text in Adams, *Bilingualism*, 357-369.

a Latin epitaph), 893 (*cyria chere* = κυρία χαῖρε, then a Latin epitaph).[29]

Code-switching more commonly operated at the level of complete phrases rather than individual words in the city of Rome and its vicinity. This tendency seems to function as an acknowledgement of Greek or Roman cultural conventions in an alternate language. The phrase θεοῖς καταχθονίοις (i.e., translation of *dis manibus*) in the monolingual Greek epitaphs of Rome is typically a way of asserting one's newly Roman identity in a Greek context: the words themselves are intelligible only to readers of Greek — yet the underlying concept is distinctively Roman. The phrase, as far as I can tell, is unknown in Greek inscriptions of Syria or Palestine, yet variations on it are common in Rome and its environs. This contrasts with bilingual or Greek inscriptions of the Roman East (e.g., *CIL* 3.125 discussed above); Roman inscriptions more commonly present entire ideas in a given language, rather than switching between alphabets mid-sentence.

Third, and building upon the previous two differences, is that bilingual inscriptions tend to convey different information in Greek and Latin (e.g., *IGUR* 718 above). This is quite different from the Roman East, where the vast majority of bilingual inscriptions repeat the same information nearly verbatim. Representative of the East is the following inscription from Gerasa:

> Ziemices Ziopen f(ilius) eque[s alae] Thracum Aug(ustae) turma[e Cai] Vesperi, hic situs est. heres [fecit ex] testamento.
> Ζιμικένθις Ἐζιωπῆν υἱός, ἱππεὺ[ς] εἴλης Θρᾳκῶν Σεβαστῆς τύρμης Γαΐω Ἑσπερίω ἐνθέδε κεῖται. ἐπύησεν ὁ κληρονόμος ἐγ διαθήκης. (*AE* 1922.131)

This draws attention to how bilingual writings understood the issue of intelligibility in different ways depending on their geographic context: bilingual writings in the East sought the broadest scope possible, whereas the matter was far more calculated in the city of Rome.

Fourth, transliterated Latin, when it occurs, has greater consistency in Rome than it has in the East. This occurs both at the level of spelling and the level of semantic domain. For instance, it is far more common to find strange spelling errors in Syria and Palestine than it is in Rome (e.g., *ala* as ἀλε instead of (ε)ἴλη, *Fretensis* as Φρετησίας instead of Φρετηνσίας).[30] These examples are

---

[29] Adams, *Bilingualism*, 21-22.

[30] *ala* as ἀλε in A. Jaussen and R. Savignac, *Mission archéologique en Arabie II: El-ʿEla, d'Hégra à Tebouk, Harrah de Tebouk, Paris, 1914 avec un Atlas* (Publication de la Société

significant because they are military words found in military inscriptions, whose dedicants were not only familiar with their usage, but used them as a point of identification and bore at least a limited competence in Latin. Civilians — like the author of Mark, presumably — of the Roman East were even less likely to have competence in Latin or much familiarity with these terms.

All of these factors suggest that there was a clear framework for asserting Greek identity politics in the city of Rome, quite distinct from the Roman East, where "Romanness" had long existed at either arm's length or did not interrupt life in a particularly significant way, and was thus novel enough that the demarcation of practices as either native or Roman was a salient measure.

Markan Transliteration in Context(s)

To what extent are Markan Latinisms consistent with the different scholarly suggestions for the Gospel's provenance? At the level of vocabulary, many of Mark's words can be found in all three locations, though they are certainly more common in Syria and post-War Palestine than Italia; it is difficult to sustain a pre-War Palestinian provenance, as they are entirely absent in that setting. Some might object that this overlooks a significant issue from above, namely that two of Mark's Latinisms explain Greek words: *quadrans* explains the word λεπτόν and *praetorium* explains the word αὐλή. This has led some commentators to surmise that Mark's intended readership was more familiar with the Latin terms than the Greek equivalents.[31] The preference for Latin terminology is striking in the case of *quadrans*, as this monetary denomination rarely circulated in Palestine during Jesus's life, but was common in the Roman West. While this might appear to be evidence that Mark and his readers were more comfortable with Romanized Latin than Palestinian Greek, it should more probably be considered as evidence for Mark's chronological lateness: the quadrans coin only entered heavy circulation in Palestine in the post-War period.[32] This was also the case with the term *denarius*, which is present in Mark 12:15, despite the general absence of denarius coins in archaeological sites across the Levant during the Julio-

---

des fouilles archéologiques; Paris: Leroux, 1914) 648 no. 16; cf. ἄλης in *CPJ* 417. *Fretensis* as Φρετησίας in *CIIP* 2335.

[31] Hengel, *Studies*, 29.

