X. Usage of Mark: (1) Titles of address to Christ; (2) Diminutives; (3) The verb at the end of the sentence; (4) ἢνα not of purpose only; (5) absence of λέγων (λέγοντες) before a statement or question, where the main verb seems sufficient to imply it.

As this series of notes draws to a close, each separate instalment becomes, almost inevitably, more miscellaneous in character. As some feature of St Mark's Gospel in relation to the other Synoptists strikes me, I proceed to group instances together, and to consider what general induction, if any, can be drawn from them. Many of the points have emerged in the course of the investigation into the 'agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark' on which I have been engaged in my Seminar for some years—an investigation now nearly complete. To the members of my Seminar (and I may be allowed to single out the Rev. R. H. Lightfoot of New College and the Rev. C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College) I owe very much, and I must not omit also to mention the expert help of Mr J. U. Powell of St John's College, on whose knowledge of the literature concerned with the history and development of the Greek language I draw whenever I am at a loss myself, and never draw in vain.

One characteristic of the present notes I should specially wish to emphasize, though I claim no finality for the conclusions which I have suggested, and that is the possibility that the Greek of St Mark has owed something, through his residence at Rome, to the influence of Latin. We all know that he transliterates Latin words more frequently than the other evangelists: but I suspect that Latin influence goes much farther than that, and I doubt whether writers on New Testament Greek have given adequate consideration to this side of their subject. I should like some one to treat systematically the Greek of Mark and of Hermas—both of them non-literary authors, both of them writing Greek in Rome—from this point of view.

My last instalment (IX: J. T. S. April 1928, xxix 275-289) was prepared under some pressure, during recovery from illness, and needs supplementing at two points.

i. Too late for insertion into my note on ἀποστερέω, pp. 275, 276, I consulted the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae under abnego, and the
reference there given to Wölfflin’s article in his Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie iv (1887) pp. 574–577. Wölfflin did not, I think, fully grasp the relation between abnega and ἀπουστείν in early Christian writers: but his collection of examples of abnega, as used of the refusal to return a sum deposited, is admirably full, and I complete my own list, loc. cit. p. 276, by the following:

Irenaeus adv. Haer. II xxxii i (xlviii 4) ‘non solum non abnegare quae sunt aliena, sed etiam si sua auferantur illis [?] aliis] non ex-postulare’.

Tertullian ad Scapulam 4 ‘Praeter haec depositum non abnegamus, matrimonium nullius adulteramus, pupillos pie tractamus, indigentibus refrigeramus, nulli malum pro malo reddimus’.

de fuga 12 ad fin. ‘Quid autem Deo debeo, sicut denarium Caesari, nisi sanguinem quem pro me fudit ipsius? quodsi Deo quidem hominem et sanguinem meum debeo, nunc uero in eo sum tempore ut quod Deo debeo expostuler. utique fraudem Deo facio, id agens ne quod debeo soluam: bene obseruaui praeceptum, Caesari reddens quae sunt Caesaris, Deo uero quae sunt Dei abnegans’.

In dealing with the compounds of ἐρχέσθαι (p. 289) I omitted εἰσπορεύεσθαι (Mark 8, Matthew 1, Luke 5). Mark i 21 (no parallels): iv 19 (Matthew omits, Luke substitutes ἐπεφύσει, but also changes the sense): v 40 (no parallels): vi 56 (Matthew omits; no parallel in Luke): vii 15, 18, 19, of the things that ‘go into’ a man (no parallel in Luke; Matt. 1° substitutes εἰσερχόμενον, 2° retains εἰσπορεύεσθαι, 3° omits): xi 2 (Matthew omits, Luke retains). Luke certainly does not dislike the form, for twice where Mark has εἰσέρχεσθαι (Mark x 23, xiv 14) he substitutes εἰσπορεύεσθαι. Matthew on the other hand, it seems, avoids very generally any compound of ἐπερεύεσθαι (though he shews no reluctance to use ἐπερεύεσθαι itself), preferring the compounds of ἐρχέσθαι, especially εἰσέρχεσθαι and προσέρχεσθαι.

