NOTES AND STUDIES

MARCAN USAGE: NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL, ON THE SECOND GOSPEL
(continued)

VIII. Auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs.

i. The past tense of the substantive verb ἦν ἦσαν with present active, present or perfect passive, participle as auxiliary; exactly equivalent to our English ‘was’ ‘were’ with present and past participle (rare in Matthew: frequent in Mark and Luke)

1. i 6 ἦν Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου ... καὶ ἔσθων ἄκριθας. No parallel in Luke: altered by Matthew. In classical Greek this construction would be quite regular, but the tense would be pluperfect and the meaning ‘had been clothed’. Mark means ‘was clothed’.

2. i 13 ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ... πεπαραχόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατάν, ‘was ... being tempted’, though both A.V. and R.V. have, less exactly, ‘was ... tempted’. Neither Matthew nor Luke is strictly parallel. Present passive participle only once again, in 17.

3. i 22 ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἔξοουσιν ἔχων, ‘was teaching’. The only case where both Matthew and Luke retain the Marcan construction.

4. i 33 ἦν δὲ ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν. Not (of course) ‘had been gathered’, but ‘was gathered’. No Synoptic parallel.

5. i 39 ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, ‘was preaching’. As pointed out in ch. III of these Notes (J. T. S., Oct. 1924, xxvi p. 15) W-H give a wrong reading here with Ν Β Λ Χιθέν, due to the desire to find a construction for εἰς. Not only does the Lucan parallel (iv 44) support ἦν, but Mark i 14 is decisive on the same side: Jesus ‘came into Galilee preaching’ at the outset of His ministry, here He ‘continued preaching’. Luke retains the construction, Matthew alters it.

6. ii 6 ἥσαν δὲ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἑκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι, ‘were sitting there and discussing’. Matthew alters: Luke retains ἥσαν καθήμενοι, but removes it to the opening of the story, ν 17.

7. ii 18 ἥσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. The statement is dropped at this point by both Matthew and Luke.

8. iv 38 αὐτῶς ἦν ἐν τῇ πρώμη ... καθεύδων. Again altered by both, by Matthew to the imperfect, by Luke to an aorist.

9. ν 5 ἦν κράζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν ἅλθοι, ‘continually, night and day ... he was crying out and cutting himself ...’ The verse is dropped in both derivative accounts.
10. v ii ἐὰν δὲ ἐκεῖ . . . ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη. Retained by Matthew, probably because the verb need not go with the participle: 'there was there a great herd feeding', rather than 'a great herd was feeding there'. Luke makes that clearer by altering to βοσκομένων.1

11. vi 52 ἢν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη. No parallels.


13. x 22 ἦν γὰρ ἐξων χρήματα [π.λ. κτήματα] πολλά. Here it is Matthew who retains the Marcan construction, Luke who alters it (ἡν πλούσιος): but see further, on this verse and context, § v 15 below, p. 359.

14. x 32 ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῷ ὄντος ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Luke omits the verse, Matthew quite alters the construction.

15. x 32 ἢν προάγων αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. No parallels.


17. xiv 40 ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ δφθαλμοὶ καταβαρνάμενοι. Matthew retains the construction but alters the present to the perfect participle: by so doing he may keep the letter of grammatical rule, but it is to the havoc of the sense, for the pluperfect is quite out of place. Their eyes 'were being weighed down', not 'had been weighed down'. There is no parallel in Luke.

18. xiv 49 καὶ ἦμεραν ἦμην πρὸς υἱὰς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων. Altered by Luke to a participle, ὁτὸς μοῦ (avoiding two verbs connected with καὶ), by Matthew, because he disliked the construction, to ἐκαθήζομην.

19. xiv 54 ἦν συνκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν. Here for the first time both Matthew and Luke make the same alteration, substituting ἐκάθητο for ἦν συνκαθήμενος—though one has μετὰ τῶν with Mark and the other μέσος αὐτῶν. But it is not beyond the ordinary doctrine of chances that in this solitary case out of a list of twenty-four passages the two later Evangelists should independently hit on so simple a change.

20. xv 7 ἦν δὲ τὸ λεγόμενον Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος. 'Now the fellow called Barabbas was . . . lying in prison': A.V. wrongly separates ἦν from δεδεμένος, rendering 'there was one . . . Barabbas which lay bound'; R.V. is ambiguous. Mark's whole reference to Barabbas is so awkwardly expressed, that it is not to be wondered at that the story is re-drafted by the other two Evangelists.

21. xv 26 ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη. Both the others change, partly perhaps because the brevity of the Marcan account

1 Βοσκομένη in Luke viii 32, in spite of the strong authority of ΝΒΔ (not d) Θα, looks like an assimilation to Matthew (and Mark).
seemed to call for expansion: Mark e.g. does not tell us where the inscription was put.


23. xv 43 δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προοιμιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Altered by both, by Luke to the imperfect of the same verb, by Matthew to the aorist of another verb.

