

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

tions of these letters we must proceed upon the supposition of their unity. Differences, for instance, in the eschatological ideas cannot any longer be explained as due to a 'development', but must be regarded as disparate elements (*Spannungen*) which are present in the unity of the Apostle's religious concepts. The recognition of this fact is of the greatest importance, not only for the representation of the 'theology' of Paul, but also for the understanding of the Pauline religious thought in the evangel of the Christian Churches.

W. MICHAELIS.

### WAS THE GOSPEL OF MARK WRITTEN IN LATIN?

THE question here posed is not so extravagant as it seems at first sight. It has been seriously asked by Dr P. L. Couchoud in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* for 1926, pp. 161-192, and it now appears in an English translation by M. S. Enslin, revised and enlarged by Dr Couchoud, in the *Crozer Quarterly* for Jan. 1928. The idea that Mark was originally written in Latin is not even contrary to tradition, for (as Couchoud points out) the Peshitta colophons at the end of the Gospel of Mark, followed by many (late) Greek MSS—and he might have added Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron (*Moesinger*, p. 286),—assert that it was written in Latin. Dr Couchoud, it must be stated at once, recognizes in Codex Bobiensis (*k*) a surviving fragment of the lost original.

I think it not out of place, before examining Dr Couchoud's arguments and examples, to consider the thesis from a general point of view, whether it be admissible or conceivable. What bearing would it have, were it accepted, on 'the Synoptic problem'? Forty years ago, when most critics believed in 'Ur-Marcus', or in a written 'Common Synoptic Tradition', Dr Couchoud's thesis would have hardly obtained a hearing. Notwithstanding continual and characteristic variations the amount of Greek words and phrases common to Matthew, Mark, and Luke makes it quite clear that they have a common Greek source, and further, that common source must have been very much like our Greek Gospel of Mark. If then Mark were composed in Latin, the common source, the Ur-Marcus, must be a translation from the Latin, which seems absurd. But the theory of an 'Ur-Marcus' is now, very properly, out of favour. The 'common tradition of the Synoptic Gospels' has resolved itself into our Greek Mark. 'Mark', we now believe, as used by Matthew and Luke, did not differ from the text of B or Westcott and Hort more than B differs from D or W. If the original was in Latin, these differences, i. e. the differences between B and D and W

and 'Mark' as known to Matthew and to Luke, can be explained as due to slight differences in more or less independent translations.

Yet not quite. For there is too much agreement between our Greek MSS, between (let us say) B and D and W, not to make it clear that they are all forms of the same 'translation'.

Wellhausen, who made out quite a plausible case for regarding the Gospel of Mark as a translation from the Aramaic, never suggested that Matthew and Luke had used this Aramaic, or independent Greek translations from the Aramaic. No, he supposed that they used our Greek Mark, and that this use of Mark in Greek is why so many passages of Matthew and Luke agree word for word, not only sense for sense. The same must be true if Mark be regarded as a translation from a Latin original. It must be the Greek translation of this Latin original that was used by Matthew and by Luke.

Further, the Gospel of Mark, as every critic knows, must have had a perilous career in its early days. Even if γάρ may end a Greek sentence, it still seems to most people that the Gospel could not have originally ended at xvi 8, so that what we have is mutilated at the end. But it was this mutilated form that was known to Matthew and Luke.<sup>1</sup> The Greek 'translation' therefore was mutilated—Why? Because it was a translation from a Latin text that was already mutilated.

This is the only form of Dr Couchoud's hypothesis that is discutable. As is well known, *k* itself is one of the prime witnesses to the shorter text of Mark. It has no sign of [Mk] xvi 9-20, as it ends this Gospel with xvi 8 followed by a single short sentence (the so-called Shorter Conclusion) designed to finish off the mutilated text. The mutilation, therefore, occurred in the Latin, before the Greek translation was made. It is a curious omission in Dr Couchoud's work that he does not discuss the end of Mark, whether we are to regard the text of *k* there as original, i. e. that the work as originally conceived ended with the Shorter Conclusion and that what is missing in Greek is only some thirty words in all, or whether both *k* and the best Greek tradition attest a form ending at xvi 8 through the loss of an ending of unknown length and character. In this latter case the text of *k* may be regarded as an attempt to provide for the missing peroration by an addition which afterwards found its way into a local text current for a time in Egypt, i. e. that represented by L and Ψ and their allies.