(1) Titles used in addressing Christ.

i. Ὄμηβη (Ὅμηβωνη)


4. xiv 45 Ὄμηβη καὶ κατεβάλγας αὐτοῖς. Luke omits the address of Judas: Matthew, here only, retains the vocative Ὄμηβη.
ii. Διδάσκαλε

(Mark ten times: Matthew six: Luke twelve).

5. iv 38 Διδάσκαλε, οὗ μελεί σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; As in i above, Matthew has κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

6. ix 17 Διδάσκαλε, ἥγεγκα τὸν νῦν μου. Again Matthew substitutes κύριε: Luke retains διδάσκαλε, as in 8, 11, 12, 13, in each case because it is not a disciple who is speaking.

7. ix 38 Διδάσκαλε, εἰδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου... Luke ἐπιστάτα, for John is the speaker. No parallel in Matthew.

8. x 17 Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω... Both Luke (see on 6) and Matthew (as also in 11, 12) retain διδάσκαλε, for the reason given on 6 above.

9. x 20 Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφιλαξάμην... Omitted by the other two, no doubt because the formal address had been used only three verses before.


11. xii 14 (Pharisees and Herodians) ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Διδάσκαλε... So both the others: they had no objection to the word as used by other Jews than the disciples.

12. xii 19 (Sadducees) ἐπηρότων αὐτῶν λέγουσες Διδάσκαλε... So both the other two, for just the same reason as in the last case.

13. xii 32 ἐπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεύς Καλώς, διδάσκαλε... Retained by Luke again on the same principle as before: no parallel in Matthew.

14. xiii 1 Διδάσκαλε, ἵδε ποιαὶ λίθοι... The exclamation came from disciples, or a disciple, and so διδάσκαλε is avoided by Matthew: Luke, quite exceptionally, retains it in effect, for he inserts it two verses farther on.

iii. Κύριε

(Mark once, by a non-Jew: Matthew twenty-two times, of which four occur in our Lord's teaching about Himself: Luke eighteen times).

15. vii 28 Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης... And so, as we should expect, Matthew: there is no parallel in Luke. This unique occurrence of Κύριε in Mark is simply due to the fact that the woman was 'Ἐλληνικώς, a heathen, and therefore used not the Jewish term 'Rabbi', but the ordinary title of respect 'Sir'.

Κύριε is inserted, where Mark has no title of address, at i 40 by both Matthew and Luke, at xiv 19 by Matthew, at xiv 29 by Luke.
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iv. Ἰησοῦ

(Mark three times, but always with a further defining phrase, and twice in the mouth of evil spirits: Luke six times: Matthew never).

16. i 24 Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνε; So Luke: no parallel in Matthew.

17. v 7 Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ ιετοῦ τοῦ υφίστου; So again Luke: Matthew omits the personal name.

18. x 47 Υἱε Δαυείδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλεησόν με. Again Luke follows Mark, though he inverts the personal and the official name: again Matthew retains the latter, but again omits Ἰησοῦ: according to many MSS he has Κύριε also. If an explanation is wanted of this isolated usage of the address ‘Jesus’ in Mark, it should perhaps be found in the setting of the episode as a whole. It is full of details that give it a place by itself in St Mark’s Gospel: I believe it represents a story given viva voce by Bartimaeus to the evangelist, and therefore the phrase may well be that actually used by the man himself.