24. xv 46 ἐν μνήματι ὑν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, 'which was hewn out' A.V. rightly: R.V. which had rendered the idiom rightly in 1, 4, 11, 21, at last found a chance to hark back to the classical pluperfect, 'which had been hewn out'. But Marcan usage is clear. Matthew changes to the active ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῷ πέτρᾳ, Luke to the shorter but perhaps more ambiguous phrase ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ.

The number of instances cited shows that we have here a favourite locution of Mark. No difference has been made in the list between instances of the present active (or passive 2, 17) participle and instances of the perfect passive participle, because it does not appear that Mark made any. But his most characteristic usage is with the present participle, ([2], 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, [17], 18, 19, 22, 23, or three out of every four cases), and it is exactly equivalent to our own use of the auxiliary verb and participle for the imperfect 'he was teaching' 'they were fasting' 'he was in the stern sleeping'. Similarly the construction with the perfect passive participle corresponds closely enough to our 'he was clothed'. Matthew very rarely uses any form of the construction; never with the present participle, except in the few cases he takes over unaltered from Mark, 3, 10, 13, 22. Luke on the other hand is not averse to it in the rest of his Gospel, but he prunes it away drastically from his Marcan material, leaving it only in the three first cases of his meeting with it, 3, 5, 6.

It might almost be said that this construction with the auxiliary verb is for Mark, as for us, the real imperfect: for his use of the proper imperfect is little, if at all, removed from his use of the aorist. In cases such as ii 27 ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἀνθρωπον κτλ., or v 30 ἐπιστραφεῖς ἐν τῷ ὀχλῳ ἔλεγεν Τίς μου ἦψατο; it seems quite impossible to read into ἔλεγεν any sense different from that of εἶπεν. When Mark wants to give the continuous sense of the imperfect, he uses ἢν with the present participle: just as when he wants to give another shade of the imperfect, the inchoative sense, 'began to do' a thing, he uses what is in effect another auxiliary verb, as we shall now see.¹

¹ Both uses, ἢν with present participle and ἦψατο with present infinitive, reflect Aramaic use, as I learn from the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College, who supplies me with references to G. Dalman Die Worte Jesu pp. 28, 21.
ii. The verb ἀρχομαι (ὁράω ὁράων) with present infinitive as auxiliary for the imperfect (Matthew 10 times, Mark 26, Luke 18).

1. i 45 ὅ δὲ ἐξέθλων ὁράω ὁρώσειν... Matthew omits the verse: Luke has a (roughly parallel) imperfect.

2. ii 23 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν ὁράων ὁδὸν ποιῶν πᾶλλοντες... Matthew retains ὁράων: Luke again substitutes an imperfect.


4. v 17 καὶ ὁράω παρακαλεῖν αὐτῶν ἀπέλθειν... Both the other Synoptists change into an aorist.

5. v 20 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καὶ ὁράω κηρύσσειν... No parallel in Matthew: Luke substitutes a participle, ἀπῆλθεν κηρύσσων.


7. vi 7 ὁράω αὐτοῖς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο, καὶ ἐδοθῶν αὐτοῖς ἔξουσίαν... No strict parallel in either Synoptist: but for the imperfect ἐδοθῶν both substitute the aorist ἐδώκεν. Here, and often in Mark, ὁράω marks a 'beginning' in the sense of a new departure rather than a continuous process.

8. vi 34 καὶ ὁράω διδάσκειν αὐτοῖς πολλά. The whole phrase disappears from both the other accounts: but in the next verse Luke ix 12 has ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ὁράω κλίνειν. That is to say, he borrows Mark's ὁράω, but transfers it to something to which 'beginning' was strictly appropriate: 'the sun began to get low'.

9. vi 55 καὶ ὁράων ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβδάτοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν. The whole paragraph is absent from Luke: Matthew substitutes an aorist, προσήνεγκαν.

10. viii 11 καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ὁράων σωζήτειν αὐτῷ. Matthew has an imperfect: Luke has the Q account of the demand for a sign (xi 29), and therefore leaves out Mark's account.

11. viii 31 καὶ ὁράω διδάσκειν αὐτοῖς δοῦ δεῖ... Retained by Matthew: Luke has an aorist participle.


13. x 28 ὁράω λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ. In both the other accounts ἐπεν. In both the other accounts ἐπεν.

14. x 32 ὁράων αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν: just as viii 31, no. 11. Once more both Matthew and Luke have simply ἐπεν.

15. x 41 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ὁράων ἀγανακτεῖν... Luke, to save the credit of two leading apostles, omits all personal references in this episode: Matthew leaves the main story untouched, but for ὁράων ἀγανακτεῖν substitutes the aorist ἐγκατέστησαν.

16. x 47 (of Bartimeus) ὁράω κράζειν καὶ λέγειν... Very probably
he did begin and go on with repeated cries: but both Matthew and Luke are, as usual, content with an aorist.

17. xi 15 ἦρετο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας. Matthew again has the aorist: Luke by exception (and so in no. 18) retains the Marcan phrase.