In this form, then, Dr Couchoud's theory that the original Gospel of Mark was a Latin work, not unlike *k* in text, is not excluded by what we know of the early literary history of that Gospel. We may, if we like, imagine to ourselves that after the troubles of the Neronian persecution and the settlement of the Flavian Dynasty the Christians of

<sup>1</sup> See Streeter *Four Gospels* pp. 175, 300.

Rome found a mutilated Latin sketch of the ministry of Jesus—was it perhaps the author's autograph?—which was translated, mutilated as it was at the end, into Greek, and so became the basis for the more comprehensive works of Matthew and Luke. A few copies of the Latin may have been made, which in their turn became the parents of a Latin Gospel text in the region where a Latin Bible was most required, viz. Carthage and North Africa.

But does the proof suffice? Does the actual text of *k*, and of the more or less revised and sophisticated text of its near relation *e*, suggest the priority of this 'original' Latin as compared with our Greek? The odd thing is that it is very hard to come to a decision, for most of the evidence is ambiguous, or can be interpreted either way. If a passage or phrase be compared in the Greek and Latin, and one is found to be obscure and awkward while the other is perspicuous, it may be said that the perspicuous one is the original and that the obscurity and awkwardness of the other was due to the mistakes or incompetence of a translator: alternatively we may say that the obscure and awkward text is original (or relatively original, as due to faithful transmission of partly misunderstood tradition), while the perspicuous text is due to a translator's paraphrastic tendencies, in order to produce 'sense'. A couple of characteristic instances may be given.

Mk ix 50 (Couchoud, p. 13).<sup>1</sup>

*bonum est sal, sed si sal fatuum, fatuum fuerit in quod illud condistis.*

Καλὸν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας ἀναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ ἀρτύσετε ;

Dr Couchoud translates the Latin (which he has partly taken from Hans v. Soden's reconstruction of *k*): 'Salt is good, but if the salt is tasteless everything will be tasteless in which you put it.' On this he remarks (p. 15) that 'the Latin is in perfect harmony with the context. The tasteless salt makes tasteless everything it touches, as the offending hand, foot, eye corrupt the whole body'.

This is all very well, but ought we not to be guided in the interpretation of Mk ix 50 by the parallel Lk xiv 34 = Matt v 13? This is independent of Mark, a 'Q' passage, if ever there be one. One may suppose it was a proverbial phrase often used by Jesus: if the source of purification be foul, what will purify the source? Therefore, attractive as M. Couchoud's new Saying of Jesus is at first sight, there is a critical difficulty in accepting it.

Moreover, it has a rather intangible form. The Latin quoted above is not the text of *k*, but an emendation. And even so it is not enough for M. Couchoud, who says in a note (p. 14): 'The original text was

<sup>1</sup> Add 34 in each case to get the pages of the *Crozer Quarterly*.

doubtless: *si sal fatuum FUERIT, fatuum ERIT . . .*, and he takes *in quod* to mean *id in quod*. But this is still not quite satisfactory, for *condistis* comes from *condire* to 'pickle' or 'spice': you do not pickle salt in meat, you pickle meat with salt. To get M. Couchoud's meaning it should read *fatuum erit quod illo condistis*, i. e. 'that will be tasteless which you have seasoned with bad salt'. Or did M. Couchoud take *condistis* as an error in *k* for *condidistis* (from *condere*)? The Greek is ἀπρόσπερε (i. e. *condietis*).

Now let us turn to *k* itself which has

BONUMEST·SALSETISALS·FATUM·	<i>end of page.</i>
FATUM·FUER·IN·QUOD·ILLUT·CONDIS	Fol. 9 b <i>begins.</i>
TIS·HABETIS·INUOBIS·PANEM·PACA	
TIESTOTE·IN·ILLA·UICEM·ET·IN·DEPRO.	

I print four lines, so that my readers may be reminded of the terribly blundering ways of the scribe of *k*.<sup>1</sup> But the spacing tells us that he took *in quod illut condistis* as a separate clause, therefore probably as an interrogative. And as the reduplicated *fatum* (= *fatuum*) is the last and first words of a page the chance that it is nothing more than a scribe's error becomes very high indeed.