The deductions from the data here accumulated can be very briefly expressed. ‘Rabbi’, the Aramaic word, represented in Greek by δδδοσκαλος, would have been in fact the form of address used to our Lord by any Jew, whether a disciple or not: and so Mark uses it, reserving Κύριε for the solitary case where the speaker was not a Jew at all. But while Mark, or rather Peter, thus represents to us the language actually used in the days of our Lord’s Ministry, the writers of the second generation could not picture our Lord’s own disciples as addressing Him in the same way as those Jews did who were not His disciples: and therefore Matthew and Luke, while they retain the address Rabbi (Teacher) in the mouth of others than disciples—and Luke more consistently than Matthew—never allow it with disciples, save that Matthew keeps it in the case of Judas, no. 4, and Luke by exception in no. 14. Where Matthew and Luke differ, is just in this, that Matthew, when he substitutes another word, regularly employs Κύριε (1, 2, 5, 6); Luke only once changes to Κύριε (2), more often (1, 5, 7) to ἐπιστάτα. Ἐπιστάτα is only Lucan (six times in all): but even in Luke Κύριε is much more common, and no doubt both Matthew and Luke mean by Κύριε in this connexion not ‘Sir’ but ‘Lord’.

(2) Diminutives in Mark.

i. θυγάτριν

(twice in Mark: never in Matthew or Luke).


ii. ἰχθύδιον

(Mark once, Matthew once).

3. viii 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὄλγα. Retained in Matthew: there is no Luke.

iii. κοράσιον

(Mark five times, Matthew thrice: never in Luke).

4. 5. v 41, 42 Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγαρε. καὶ εὕθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον. Matthew omits the first, but retains the second, κοράσιον: but he also uses κοράσιον for the παιδίον of Mc. v 39. Luke changes the first κοράσιον to Ἡ πας, and omits the second.

6. vi 22 ὅ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τῷ κορασίῳ. The episode is absent from Luke, the word from Matthew.

7. 8. vi 28 ἐδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἐδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρί. Matthew retains the word on the first occasion, omits it on the second.

iv. κυνάριον

(Mark and Matthew twice each: not in Luke).

8. 9. vii 27, 28 λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν. ἡ δὲ ἀπεκράθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Κύριε, καὶ τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης... Not in Luke: Matthew has both the episode and the double mention of κυνάρια. Phrynichus (quoted by Wetstein: Rutherford New Phrynichus p. 268) says that κυνίδιον, not κυνάριον, is the correct form of the diminutive.

v. σανδάλιον

(once in Mark, but nowhere else in the Gospels).

10. vi 9 ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεμένονς σανδάλια. Not in either Matthew or Luke: Luke omits the item, perhaps because it breaks into the catalogue of things that the Apostles were not to take with them; Matthew more skilfully adapts it to the negative framework of the catalogue by substituting μηδὲ ὑποδήματα—if they were to wear 'little sandals', they were not to wear boots or shoes. The diminutive σανδάλιον is apparently commoner in Greek than the form σάνδαλον.

vi. ψιχίον

(once each in Mark and Matthew).

11. vii 28 καὶ τὰ κυνάρια... ἵθελον αὐτό τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων. And similarly the parallel in Matthew. Both ψιξ and ψιχίον appear to be rare words, but Suidas recognizes both forms: cod. D has ψιχίον in both Gospels.
vii. ὀτάριον

(once in Mark, followed by John: not in Matthew or Luke).

12. xiv 47 ἀφείλειν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὀτάριον. So ΝΒΔΙ; and in the parallel passage John xviii 10 ΝΒΧ*ΛΩ. The rest have ὠτίον, following Matthew. Luke has ὀς in xxii 50 without variant, in the next verse D (with the Old Latins) again gives ὀς, the other MSS ὠτίον. Of all examples of diminutives in Mark, this is the most instructive, for, in contrast to words like θυγάτριον κοράσιον παιδίον, ears of adults are more or less similar in size—we cannot suppose that Mark means that Malchus' ear was a particularly small one—and the diminutive must be due simply to the writer's fondness for that type of word. Moreover ὀτάριον is not only a diminutive, but a diminutive of a diminutive. ὀς is the classical form, and as such is used by Luke: ὠτίον is the first stage of change, occurs occasionally in the LXX, and was probably in common use in the κοινή (ὀς ἀττικὸς, ὠτίον ἐλληνικὸς is quoted from a grammarian by Wetstein on Matt. xxvi 51): ὀτάριον is a further stage of change, but is cited mainly from comic verse—it was doubtless only colloquial. It is typically Marcan, and John has followed Mark. The preservation of ὀτάριον in the Alexandrian text (with D in Mark, and W in John) is a striking testimony to their faithfulness, for it must have been just the word they would have liked to alter. Note that Matthew goes only one stage back in substituting ὠτίον, while Luke goes the whole way with ὀς.