18. xii 1 καὶ ἦρετο αὗτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν 'Ἀμπελώνα . . . .
Matthew, having just inserted in the Marcan framework the parable of the Two Sons, naturally omits the whole phrase: Luke follows Mark again, as in the last preceding case.

19. xiii 5 ἦρετο λέγειν αὐτοῖς Βλέπετε μή τις δύμας πλανησθῇ. As in no. 11, it is a real commencement of new matter, the eschatological discourse. Notwithstanding, both the other Synoptists prefer to treat our Lord's words simply as an answer to the question put to Him, 'When shall these things be?' and so introduce them with an aorist.

20. xiv 19 ἦρεντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ . . . . Matthew retains ἦρεντο: Luke omits this and the following verse, perhaps because it seemed impossible that any but the actual traitor could have needed to put the question 'Is it I?'


22. xiv 65 καὶ ἦρεντο τινες ἀμπτέον αὐτῷ. For this Matthew has an aorist, Luke (better) an imperfect.

23. xiv 69 καὶ ἡ παιδύσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἦρετο πάλιν λέγειν. For this Matthew has a present tense, Luke an aorist. B and the Sahidic, moved by just the same considerations as the two Evangelists, substitute εἶπεν in St Mark for the characteristic language of the author.

24. xiv 71 ὁ δὲ ἦρετο ἀναθεματίζειν. So too Matthew: Luke, not liking to attribute oaths or curses to the apostle, contents himself with the statement of fact 'Peter said'.

25. xv 8 ὁ δῆλος ἦρετο αἰτεῖσθαι . . . . The verse has nothing corresponding to it in the other two accounts.


Out of these twenty-six instances, there are parallels in Matthew to nineteen, in Luke to fifteen: Matthew gets rid of ἦρεντο thirteen times, or twice in every three, Luke twelve times, or four times out of every five. As with regard to the substantive verb and participle, so here Matthew is averse to the construction himself, and where he does use it it is more often than not (six times out of ten: see 2, 11, 12, 20, 21, 24) taken over straight from Mark; while conversely Luke is again not so disinclined to the usage on his own account, but leaves it unaltered in Mark less often than Matthew, 17, 18, and see on 8.

Not only is the verb δύναμαι more common in Mark than in either Matthew or Luke, but in many cases its force is so weakened that it becomes almost an auxiliary verb, and corresponds to our ‘can’ ‘could’ or even ‘may’ ‘might’. Translation of this shade of meaning is therefore easy in English, and the Authorized Version uses ordinarily ‘can’ and ‘could’, but in iv 32 ‘may’, in xiv 5 ‘might have been sold’, and in iv 33 ‘as they were able’. In about half the cases of the use of δύναμαι in St Mark, there is nothing remarkable about it, and they will not be cited here: where there are parallels in the other Synoptists, they do not shrink from repeating Mark’s phraseology; where, as in the majority of cases, a negative is expressed or implied, we could paraphrase ‘it is impossible’. But in the other half Mark’s usage of δύναμαι is tending towards an auxiliary sense, and any rendering like ‘it is not possible’ would exaggerate his meaning: R.V. (though it may be right in substituting ‘are able’ for the ‘can’ of A.V. in Mark x 38, 39) goes wrong when it tries to represent the future δυνήσεται (iii 25, viii 4, ix 39) by ‘will (shall) be able’: for the ‘can’ of A.V. all that is necessary is to put ‘could’.

The cases that follow are those where the weakened or auxiliary use is probable or at least possible.

1. i 45 ὡστε μηκέτι αὖτων δύνασθαι εἰς τὸλμ φανερῶς εἰσελθεῖν. There was no physical impossibility: A.V., R.V., rightly ‘could no more’. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

2. iii 20 ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοῦς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν. No parallels: but cf. Mark vi 31 οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὕκαίρον where the sense is practically the same as in iii 20 ‘They could not even get a meal’. Again no question of physical impossibility.

3. iii 23, 24, 25, 26 πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; . . . οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι . . . οὐ δυνήσεται στῆραι . . . οὐ δύναται στήραι. Probably Matthew and Luke take the passage from Q: in any case they avoid the use of δύναμαι right through. (But Matthew follows Mark iii 27 in using it of the entry into the strong man’s house.)

4. iv 32 ὡστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αἰτοῦ τὰ πεπείνα τοῦ ὀφρανοῦ κατασκηνῶν. Matthew retains Mark’s construction but substitutes ἐλθεῖν for δύνασθαι: Luke turns the clause into a statement of fact καὶ . . . κατασκηνώσειν. Q may once more have affected Matthew and Luke: but anyhow they have in fact both avoided Mark’s δύνασθαι, which A.V. very well renders ‘may’.

5. iv 33 He spoke the word to them in parables καθὼς ἦδύναστο
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ακοίεν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew omits the phrase. A.V. and R.V. 'as they were able to hear it', but I suspect that Mark does not mean more than 'in proportion to their capacity' 'as they could hear'.