Somewhat similar in character is the passage from which Dr Couchoud starts (Mk. xiii 34-37, Couchoud, p. 5 f). We read

'As a man going on a journey left the house and gave to his servants authority, to each his own work, and to the door-keeper he commanded to watch, so watch (*sic uigilate*) for ye know not when . . . lest he find you sleeping; but what he (the man) said to one, I say to all of you.'

Here *k* has *sic uigilate* where the Greek has γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, and for the last words, where the Greek has ὁ δὲ ὑμῶν λέγω, πᾶσιν λέγω γρηγορεῖτε, *k* has (or virtually has, according to Couchoud)

*quod autem uni dixit, omnibus uobis dico.*

In reality *k* has *dixi* not *dixit*, but Dr Couchoud suggests that a *t* has been dropped by a Latin scribe. Accepting this correction for the moment, we get a continuous paragraph: 'As a man left his home and told the porter to watch, so watch ye: what he said to the *one*, I say to *all* of you.'

This is really very nice and attractive. What is more, the text of *k* is in certain particulars sustained by subsidiary evidence. The use of *sic* for οὖν is attested by *e* (unfortunately not extant for the latter part of the passage), and also by *c*. The final 'watch!' is also omitted by *c*.

<sup>1</sup> It need hardly be remarked how grateful we ought to be that *k* is *not* a revised text. Had the scribe been more familiar with Christian diction many a valuable old reading would doubtless have been corrected away.

And the African Optatus has 'to one'—*quod uni ex uobis dico omnibus dico*—unfortunately without giving the context. But the *t* of M. Couchoud's *dixit* is otherwise unattested, and that is the one link which connects the word with the man of the simile rather than with Jesus Himself.

What of the  $\acute{\omega}\sigma$  at the beginning, which in the Greek is not answered by a corresponding clause with 'so' or 'in like manner'? Wellhausen considers it sufficient to remark 'In Semitic a principal sentence often begins with (the equivalent of)  $\acute{\omega}\sigma$ , meaning "It is as when"'.<sup>1</sup> I would rather compare it with the Semitic suppression of a too obvious apodosis, of which familiar examples are to be found in Dan. iii 15, Lk. xiii 9.<sup>2</sup> No one would ever maintain that the Gospel of Mark, whether first written down in Greek or Latin, was composed according to the rules of art as taught by schoolmasters ever since schools existed. It invites 'correction', but how effective it is! Let any one read rapidly aloud Mk. xiii 33-37 as it stands in the Greek, with an emphasis on  $\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\rho\eta$  (for it is the key-word of the passage), but without stopping to consider whether an apodosis has been expressed or only implied: I venture to think his hearers will not feel that the paragraph is 'vague and confused', or that 'an orderly little picture' has been 'broken up into three fragments', as M. Couchoud maintains. No, they will be moved to keep awake! I find it difficult to believe that anything so moving and so impressive—i. e. when declaimed, not just analysed—can be the result of unskilful translation. A translator, on the other hand, or an adapter (such as Matthew or Luke), is bound to be an analyst, unless he simply copies word for word. So the Latin translator of Mark turned *oὕτως* into *sic*, while Luke (Lk. xxi 34-36) rewrites the whole passage.

This notice is already too long, except for one or two scattered remarks. When on p. 34 M. Couchoud says 'The Latin Mark occupies a central position so far as affinity for the Greek texts is concerned' he seems to forget that 'the Latin Mark' here means codex *k*. It would be different if we had a series of Latin MSS which agreed together. As it is, *k* occupies a place on a plane with other primary authorities (B, D, W, syr.S); you find B *k*, *k* syr.S, &c., against the rest, but also B D, B syr.S &c., against the rest, and every other binary combination. The incidents of translation are not sufficient to explain this: nothing explains it but the recognition that in early times there were extensive and capricious variations in the text of Mark in every language in which it was extant.

On p. 21 M. Couchoud refers to my discussion of Mk. viii 32 in

<sup>1</sup> *Das Evangelium Marci* (ed. of 1909), p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> See *J. T. S.* xxviii 275.