One word, diminutive in form, is not included in the above list, namely παιδίον. All three Synoptists use it regularly, but again there is a significant distinction to be drawn: παις is used, though less frequently than παιδίον, in both Matthew and Luke, but it is nowhere found in Mark, and therefore παιδίον takes its place. Thus in the story of Jaeirus' daughter Mark has (besides θυγάτηρ, θυγάτριον, and κοράσιον) four instances of παιδίον, Matthew has θυγάτηρ and κοράσιον, Luke has θυγάτηρ and (twice) παις. The child was twelve years old, so that Luke made the dividing line between παις and παιδίον at an earlier point than twelve. Again in the miracle of ix 17-27 the boy healed had suffered ἐκ παιδιόθεν (v. 21), and therefore cannot have been a mere child: moreover he is brought to Christ, not carried (vv. 19, 20)—not to say that he is called by his father at the opening of the story (v. 17) 'my son': yet we have in Mark (v. 24) δ᾽ ἑγέρω τοῦ παιδίον. We are not surprised that both Matthew and Luke call the boy not παιδίον but παις. Clearly then there is no justification for translating the word

1 Mark 12; Matthew 18, but chapter ii accounts for just half the instances; Luke 13, and again about half in chapters i and ii. Thus Mark is the one of the three who, apart from the Infancy narratives, uses the word most.
in Mark 'little child', as R. V. in ix 36, 37, x 13, 14, 15: in ix 36, 37
A. V. rightly has 'child' 'children', and in x 13 'young children' of
A. V. is less incorrect than R. V.’s 'little children'.

In the result Mark’s fondness for diminutive forms is well estab­
lished; at least with ὀτρυφον and παιδίον, perhaps with other words, he
uses such forms without any necessarily diminutive sense about them.
Luke uses none of Mark’s diminutives at all except παιδίον, and that,
as we have just seen, as strictly diminutive in contrast with παῖς.
Matthew, as so often, takes an intermediate place. Put in other words,
Luke upholds a literary tradition stringently, Matthew makes some
concession to popular usage, Mark reproduces whole-heartedly the
colloquial talk of everyday life. The fondness for diminutives grows
with the growth of the language. They are absent from Homer: they
begin to abound in Aristophanes and the later comedians: in the first
century after Christ it must have been a conscious literary archaism to
avoid them.

(3) The verb at the end of the sentence, after noun or personal pronoun.

(a) with the verb ἀπτεσθαι

(Mark eleven, Matthew ten, Luke ten).

ἀπτεσθαι is thus a rather favourite word of Mark’s, and his fondness
for putting the verb after the pronoun (or noun) is specially noticeable
in relation to it, so that I have treated it separately.

1. i 41 ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἰησοῦ. Both Matthew and Luke
ἐκτείνας τὴν χείρα ἰησοῦ αὐτοῦ. Perhaps the caution should be given
that in Mark αὐτοῦ goes of course with ἰησοῦ and not with τὴν χείρα,
which according to Greek idiom (and Latin usage is similar) would
mean 'his hand' without the addition of any pronoun.

2. iii 10 ὅστε ἐπιπέπτειν αὐτῷ ᾧν αὐτοῦ ἀψωνεται ὅσοι εἴχον μάστιγας.
No parallel in Matthew: but Luke again changes the order τῶν ὥρων
ἐξήτων ἀπτεσθαί αὐτοῦ.

[ν 27 ἰησοῦ τῶν ἰματίων αὐτοῦ. So by exception (though the addi­
tion of τῶν ἰματίων makes the exception less marked), and so naturally
the other two Synoptists here retain the same order of words.]