6. vi 5 ὦκ ἔδωκα ἐκεῖ ποιήσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν. No parallel: but obviously Mark means that it was a moral impossibility for Christ to work miracles where there was not faith to correspond. Both our versions rightly 'could there do'.

7. vii 15 ἀ δύναται κοινωσιν αὐτῶν (cf. v. 18). No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes the simple κοινωνικός, because 'can defile' hardly means more here than 'does defile'.

8. ix 39 ὁδεῖς γὰρ ἔστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ δύναμιν μον καὶ δυνάμεις ταχύς κακολογήσαι με. 'Could easily revile me' is surely the right shade of the meaning, rather than 'shall be able to' of R.V. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

9. xiv 5 ἢδύνατο γὰρ τούτο τῷ μέρος πραρθῆναι... So Matthew: no parallel in Luke. 'Might have been sold' A.V. and R.V., rightly.

10. xiv 7 ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε... εἶ ποιήσαι. Matthew omits: Luke again has no parallel. A.V. 'whenever ye will ye may do them good' is exactly right: 'can do them good' of R.V. is unnecessary, and 'are able to do them good' would be an exaggeration of emphasis.

Consideration of Mark's use of δύναμαι does not perhaps at first sight compel us to conclusions so clear as those of the two preceding sections of this paper. But it cannot be without significance that Mark uses this verb, in proportion to the length of his Gospel, about twice as often as the other two Synoptists: and that being so, I think it is legitimate to apply the presumption to be drawn from his use of auxiliary verbs in general to this particular case. The parallel of our own language shews us how a verb like 'can' has tended to lose something of its original force: 'can you come to lunch to-morrow?' is intermediate between 'will you come?' and 'are you able to come?' Verbs like ἢσχύω begin to replace the stricter meaning of δύναμαι in later Greek. In Mark ix 18 'I said to thy disciples that they should cast it out' καὶ ὦκ ἢσχύσαν, both the other Synoptists substitute οὐκ ἢσχύσαν, perhaps from οὐκ ἢσχύσαν of Mark ix 28. Did the father use a stronger word than the apostles?


Θέλω is even more definitely an auxiliary in Mark than δύναμαι. It cannot indeed be distinguished from βούλομαι, since the latter word has almost dropped out from the language of the Gospels, and θέλω has replaced it. But θέλω itself hardly expresses the idea of a strong definite wish: for that sense other words have to be found, and θέλω in
Mark can almost always be rendered by our own auxiliary verbs 'will' (in the present tense) and 'would' (in the past). Since, however, we use 'shall' and not 'will' as the auxiliary verb in the first person (singular and plural), the rule does not apply to the forms θέλω θέλων: Mark vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἔχανὸς δῶς μου is really mistranslated by the 'I will' of both A.V. and R.V.: x 35 θέλων ἵνα δ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμεν σε ποιήσης ἤμων is better rendered by them 'we would'; 'I want' or 'I should like' would be the most exact equivalents, and so indeed also, though the existing rendering has too sacred associations to be replaced by any other, in xiv 36.

It is interesting to note further how often in Mark the verbs θέλω and δύναμαι, our 'would' and 'could', stand in context and contrast with one another: i 40 ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι, 'If you would, you could make me clean'; vi 19 θέλειν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείναι καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκατο, 'she would have killed him, but could not' (A.V. is right: R.V. 'desired to kill him' is wrong); vii 24 οἴδενα θέλειν γνῶναι καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκατο λαθεῖν, 'he would have remained incognito, but could not'; xiv 7 ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς πάντοτε εὑρίσκατε, 'if you would, you could be benefiting them continually'.

That θέλω must not be translated 'wish' or 'desire' in St Mark is made abundantly clear by vi 48 θέλειν παρελθεῖν αὐτοῖς, which of course does not mean 'He desired to pass them by', but exactly what we express by 'He would have passed them by'—if they had not noticed Him and stopped Him.

Now let us take some other passages in order, and see how they fit in with the principles of rendering just enunciated.

iii 13 προσκαλεῖται οὗς θέλειν αὐτός. Here we approach nearer than anywhere else in the Gospel to the sense of 'choice', and it is possible that this is just what is suggested by the otherwise inexplicable αὐτός. For obviously it cannot mean 'whom he himself selected and not somebody else', so that R.V.'s 'whom he himself would' is pure nonsense: and though St Mark wrote a Greek of his own and not that of the grammars, he meant something by it. Faute de mieux, it may therefore not be too bold to suggest that what he did mean by αὐτός was to add the element of personal choice to the colourless word θέλειν, and so for A.V. 'whom he would' I would substitute 'whom he willed'.

vi 26 οὐκ θέλησον αἰτήσαι αὐτήν. For 'he would not reject her' I should be inclined to write 'he did not want to reject her'. That is, I think, the best rendering where a negative precedes θέλω.

viii 34 ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ σώσαι is strictly parallel to ὃς δ' ἄν ἀπολέσει—for it will hardly be suggested that a 'will to save life' is contrasted
with an accidental or involuntary loss of it. No instance could shew more clearly that \( \text{θέλω} \) is \textit{practically} an auxiliary verb, and nothing else. So \( \text{x 35, x 43} \).


