

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

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

Mr. Hugh Martin, M.A., Literature Secretary of the Student Christian Movement, has written an excellent book in which he traces and expounds the gradual revelation of 'the missionary purpose of God.' The title is *The Kingdom without Frontiers* (S.C.M. ; 3s. net). Either as a study of the religion of Israel and its development in Christianity, or as a strong plea for increased interest in missionary enterprise, it is well worth perusal.

The fourth volume in the series of 'Missionary Biographies' which the Student Christian Movement is publishing is *Robert Morrison* (5s. net). It is written by Mr. Marshall Broomhall, who is the Editorial Secretary of the China Inland Mission. This volume possesses the qualities of picturesque writing and clearness, which we now associate with the series.

Many are probably unaware that there is a problem about the institution of the Lord's Supper. Careful study, however, suggests several. Are the accounts in the Gospels and in St. Paul's Epistle contradictory in any important particular? When was the Supper instituted? Was it indeed instituted by Jesus at all as a permanent rite for the Church? If so, was it a new rite, or one already familiar given a new significance?

In *Was Holy Communion instituted by Jesus?* (S.C.M. ; 6s. net), the Rev. Douglas S. Guy, B.D., discusses all such questions, and is led to answer them in a sense of which all who love and value the Ordinance will approve. The sub-title 'A

Candid Enquiry' is justified. Mr. Guy reveals himself as a competent scholar well able to give reasons for the faith which he holds.

Messrs. Thomson & Cowan of Glasgow are becoming known as enterprising theological publishers, and it is an excellent idea on their part to issue a volume of *United Free Church Sermons* (5s. net). But perhaps the credit of the idea belongs rather to Mr. Hubert Simpson, and to Mr. D. P. Thomson, the editors. The bulk of the contributors are well known to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The Rev. A. J. Gossip of Aberdeen has chosen for his subject 'What Christ does for a Soul.' Four of the sermons are by professors of the Church—Principal Clow, Professor Macgregor, and Professor Moffatt of Glasgow, and Professor H. R. Mackintosh of Edinburgh—for it is a tradition of this Church that its professors should add to other gifts that of preaching. But what the volume contains may be best seen by an abbreviated address. Look for it in 'In the Study.'

From the University of Chicago Press comes a second edition of Emily Clough Peabody's *Lives worth Living*. Its studies of Biblical and modern women were first given to a Sunday-school class of elder girls, and they are eminently suited for this purpose. At the end of the volume are some suggestions for teachers. This is one of them. 'The class should have access to a dictionary of the Bible, such as Hastings', in order to understand the customs and local conditions.'

An Unrecognized Latinism in St. Mark.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

It will be remembered by those who are diligent readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that, some time ago,¹ I drew attention to what might be described as an unrecognized Aramaism in the text of Mark. It was in the opening verse of the fourth chapter where Jesus is said to have 'gone up into a ship, and sat in the sea.' We pointed out that the discomfort, nay! the impossibility of such a proceed-

¹ March 1915.

ing was got rid of by observing that to 'go up into a ship and sit' is the regular Syriac equivalent for 'to embark.' Not only was the sense of the passage cleared by this simple linguistic explanation, but a flood of light was thrown on the Synoptic parallels, as one observed how Matthew and Luke endeavoured to improve and rationalize the text of Mark. Since then, a number of similar instances have come to light, especially in the new Latin

Diatessaron, to which Dr. Plooiij has been drawing attention, of which the Syriac affinities are conspicuous.

Most modern scholars expect to find Aramaisms in Mark. They even assume as a certainty that the text of Mark is a direct translation from an Aramaic base—before such a sweeping generalization has become lawful. In the present brief note I am going to suggest that there is an unrecognized *Latinism* in the text of Mark, and to add a few observations which the recognition suggests.

Any one who reads, critically, the closing verses of the ninth chapter of Mark will be struck by the inconsequence of the tradition and the irrelevance of the argument. He will observe that there is nothing to connect the doctrine of the elimination of the right eye, with the loosely jointed sentence on the virtues and potency of salt; and, if he has the smallest capacity for proof-reading in an uncorrected text, he will surely stumble at the extraordinary oracle with regard to the salting of every human being with eternal fire; a passage which is not redeemed from absurdity by the fact that Keble tried to set it to music. But as even a verse of that kind may have an educational value in theology, I set it down:

Salted with fire they seem, to show
How spirits lost in endless woe
May undecaying live.

We will set aside, however, the alluring task of rectifying an obviously corrupt text, and look at the whole group of sayings with 'Salt' for their theme. The simplest way to restore them to continuity would be to regard them as the rough notes of a discourse, of which 'salt' is the text, with divisions under appropriate heads, and illustrations drawn partly from the Levitical law and partly from Natural History. Leviticus is there, because in the O.T. we have the following regulation: 'And every oblation of thy meal offering shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meal offering: with all thine oblations thou shalt offer salt' (Lv 2¹³). And Natural History is involved, because there appear to be references both in Mark and the other Synoptics to a condition in which salt (badly prepared) deliquesces or otherwise becomes ineffective, either as preservative or gustative. The sentence concludes with some ethical observations on the value of salt in character,

in the following terms: 'Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another.' We may call this the final application, the Nthly of the sermon. Suppose we turn this into Latin in its Vulgate form:

Habete in vobis sal,
Et pacem habete inter vos.