3. ν 28 ἃν ἀψωμαι κάν τῶν ἰματίων αὐτοῦ. So the critical editions,
and so Matthew (Luke drops the verse): but Marcan usage makes it
more than probable that the Alexandrian reading—it is only found in
ςΒCLΔΘ—is an assimilation to the previous verse or to Matthew,

1 Luke, however, here (xviii 15) has βρέφη, interpreting Mark’s παιδία—rightly or
wrongly—in this sense. He also uses βρέφος four times in chapters i and ii, of the
babe in the womb or newly born: his terms for age are more clearly articulated
(as we should expect) than those of the other evangelists.
and that we ought to follow the rest of our authorities, including D and the Latins (it is true that Latins may be just following the idiom of their language), and invert the order καν των ἵματων αυτοῦ ἄφονα.

4. v 30 Τίς μου ἰδιατό τῶν ἵματων; Luke substitutes Τίς ὁ ἰδιαμενός μου; Matthew drops the verse.

5. v 31 καὶ λέγεις Τίς μου ἰδιατό; Matthew again gives no parallel: Luke, changing the interrogation to a statement, alters the order to ἰδιατό μου τίς.

6. vi 56 ἦνα καν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἵματων αυτοῦ ἄφωνα. No Luke: but Matthew makes the expected change ἦνα μόνον ἄφωνα τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἵματι τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

7. vi 56 ὅ καὶ ὤσοι ἦν ἰδιατό αὐτοῦ διεσώθησαν. But I suspect that with the Old Latins and Matthew (there is no Luke) we ought to omit αὐτοῦ. If Matthew had found αὐτοῦ in that position in his text of Mark, why in the world should he have omitted it?

[vii 33 πτύσας ἰδιατό τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ. Compare v 27 above: no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.]

8. viii 22 παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτοῖν ἦνα αὐτοῦ ἄφωνα. Again no parallels.

9. x 13 προσέφερον αὐτῶν παιδία ἦνα αὐτῶν ἄφωνα. So W-H with ΝΒCLΔΘ124 and Luke: Matthew ἦνα τῶς χειρας ἐπιθή αὐτοῖς. But Tischendorf in Mark has ἄφωνα αὐτῶν with the mass of authorities, including DW Old Latins and Origen. Decision is difficult: yet can we suppose that Luke found before him in Mark ἄφωνα αὐτῶν, and altered it to αὐτῶν ἄφωνα?

(b) Other instances in Mark of the verb placed last, after its object, or the noun after the pronoun depending on it.


12. iii 11 ὅταν αὐτῶν ἔθεωρον. No parallels.

13. iv 30 ἐν τίνι αὐτήν παραβολῇ θώμεν; No parallel in Matthew: Luke τίνι ὑποῖσσαν αὐτήν;


15. v 4 οἰδεὶς ἔχουσιν αὐτῶν δεμάσαι. No parallels.


17. vi 17 ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν. No parallel.

18. vi 20 ἡδεῖς αὐτοῦ ἢκονεν. Matthew in effect retains the construction while he alters the sense, ὅς προβήτην αὐτῶν ἔχον. No Luke.
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19. vii 18 οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινώσαται. No parallel.
20. ix 18 a ὅτιν. ἔάν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ. Matthew omits: Luke, though with a change to the direct construction, ἵνα πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτὸν.
22. ix 19 ἐς τότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; So in effect Matthew: Luke ἐς τότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς;
24. ix 37 ὅπε ἐν τῶν παιδίων τούτων δέξηται. Here both the other Synoptists transpose, ὅπε ἐν δέξηται ἐν παιδίων τοιοῦτο (Luke τούτῳ τὸ παιδίον).
26. x 32 ἥρατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν. Matthew and Luke both omit ἥρατο, but both put the personal pronoun last, εἴπεν αὐτοῖς, εἴπεν πρὸς αὐτούς.
27. xi 28 τίς σοι τὴν ἐξονισίαν ταύτην ἐδωκεν... Both Matthew and Luke transfer τὴν ἐξονισίαν ταύτην to the end, after the verb.
28. xii 12 a ἐξήτον αὐτὸν κρατήσαι. So Matthew: Luke ἐξήτησαν...
29. xii 12 b ὅτι πρὸς αὐτούς τὴν παραβολήν εἴπεν. Matthew omits the noun, Luke transposes it εἴπεν τὴν παραβολήν ταύτην.
32. xiv 1 πῶς αὐτοῦ... ἀποκτείνωσιν. So in substance Matthew, but with τὸν Ἰησοῦν for αὐτὸν: Luke τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτῶν.
36. xiv 14 ὅτου τὸ πάσχα... φάγω. Luke by exception agrees: it is here Matthew who inverts, ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα.
38. xiv 42 ὁ παραδοδοῦς μὲ ἠγγίκεν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew ἠγγίκεν ὁ παραδοδοῦς με. Strictly speaking this instance does not come
under the heading of verb and object, as ἀγγικέν is intransitive; but the change of order in Matthew seems significant.