\( \text{x 36 τι \text{θέλετε \ ποιήσω \ ὑμῖν;} \) Our authorities vary a good deal in these words, but the reading is borne out by \( \text{x 51 τι \text{σοι \ θέλεις \ ποιήσω;} \) xiv 12 ποῦ \text{θέλεις ἀπελθόντες \ ἐτοιμάσωμεν;} \) xv 9 \text{θέλετε ἀπολύσω \ ὑμῖν;} and possibly xv 12 τί \text{οὖν \ [θέλετε] \ ποιήσω; ‘What would ye I should do? ’ or in more modernized English ‘What do you want me to do?’  

The extraordinary reading of \( \text{νo \ Β \ Ψ} \text{ in } \text{x 36 τι \text{θέλετε \ με \ ποιήσω \ ὑμῖν;} \) is relegated to the margin of \( \text{W-H}, \) and must presumably be a conflation between two readings \text{ποιήσω} and \text{με \ ποιήσαι}.

xii 38 τῶν γραμματεῶν τῶν \text{θελόντων \ ἐν \ στολαῖς \ περιπατεῖν.} A.V. ‘love’ is a shade too strong: but it is nearer the mark than R.V. ‘desire’. Our exact equivalent is ‘like’ to walk in their best clothes.

One remaining word, and it is an important one, must be said about the construction \( \text{θέλω \ ἵνα.} \) It is found three times in Mark, vi 25 \( \text{θέλω \ ἵνα \ εὐαντῆς \ δοὺς \ μοι \ ἐπὶ \ πίνακι \ τήν \ κεφάλην \ Ἱωάνου,} \) ix 30 καὶ οὖν ἤθελεν ἵνα τίς γνῶ, x 35 \( \text{θέλομεν \ ἵνα \ δ \ ἔαν \ αἰτήσωμεν \ σε \ ποιήσης \ ὑμῖν;} \) where the idiomatic rendering is, I think, ‘I want you to give me’ ‘He did not want any one to know’ ‘We want you to give us’: once apiece in Matthew and Luke but in the same phrase, Matt. vii 12 = Luke vi 31 \( \text{σοι \ ἵνα \ θέλησε (καθὼς \ θέλετε) \ ἵνα \ ποιῶσιν \ ὑμῖν \ οἱ \ ἄνθρωποι,} \) where perhaps the phrase of \( \text{Q} \) was already so ingrained in Christian use as not to permit of change: once in John, xvii 24. Now \( \text{θέλω \ νά} \) is the modern Greek for the future tense: obviously the \( \text{κοῦνή} \) of the first century A.D. was already moving in that direction, and Mark of all the Evangelists most nearly represents the \( \text{κοῦνή} \) unaffected by literary tradition. The usage of auxiliary verbs was already beginning to establish itself.

v. \text{The verb \( \epsilonχω \) \text{(73 times in Matthew, 68 in Mark, 76 in Luke).} \)

The account of auxiliary and quasi-auxiliary verbs would be incomplete without some treatment of the verb \( \epsilonχω, \) which shares with the words hitherto treated a disproportionate frequency of usage in

1 In ix 5 the ordinary texts give \( \text{καὶ \ ποιήσωμεν \ τρεῖς \ σχημάτας,} \) and Luke too has \( \text{καὶ \ ποιήσωμεν;} \) but Matthew has \( \text{εἰ \ θέλεις \ ποιήσω;} \) and whence did he derive \( \text{εἰ \ θέλεις,} \) unless he read in Mark either \( \text{θέλεις \ ποιήσω} \) with \( \text{D \ b \ \prime \ \prime,} \) or \( \text{θέλεις \ ποιήσωμεν} \) with \( \text{Θ \ σαμ \ 13569? \ ‘Would you like us to make three tabernacles?’} \)

2 The use of \( \text{ἵνα} \) in Mark demands special treatment. It is found 58 times in Mark, as against 33 and 37 times respectively in the longer Gospels of Matthew and Luke.
Mark as compared with Matthew and Luke, though it is not strictly auxiliary. Only in two passages is there anything like an echo of the low-Latin idiom of *habeo* with the past participle passive which has as we know established itself in the languages of Western Europe: \( \text{iii i} \) ἀνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἐξων τὴν χεῖρα, viii 17 πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ῥήμαν; That does a little suggest *arrectam habens manum*, and Matthew and Luke both instinctively substitute the adjective ἐγράφα for the participle ἐξηραμμένη: they have nothing parallel to viii 17. The papyri and modern Greek, I am told, shew that Greek as well as Latin developed along the lines of the auxiliary use of 'have' with the perfect participle; and that would account for the two instances in Mark.

But Mark's fondness for ἔχειν goes much farther than this, and the tendency of the two other Synoptists, and especially Luke, to modify Mark's language on many of the occasions of its use, is worth recording. I do not propose to examine all, or anything like all, of the sixty-eight instances where ἔχω occurs: any Greek writer, literary or not, will of course be found to make regular use of the word: what is peculiar to Mark is partly just his fondness for it, partly certain characteristic methods of employing it where a better trained writer like Luke will generally avoid it.