We notice that the sentences are beginning to acquire parallelism. Let us turn now to the oldest Vulgate MSS. Here we find instead of *Sal*, the masculine accusative *Salem*. The same feature occurs in the Latin of Codex Bezae, and the fact need not trouble us: *Salem* is good Latin (Cicero, Pliny, etc.). But what surprises us is, that the parallelism has begun to talk: *Salem* is an interpretation of *pacem*, a word with which we are familiar in other quarters. For instance, there is the reference in the Epistle to the Hebrews to 'Melchizedek, king of Salem, which is being interpreted, king of Peace'; and there is the early interpretation of Jerusalem as 'City of Peace,' with which, in the related form 'they shall see Peace,' our Lord Himself was familiar, as we know from His lamentation over Jerusalem; the 'things that belong to *thy peace* . . . are hid from *thine eyes*.'

Returning then to the Gospel, we see that some one has been making a mystical explanation of 'Salt (Salem)' as 'peace': the two halves of the Marcan sentence now mean the same thing. If this is in any sense an elucidation, we can hardly describe it in any other way than as a *Latinism* in Mark; and it will be interesting to see whether any similar passages and explanations can be found in that Gospel.

Unless the suggestion of a *Latinism* in the foregoing analysis is entirely untenable, and the linguistic parallel merely an accident, we can hardly evade the consideration of a number of other questions. The first is the possibility that Mark wrote his Gospel in Latin, as was thought by some early transcribers; the second is much more important, namely, whether our Lord can be credited with trilingualism, so as to discourse in a Latinizing parable. To this we have a supplementary inquiry as to whether it is within the bounds of a reasonable criticism to refer to Him the *disjecta membra* of a homily on Salt.

We do not propose to attempt here an answer to these inquiries. What we can do is to imagine ourselves in the area where such a discourse could

be delivered, and make some attempt at composing it ourselves. It would take the form of a Midrash, in the Synagogue manner. Such a homily, it may be assumed, would proceed from the passage in the O.T. already referred to, which says, 'Every sacrifice and oblation must be salted.' And we must begin our Sermon on Salt by saying, almost in the same breath, a Sermon on Sacrifice. And at once, if we are reformers, we are in difficulties. The Jewish religion had nothing more revolting than its incessant sacrifices, with which our Lord appears to have been as much out of sympathy as if He had been an Essene, to whom the Temple and its ritual was an abomination. Without becoming definitely Essene, there were two ways of regarding sacrifice and the *corpus* of regulations for sacrifice. One was the allegorical, according to which the instructions were valid indeed, but susceptible of a higher meaning than their concrete fulfilment: the other was the prophetic, which denied that God had ever commanded or required such burnings or such butcherings. For the first point of view we turn to Philo for our illustration; for the second, to our Lord and His first followers.

Philo puts it this way, and it will be observed that he deals with the two questions: What is the true sacrifice? and What is the Salt of the true sacrifice? The first he answers by saying that the true sacrifice is Praise, and that the 'altar is the grateful soul of the wise man' (as usual, Philo is a good Stoic) 'where the sacred fire is continually kept burning, preserved with care and inextinguishable.' This is the same doctrine, or nearly so, as we have in He 13¹⁵, 'By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually.' Philo does not definitely say 'no more sacrifices,' but he treats them as a mystical sublimation. He then proceeds to allegorize the salt, as follows: 'After this the Law says: "On every offering thou shalt add salt," by which injunction, as I said before, he [Moses] figuratively implies a duration for ever; for salt is

calculated to preserve bodies, being placed in the second rank as inferior only to the soul. . . . On which account the Law calls the altar *θυσιαστήριον*, giving it a peculiar name of special honour, from its preserving (*διωτηρεῖν*) the sacrifices (*θυσίας*) in a proper manner, and this, too, though the flesh is consumed by fire; so as to afford the most evident proof possible that God looks not upon the victim as forming the real sacrifice, but on the mind and willingness of him who offers them, that so the durability and firmness of the altar may be ensured by virtue' (Philo, *On those who offer Sacrifice*, c. vi.).

We can see how the subject of Salt and Sacrifice would have been treated in the great Synagogue at Alexandria. The real sacrifice is the Willing Mind, or rather the Praise of the Willing Mind, the salt is the pledged permanence of its devotion.

The prophetic method, which is also the early Christian one, is to maintain the invalidity of sacrifice in the external ('Did I ever enjoin sacrifice and burnt-offering?') and the validity of the inward sacrifice. For this we have abundant evidence in the early Christian testimonies. If, however, the sacrifice is the contrite person or group of persons, what is the Salt? It is this question which is answered in Mark. The Salt is the Peace. So we may make the divisions of our possible homily thus:

Salt and Sacrifice,
Salt as preservative,
(*θυσιαστήριον* = *θυσίας τηρεῖν*),
Salt as condiment,
Salt that is not—salt,
Salt = Peace.

and conclude the discourse with a benediction in the manner of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, where one is almost entitled to write Philo's interpretation on the margin: 'The very God of Peace sanctify you wholly; may your whole spirit, soul and body (*i.e.* the sacrifice) *be preserved* (*τηρηθεῖν*) blameless.'