[32] C. Katsari, *The Roman Monetary System: The Eastern Provinces from the First to the Third Century AD* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) 72-75.

Claudian era.[33] The influx of legionaries after the War entailed a similar increase in imperial coinage such as denarii and quadrantes, but lepta had stopped being minted before the Herodians came to power and prutot ceased production with the Jewish War. Numismatist Danny Syon agrees: "It is also possible that [Mark], writing in the post-70 CE period—when *denars* were already common enough—assumed that *denars* had circulated under Tiberius as well…."[34] That is, in post-War Palestine, the terms *denarius* and *quadrans* were more meaningful than λεπτόν. This is borne out in the epigraphic and papyrological record of post-War Palestine, wherein δηνάριον or its symbolic designation ✳ appear in Greek texts (see note 23 over). Mark was clearly operating in a context where Roman currency was the norm, as evident by the fact that the monetary value of food is counted in Roman denarii (6:37). In a similar move, Joel Marcus contends that *praetorium* is probably not a translation of αὐλή, but a clarification.[35] αὐλή in Mark 15:16 refers to one palace among others in Jerusalem and was identifying a specific palace within the city, namely the gubernatorial residence (i.e., the *praetorium*).

Perhaps the one Markan Latinism that may suggest a Roman compositional context is *vae*, if indeed it is a Latinism. The use of exclamations

[33] On the rarity of Roman coinage in pre-War Palestine, see D. Syon, *Small Change in Hellenistic-Roman Galilee: The Evidence from Numismatic Site Finds as a Tool for Historical Reconstruction* (Numismatic Studies and Researches 11; Jerusalem: Israel Numismatic Society, 2015) 213-215. Syon further observes that coinage with portraits in the pre-War period were also generally uncommon in Palestine (despite the centrality of the image to the pericope in question). See also the concerns about denarii and Palestine in F.E. Udoh, *To Caesar What Is Caesar's: Tribute, Taxes, and Imperial Administration in Early Roman Palestine 63 BCE-70 CE* (BJS 343; Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2005) 228-236; Zeichmann, "Date of Mark's Gospel," 428-429.

[34] Syon, *Small Change*, 215. Cf. the analysis of K.K.A. Lönnqvist, "The Date of Introduction of *denarii* to Roman Judaea and the Decapolis Region," *Aram* 23 (2011) 307-318. The same might be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of quadrantes and lepta: lepta circulated long after their minting stopped, but they ceased heavy circulation at the end of the Jewish War. One might object that, as a Palestinian or Syrian, Mark would have been aware of what kind of money circulated in pre-War Palestine and that it was not the same as the post-War period, but the situation might be compared to the shift from one-dollar bills to one-dollar coins ("loonies") in Canada in 1987: someone might recollect stories wherein they anachronistically attribute use of coins to real-life individuals who only used bills at the time. E.g., "My dad said he bought six Spider-Man comic books for a single loonie when he was growing up during the 1960s!"

[35] Marcus, "Jewish War," 142-146.

and similar tags is far more common in the city of Rome than it is anywhere else in the Empire. That said, Mark's οὐαί more likely derives from the influence of the Septuagint than it does the Latin language (cf. its pre-Roman use in *P.Oxy.* 413).

Markan Latinisms tend to occupy a much larger domain of meaning than the Latin term being transliterated. For instance, *modius* is not merely a peck measure, but a measuring basket as well; *legio* is not merely a legion, but a way of saying "many" as well; *sextarius* is not merely a measuring unit, but a jar as well; *speculator* is not merely a military scout, but an executioner as well; *census* is not merely a head-count, but a capitation tax as well; the exact meaning of Mark's πυγμη is still far from established, but *pugnus* means "fist" in Latin. Some of these have entirely unparalleled meanings in texts independent of Mark: *legio, census, speculator, modius, pugnus.*[36] These words are clearly novel for the author of Mark. This led to some confusion among Latin writers using the Gospel of Mark. For instance, Jerome did not find Mark's Latin satisfactory at times, rendering *census* more precisely as *tributum* and *sextarius* as *urceus* in his Vulgate. More radical is Jerome's complete change of *pugnus* to *crebro*, words that have no lexical overlap with each another; this is not to mention the many other text-critical variants which try to make sense of Mark's *pugnus*. The irregularity of Mark's Latinisms was recognized as such in antiquity and evidently created problems for scribes and translators. This imprecision is far more consistent with Syria or post-War Palestine than with metropolitan Rome, given the prevalence of high-level Latin speakers and writers in the latter.