1. i 22 ὡς ἐξοσπάν ἔχων. So Matthew: but Luke gets rid of ἔχων by writing ἤν ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. In ii 10, iii 15, the same phrase is followed by an infinitive, which makes all the difference.

2. i 32 τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας, cf. i 34, ii 17, vi 55. In classical Greek this would be κακῶς πράσοντας or κακῶς πάσχοντας: and therefore, though Matthew has no objection to the phrase, Luke avoids it here, though he does not alter it where our Lord is the speaker, ii 17 χρείαν ἔχον διὸ ἀπροφανή... ἀπό τοῦ... οί κακῶς ἔχοντες—probably a proverbial phrase, and for that reason also more difficult of change.

3. ii 19 δυσομερῶν ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ' αὐτῶν, cf. xiv 7 πάντοτε τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. In ii 19 both Matthew and Luke omit the phrase, primarily no doubt because it is redundant after ἐν ὑμῖν οὐ κακῶς μετ' αὐτῶν ἑστίν. But the use with ἐναι is the use satisfactory to Luke, cf. i, 5, 9, 13.


5. iii 1, 3, ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα (see above, at the top of the page), τῷ τῆς χείρα ἔχοντι ἔγραφα: on the first of the two occasions Luke vi 6 substitutes ἦν χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ἢ διείσα ἤν ἔγραφα, cf. i, 3. See the next note.

6. iii 10 ὡς τῶν ἐχον μάστυγας, cf. iii 22 Βεθζεδούλ ἔχει, iii 30 πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, ν 25 τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγίωνα, vii 25 ἔσχεν τῷ θυγάτριον
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avT1j<; 7r11£vµ,a &KaBapTOv, ix 17 ἐχοντα πνεύμα ἄλαλον. Of these six cases of ἐχειν neither Matthew nor Luke (where they have parallels at all) retain any one. Luke paraphrases with οἱ ἐνοχλοῦμενοι ὑπὸ ... ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐζηλώθην (but in viii 27 he writes ἔχων δαιμόνια). Matthew with κακῶς ἔχοντες, κακῶς δαιμονίζεται, κακῶς πάσχει. Mark’s use would seem to be a sort of colloquial idiom, somewhat resembling our own ‘a man with an unclean spirit’ and the like.

7. iii 29 οὖκ ἔχει αἵφεσιν. Both Matthew and Luke substitute the cognate verb ἀφίέσθαι. Mark’s use is very un-Greek—‘to have forgiveness’ instead of ‘to be forgiven’—and no better example of his exaggerated use of ἔχειν could be found.

8. iv 5, 5, 6, 17 οὖκ ἔχειν γῆν πολλὴν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βίαν, οὖκ ἔχοντιν βίαν. There is nothing wrong in these phrases, but they do illustrate the limitations of Mark’s vocabulary and his fondness for an elementary verb like ἔχειν. Precisely similar is his repeated usage, for instance, of ἔφεσθαι.

9. iv 40 οὕτω ἔχετε πίστιν; cf. xi 22 ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ. Again nothing absolutely incorrect, and Matthew has the construction three times, the Epistle of James twice. But common as πίστις is in St Paul’s Epistles, ἔχειν πίστιν only occurs three times. Luke viii 25 changes to ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;


12. vi 34 ὡς πράβατα μὴ ἔχοντα πομένα, ‘as sheep without a shepherd’, see on 6 above. The phrase is adopted by Matthew in another context, Matt. ix 36. The idea is frequent in O. T., but the LXX (cf. Luke’s usage, see on 3 above) always renders οἷς οὐκ ἐστιν πομην (Swete).

13. vi 38, viii 5 πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; Matthew on both occasions has the same construction as Mark: Luke here (no parallel to viii 5) changes once more to the construction with εἶναι, see on 3, οὐκ εἰσίν ἤμων πλείων ἢ ... But in viii 16, 17 οὗτος οὐκ ἔχονυμ, ὁτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε (no Lucan parallel), Matthew substitutes ἠλάβομεν, ἠλάβετε.

14. ix 50 ἔχετε ἐν εαυτοῖς ἄλα. No parallel: but perhaps Matthew’s ἔμει αὕτη τὸ ἄλα τῆς γῆς (Matt. ν 13) represents the Q form of the same Saying.

15. x 21 οἴα ἔχεις πόλησον, 22 ἢν γὰρ ἔχων χρήματα πολλά, 23 οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες. It is curious that Luke retains the first and third of these contiguous phrases, and changes the second to ἢν γὰρ πλοῦσις σφόδρα, while Matthew retains in substance the second (with κτήματα
for χρόνα) but changes the first to πώλειτον σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα and the third to πλούσιοι. Obviously the common instinct of both was to modify at some point or another Mark's superabundant use of ἔχεν in this context.