*J. T. S.* ii 112. Here καὶ παρηρησία τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει corresponds to *et cum fiducia sermonem loqui* in *k*, attested also by *syr.S* and by the Arabic Tatian. Whichever reading be original, the presence of the *k*-text in Syriac demands explanation. Must we not, if Mark were originally written in Latin and *k* be a descendant of this original Latin, regard the variant ἐλάλει for λαλεῖν as a *Greek* variant, from which the Syriac (a sub-translation from the Greek) has escaped? The other alternative is extremely complicated: we have to suppose an original Latin Harmony made from the three *Greek* Gospels and the *Latin* Mark, that the Diatessaron was made from this Latin text, and that *syr.S* here has followed the Diatessaron against the Greek. Some of these steps are, in my opinion, not improbable in themselves. As readers of this JOURNAL may remember, I believe that the genesis of the Syriac Diatessaron took place something in this way.<sup>1</sup> But the whole of the evidence which makes the priority of a Latin Diatessaron probable points to its Latin text having been in language and phraseology 'European' and remote from *k*. In the evidence which points to the originality of the Latin Diatessaron there is nothing which points to the extracts from Mark having been made from a text different in character from that of the other Gospels.

M. Couchoud does not refer to Mk xv 15, where τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι corresponds to *satisfacere* in the Vulgate. This is not carelessness, but arises from the fact that every extant Old-Latin MS at this point (*viz.* *D ff k* and *r*) omit the whole clause. Here *a b e f i* and *g* are all missing: the late mixed text *c* agrees with the Vulgate, but it is known to have many Vulgate readings. Probably the omission is a mere piece of carelessness in some early 'Western' text, but as it stands in the Greek it has always been reckoned as a striking Latinism. In *Hermas* (*Sim.* vi 5, 5) τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῶν actually occurs—an early Christian writing in Greek at Rome. So also was Mark, according to the ordinary view. It seems to me that this is the explanation of most of M. Couchoud's examples.<sup>2</sup>

As I have tried to explain in the beginning of this notice, the hypothesis that Mark was originally written in Latin is not altogether beyond the region of possibility. It explains better than any other view its preservation and dissemination in a mutilated form. But M. Couchoud's examples, interesting and attractive as is the way in which he puts them forward, do not, in my opinion, prove his case: some of

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.* xxv 128.

<sup>2</sup> In passing I would like to call attention to the fact that *cena pura* survives in the Sardinian dialect in the form *Kendabura* as the name of Friday. This interesting fact is quoted by Couchoud (p. 43, note 45<sup>b</sup>) from D. S. Blondheim's very learned investigation called *Les parlers judéo-romans et la vetus latina* (Paris, 1925), p. lx.

them indeed rather weaken it. How strange it is, that the Gospel which more than any other seems to have been written by one who thought in Aramaic should be that in which Latin influence should be so strong!

F. C. BURKITT.

### A NOTE ON ROM. VI 17, 18.

THERE is no real difficulty about the Greek text of these verses, which may be given at once for reference:

Χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἦτε δούλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.

The general sense is clear; they were slaves to sin, but now they have been freed from the mastery of sin and enslaved to righteousness. For this the Apostle gives thanks. Slavery was an institution so familiar in biblical times that figures are taken from it which in our day we should be inclined to avoid; St Paul himself, for example, can find no better word to express his entire devotion to the service of Christ than to call himself His 'slave', though we soften the expression to 'servant'.

The text of the Revised Version translates the above verses as follows:—

But thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness.

The margin offers the following alternative: 'that ye were servants of sin, but ye became obedient.' It also gives 'pattern' as an alternative to 'form', and 'bond-servants' as an alternative to 'servants'.

It will be observed that text and margin alike suppose that the clause, 'ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered', refers to the time *after* conversion. And that is the generally accepted translation and interpretation of the passage. It is unnecessary to discuss individual translations: the Authorized Version, the Geneva, Cranmer, Tyndale, Rheims, 'Wiclif' versions (all these in *The English Hexapla*, edited under the Greek text of Scholz by Bagster), the Twentieth Century, Weymouth, Moffatt translations—all agree in this. So also does *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures*; for although I had doubts from the beginning, the weight of authority was so overwhelming on the other side that I had not the courage to contradict it. It should be observed, however, that St Jerome's Vulgate is really neutral, rather translating the *words*,