What is the lexical domain of the Markan Latinisms? The Latin terms deployed in Mark are those one could encounter in various Romanized contexts. This is also evident in the locations where Mark's characters use such words: most of Mark's Latinisms are used when the characters are in the city of Jerusalem where such terms were more likely to be used, while others appear in relevant locations (a palace for *speculator*, Roman-friendly Decapolis for *legio*). Consequently, the argument from Latinisms is weak. Mark was composed in the wake of the Jewish War if it was written in Palestine, so the author was also writing at a time when Roman influence encroached heavily on cultural production: numerous Latin-speaking administrators, soldiers, and bureaucrats

---

[36] I have written elsewhere about *census*: Zeichmann, "Date of Mark's Gospel," 429-431; cf. G.H.R. Horsley, "Minor Philological Notes," in *NewDocs 3,* ed. G.H.R. Horsley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 61-94, at 70-71. Also unusual is the meaning Mark provides *sextarius*, but see *P.Oxy.* 109 and 921.

were introduced to the region in the years immediately after the War. The increased use of Roman measurements, coinage, and so on was experienced concomitantly, as noted by epigraphic expert Werner Eck:

> Denn lateinische Inschriften sind auch sonst, wie schon angeführt, in Syria Palaestina fast nur dort anzutreffen, wo Militär permanent vorhanden war oder wo jedenfalls Leute lebten, die politisch, militärisch oder administrativ eng mit Roms Präsenz in der Provinz verbunden waren, z.B. Veteranen.[37]

If Mark had been composed in Rome's vicinity, the text would have an unusual abundance of technical Latinisms and very few mundane terms compared to other Latin-Greek bilingual texts composed in the area: in general, transliterated technical terms tends to reflect unfamiliarity with the language and novelty of the words, whereas transliterated mundane words tends to indicate the opposite.[38] To this effect, J.N. Adams observes that while Greek could be used in the military for many purposes, Latin "had super-high status which made it suitable for various symbolic purposes, whether in legalistic documents, or to highlight the Roman identity of a soldier, or to mark or acknowledge overriding authority."[39] These are precisely the domains that Mark's Latinisms fall under, since the military was nearly the exclusive source of Latin texts in Syria and Palestine during the Principate and Dominate:

> Latin inscriptions are rather rare, and are usually restricted to funerary inscriptions for soldiers, veterans, and their wives…. From these Latin texts, and the closely related Greek inscriptions, it is clear that those commemorated came from

---

[37] W. Eck, "Epigraphische Vorarbeiten zu Band IV des CIIP," *ZPE* 193 (2015) 261-271, at 265; cf. W. Eck, "The Language of Power," in *Semitic Papyrology in Context: A Climate of Creativity,* ed. L.H. Schiffman; Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2003) 125-144.

[38] By analogy, most Assyrian loanwords in the Hebrew Bible are found in Palestinian texts and the words themselves are political and military terms; see P.V. Mankowksi, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (HSS 47; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000) 167-170, 173-175.

[39] Adams, *Bilingualism*, 617; cf. B. Isaac, "Latin in Cities of the Roman Near East," in *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East,* eds. H.M. Cotton, R. Hoyland, J. Price, and D. Wassertein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 43-72, at 66.

all over the Empire, even Rome itself, and so their language use is unlikely to have been typical of surrounding villages.[40]

The Roman East would thus seem to be an ideal setting for a Greek document with the type of Latinisms we have found in Mark.

Conclusion

Code-switching provides us with clear theoretical benefits, especially foregrounding the political and local nature of the Latinisms found in Mark. Whereas the concept of loanwords tends to reduce the issues of bilingual transliteration to matters of density (i.e., how many Latinisms are found in Mark), with code-switching we are positioned to understand the lexical domains that are socially and verbally encoded as "Roman" as a geographically specific phenomenon. Though the present argument is not entirely decisive of Mark's compositional context, the author's use of Latin vocabulary is more consistent with a geographic provenance in either Syria any time during the first century or Palestine in the post-War period. Many of the terms in the Gospel are clearly unfamiliar to the author and thus imprecise in their usage, the terms are largely limited to those found in the Roman East, and seem to subtly evoke a creeping sense of Romanization into the landscape of its narrative. While the arguments presented here cannot rule out Rome entirely, they nevertheless problematize many reasons for adducing Mark's Roman provenance based on its Latinisms. Take, for instance, the arguments of Brian Incigneri:

> This claim fails to take the content of the story into account, especially as it tells of a Roman trial and execution in a country under occupation. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that military terms were more likely to be used in the provinces just because the legions were there. The exploits of legions were the talk of Rome. Further, executioners and flogging were common in Rome, and Roman measures were at home in the extensive granaries, warehouses, and shops of the city. In fact, as the administrative centre of the empire where military language was common, Rome is *the* place where all of these Latin terms came together most commonly.[41]

---

[40] D.G.K. Taylor, "Bilingualism and Diglossa in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia," in *Bilingualism and Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text,* eds. J.N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swain (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) 298-331, at 306.