16. xi 13 συκῆν ... ἔχουσαν φίλλα, 'a fig-tree in leaf' 'with leaves'. Luke omits the whole episode because of its difficulty, Matthew omits ἔχουσαν φίλλα, perhaps simply because the phrase immediately following 'nothing but leaves' sufficiently implies that there were leaves.

17. xii 6 ἐπὶ ἐνα ἔχεν νῦν ἀγαπητῶν. Both Matthew and Luke reconstruct the phrase, perhaps just in order to get rid of ἔχω in this connexion. A Greek would naturally have written not ἔχεν νῦν, but ἦν αὐτῷ νῦν.

18. xiv 8 δὴ ἔχεν ἐπούμεν, 'what she could she did'. Luke omits the episode, because he has already given a similar story in vii 37 ff: Matthew omits this sentence, it may be only to get rid of the collocation ἐμὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε δὲ ἔχεν ... But the parallels which Swete quotes from Luke to this use of ἔχω (Luke vii 42, xii 4, xiv 14, Acts iv 14) are not strictly in point, for in each of them a negative precedes, and that makes a real difference.

Nothing was said above of i 38 τὰς ἐξομένας κομπόλεις, because this use of the participle of the middle voice is not in pari materia with the rest of the passages enumerated, and moreover it is quite good Greek.

APPENDIX

εἶδοναι, γνῶσκεν, ἐπιγνῶσκεν, substantially identical in sense in Mark.

We are all familiar with the distinction in classical Greek between εἶδοναι 'to know by intuition' and γνῶσκεν 'to know by experience or learning', or in other words between 'knowing' and 'learning'. But does this distinction exist for St Mark? Does not the process of degeneration of the language of which we have been accumulating evidence extend to these two similar verbs as well?

I. iv 13 οὗτος οἶδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταῦτην; καὶ τῶς πᾶσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνῶσκεθε; (no parallel in Matthew or Luke).

Both A.V. and R.V. translate both words 'know': but Swete ad loc. would draw the ordinary distinction between 'knowledge which comes from intuition or insight' and 'that which is gained by experience or acquaintance'. Our versions are right, if only for the reason that there is no future of εἶδοναι in N. T.: εἶδησος is only once found (Heb. viii 11), and that in a quotation from the LXX. But if γνῶσομαι is used as the future of εἶδοναι—as it certainly appears to be in this passage—a presumption is already created that in Mark at any rate the two verbs are
not really distinguishable. That presumption appears to be borne out in the passages which follow.

2. v 29, 33 ἐγγω τῷ σώματι οτι ἦταν ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος ... εἰδῶν ὁ γέγονεν αὐτῷ.

Our versions make the distinction of ‘felt’ and ‘knowing’: but I do not think there is any justification for this, beyond perhaps the consideration that γνῶσκε may tend to be used where the sphere of knowledge, σώματι or πνεύματι, is expressed.

3. xiii 28, 29; 33, 35 γνῶσκεται οτι ἐγγός τὸ θέρος ἐστίν ... γνῶσκετε οτι ἐγγός ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύρας ... οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς [ἐστιν] ... οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται.

Here it is not easy to give any other rendering throughout than ‘know’. All that can be said is that it is practically a rule with the negative to use οἴδατε rather than γνῶσκετε: cf. iv 27, ix 6, x 38, xi 33, xii 24, xiii 32, xiv 40.

4. xii 12 ἐγγόσαν γὰρ οτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ἔπειν, and xv 10 ἐγγόσαν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν (where Matthew at any rate thought that άδει was the proper word to use) contrasted with ii 10 ἡν δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξούσιαν ἔχει ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφίειν ἀμαρτίας and xii 32 ἀπαντῆτε γὰρ ἤδεισαν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ἵπτε φρόνησις ἵν. Here I read ἤδεισαν confidently with D W Θ 565 700 and O. L. including k: for (i) the alternative reading ἔχον is easily explained as introduced from Matthew, (ii) ἤδεισαν suits better than ἔχον with the word ὄντως —you can ‘know of a surety’, but how can you ‘regard of a surety’?

Does Mark mean to distinguish in these two sets of passages between two sorts of knowledge as predicated on these different occasions of Scribes and Pharisees, of Pilate, and of the crowd? I think the words are synonymous.

5. ii 8, v 30, viii 17, xii 15: the participles γνοὺς, ἐπιγνοὺς, εἰδῶς, as used of our Lord.

ii 8 καὶ εἰδῶς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ... For this and the next case see on 2 above.

v 30 καὶ εἰδῶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθούσαν ...

viii 17 καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε;

xii 15 ὁ δὲ εἰδῶς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί με πειράζετε; So B C L A Δ Ψ a k Vulg. Syriac and Egyptian versions against ἔδων of the rest: and in spite of xii 34 (and xii 28?) the preponderance of authority for εἰδῶς here seems decisive.¹

¹ Even if εἰδῶς is not the correct reading in this passage, the participle reappears in v 33 (quoted above) and vi 20 of Herod ἐροθείτε τὸν Ἰωάνην, εἰδῶς αὐτῶν ἀνδρα δικαιούν καὶ ἄγιον. So for the other two verbs cf. vi 54 εἰδῶς ἐπιγνώστες αὐτῶν and xv 45 γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντηρίου.
It does not seem possible to distinguish any difference of meaning between the three verbs as used of our Lord's knowledge in these four passages. What distinction there is is perhaps one of tense—eidoš being the present, γνóις and ἐπιγνóις the aorist: γινώσκων, ἐπιγινώσκων, are not found in Mark. In other words, when Mark wanted to write a present participle, he used that of oída: when he was writing an aorist, he turned to γινώσκω or ἐπιγινώσκω. Just as with oída and γνώσθη, so with eidoš and γνóις, we construct the complete paradigm only by the help of the two verbs.

The practical identity of γινώσκω and ἐπιγινώσκω seems to be borne out by a comparison of vi 33 καὶ ἔγνωσάν πολλοί (if we read ἔγνωσαν with B D and fam. 1) καὶ πεξῄ... συνέδραμον and vi 54 εἶδοσ ἐπιγνώττες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον ...

C. H. Turner.

'ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ

A year ago Prof. Souter published in the Journal (Oct. 1926, xxviii 59) a passage of Plutarch illustrating the sense of ἀγαπητός for which I have pleaded in reference to the Gospels. Shortly before the appearance of Prof. Souter's note my friend the late Prof. A. H. Cruickshank, of the University of Durham, had communicated to me another passage from Plutarch where ἀγαπητός is conjoined with μόνος in the same sense: de genio Socratis 27 (Charon talking of his son) οὗτος (ἐπει) ὁ ἄνδρες ἕμοι μόνοι ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαπητός, ὡς λοτε.

C. H. Turner.


In one of the Additional Notes to Can we then Believe? Dr Gore deals with the problem of the 'shorter text' of St Luke's account of the Institution of the Eucharist. In this note the writer, with characteristic candour, records his abandonment of 'a preference for the longer text, as it is found in the A.V. and R.V.', and admits the force of the textual argument against that longer text, as presented by Dr Hort and Dr Sanday. But he still finds the problem of this passage insoluble. The shorter text appears to hold the field, yet 'on the other hand, it is difficult to suppose that St Luke should have been content to give an account of the Institution which ends so abruptly, and leaves it to be supposed that our Lord dealt with the cup before

1 In the Teubner edition of the Moralia, iii 539.
the bread, and should have omitted in connexion with the cup any reference to its sacramental meaning'.

Dr Gore is surely justified, alike in abandoning the 'longer text', and in feeling that the 'shorter text', as commonly presented, is extremely hard to accept and to understand. It is the purpose of this note to give reasons for thinking that a different 'shorter text' can be reconstructed, on the basis of the textual evidence, and that such a text is both likely to be what St Luke actually wrote, and also offers none of the difficulties which are involved in the acceptance of the reading found in Codex Bezae.¹

Before passing on to consider the textual evidence, I would call attention to a question which is more important than some scholars have appeared to realize. The Marcan narrative provided St Luke with the words οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἄμπελον ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίω καὶ ὁ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. Since Luke was purposing to add at a later point a reference to eating and drinking at the table of the Lord in His kingdom, he wrote down Mark xiv 25 in a shortened form—οὐ μὴ πίω... ἐως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ; but he also deliberately duplicated the whole utterance—ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα φαγεῖν... λέγω γὰρ ἡμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἐως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. What was the point of this duplication? This will appear more clearly later on; but it is to be noted that the effect of the duplication is to open the story of the Last Supper with a solemn and mysterious reference to (1) eating and (2) drinking. In the Textus Receptus this double reference is then repeated, in full liturgical form; whereas in the text of D the reference to drinking is followed only by a curiously abrupt account of the eucharistic breaking of the bread. Thus it is misleading to speak of that text as though it merely inverted the normal liturgical order, and placed the cup before the bread; it does not do so²; it merely adds a reference to bread and eating after

¹ The whole passage Luke xxii 14-23 was the subject of a very interesting study by Dr H. E. D. Blakiston which appeared in this JOURNAL in 1903 (vol. iv, pp. 548–555). Dr Blakiston, who was definitely inclined to prefer the 'longer text' to that of W-H, propounded the hypothesis that the whole section was 'not the Synoptic tradition with additional details perhaps affected by St Paul's version, but a deliberate, though intentionally incomplete, conflation of two distinct, independent, and perhaps equally original narratives of the Institution'. The acute arguments by which this hypothesis was supported do not concern me here; but it is interesting to find that the narrative which Dr Blakiston assigned to the Lucan source is exactly identical with the Lucan text towards which, as I believe, the textual evidence really points.

² The view here rejected is maintained by Loisy (Évangiles Synoptiques ii 528): 'le récit de Luc a toujours embarrassé les commentateurs, la bénéédiction de la coupe précédant celle du pain, sauf à revenir une seconde fois après le souper.' Loisy holds the common view that the Lucan account and order, as given in D &c., is to