[41] B.J. Incigneri, *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel* (BibInt 65; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 101, emphasis in original.

There is much to dispute here. Judaea was not "under occupation" in the pre-War period, but garrisoned a military that was a locally recruited force of the *cohortes et ala Sebastenorum*. Incigneri does not cite evidence for his claim that Mark's lexical tendencies are specific to Rome and — to the contrary — we have seen that they are more pervasive in Greek writings of the Roman East, where Latin signified "Rome" and its institutions. Consequently, several Markan Latinisms are attested in either Syria or Palestine, but seem to be entirely unknown among Greek texts from Italia: φραγελλοω, κοδραντης, and σπεκουλατωρ; most other words are more common in the East than the environs of Rome. Furthermore, some of Mark's Latinisms are found in other languages of the Roman East as well: an Aramaic transliteration of *centurio* on a Nabataean tomb (*CIS* 2.217), an Aramaic transliteration of *centurio* from Algeria (*CIL* 8.2515), Aramaic transliterations of *centurio* and *legio* in an inscription from Palmyra (*CIS* 2.3692), and an abbreviated Aramaic transliteration of *denarius* on a Judaean *ostrakon* (620). Greek writings of Italia are largely limited to the lower classes and tend to reflect interests specific to their situation, as well as institutions specific to the capital city or otherwise deeply invested in Roman identity practices (e.g., *dis manibus*, *Aedes Iovis Optimi Maximi Capitolini*). Even though "legions" and so on may have been the talk of Rome among Latin speakers, evidence suggests this was not the case among those who preferred Greek.

Incigneri's argument is far from exceptional; though Latinisms are commonly asserted to indicate a Roman provenance, the reasoning is rarely supported with papyrological or epigraphic evidence. Robert Gundry writes:

> The counter argument of W.H. Kelber that a Roman setting would have produced domestic, social, and religious Latinisms rather than military, judicial, and economic ones overlooks the many which do not fit the latter description and would only have force if the subject matter of Mark were set in Rome. On the contrary, that subject matter is set in Palestine, militarily, judicially, and economically dominated by Rome. It is a Roman setting of the writing of Mark that makes Latinisms especially suitable in description of what was happening in a Palestine occupied by the Romans.[42]

These claims do not withstand scrutiny. Mark's bilingualism is not consistent with that of Rome's lower classes and the force of Kelber's objection is

---

[42] Gundry, *Mark*, 1044, citing Kelber, *Kingdom in Mark*, 129 n. 1.

left unanswered: why wouldn't Mark transliterate terms that easily fit within his Gospel and are distinctive to Rome's Greek-speaking populace (e.g., Roman calendar and dating methods instead of Jewish ones, funerary practices) or even typically Roman methods of transliteration (e.g., ει for the long Latin i, β for the Latin v)?[43] Or, indeed, why write in Greek at all? In light of the preceding comparative approach to Greek-Latin code-switching among papyri, epigraphs, and literature from the regions of possible Markan provenance, we have seen that Syria and post-War Palestine emerge as the most likely candidates.

The present study could be fruitfully extended to Mark's use of other languages, as there are other terminological gaps between Jewish associations of Rome and the Near East. Most obviously, there is the question of Aramaic and Hebrew. The situation of Greek-Hebrew and Greek-Aramaic bilingualism is a far different matter from that of Latin; the spread and use of latter is readily linked with political vicissitudes. But even so, it is worth providing a clear theoretical framework for understanding these Semiticisms: are they the work of a Roman writer evoking an "exotic East"? Are they there to signify the epic history of the Jewish people? Are they merely words that were commonly used in Greek-Hebrew or Greek-Aramaic bilingual discourse? Or are they the product of an entirely different sociolinguistic scenario? But there are terminological preferences distinct between Rome and the East as well: for instance, the Markan Jesus addresses the readers with warnings about their impending abuse in συνέδρια and συναγωγαί, almost addressing Mark's readership directly. Juvenal (*Sat.* 3.295), Philo (*Legat.* 155-161), and an inscription (*CII* 15.531) all prefer the term προσευχή or the Latin transliteration *proseucha* when referring to Rome's Jewish associations, and the term συναγωγῆ is never used in reference to Jewish gathering sites in Rome until much later. This leads Anders Runesson, Donald Binder, and Birger Olsson to conclude that προσευχή "was the normative term for the synagogue in the Roman capital during [the first and second centuries C.E.]"[44] Though Mark's transliterated Latin seems suggestive of an Eastern context, is that the case for the Gospel's use of other languages? And might we be able to use such methods to determine Markan provenance with greater specificity — is it specific to certain cities, ethnic groups, or sub-regions?

---

[43] J.N. Adams, *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), with extensive primary and secondary citations for these and similar phenomena.

[44] A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, and B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (AJEC 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 237.