40. xiv 63 τί ἐκεῖν ἔρθη μετὰ μαρτύρων; with Matthew. Even here, where change seems less necessary, Luke alters to τί ἐκεῖν ἔρθη μετὰ μαρτύριας χρείαν;

41. xiv 65 οἱ ἀπεκρίναντες ἐπόθρημαν αὐτὸν ἐβαλον. No parallels.

42. xiv 72 ἀλέκτωρ ἔφωνησεν, and so Matthew: but Luke ἔφωνησεν ἀλέκτωρ.

43. xv 31 ἄλλους ἐσωσεν, ἐαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. So Matthew, and the emphasis on ἄλλους . . . ἐαυτῶν seems to justify the order: but again Luke's instinct is for change, ἄλλους ἐσωσεν σωσάτω ἐαυτῶν.

44. xvi 7 ἐκεὶ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. Here, though Matthew follows Mark the order seems indefensible in Greek: but unfortunately there is no Lucan parallel.

It is not suggested that these instances are typical of Mark in the sense that this order of words is his normal usage: but they are not inconsiderable in number, and Luke's alteration of them in almost every case, whether instinctive or intentional, is certainly no mere accident—not even though the actual converse happens on occasion, as for instance (if our texts are correct) Mark xi 17 πεπονήκατε αὐτῶν στήλαιον λῃστῶν, where the others give αὐτῶν ἐποιείτε (ἐποιήσατε) στήλαιον λῃστῶν. In thirteen of our forty-four cases there is no Lucan parallel: of the remaining thirty-one, Luke makes the change to the normal Greek order of words in no less than twenty-nine, the exceptions being only 9, 36. Matthew, as so often, stands in between Mark and Luke, altering the Marcan order about as frequently as he leaves it unchanged; that is to say, out of twenty-eight cases where his text is parallel, he follows Mark in fourteen and diverges in thirteen (7 being a doubtful reading in Mark).

Whence did Mark derive his occasional use of an order of words so fundamentally alien to the Greek language? Greek puts the emphatic words in the forefront of the sentence, and the verb therefore cannot be left to the last. Latin, on the other hand, habitually closes the sentence with the verb. The conclusion seems irresistible that—just as Jerome in the Vulgate introduces a Graecizing order, putting words like eius, for instance, at the end of the sentence—Mark introduces in the Greek of his Gospel a Latinizing order. The influence which Mark's years of residence in Rome exercised over the development of
his literary Greek style (if one may use such a phrase about his Gospel at all) was doubtless not inconsiderable. The Greek he had picked up in his boyhood at Jerusalem was, we may assume, wholly non-literary and colloquial. That it came in a Latin-speaking city to such maturity as it attained, is suggested forcibly by the feature of it which we have now been examining.

(4) iva (Mark 1½ columns, Matthew barely 1, Luke 1; John nearly 3). But in the following list iva is only included when not used with its proper sense of purpose.

1. iii 9 καὶ ἐπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἦν πλουάριον προσκαρτερῆ αὐτῷ. No parallels.
3. v 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτόν πολλὰ . . . ἦν ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς—so I think Mark means to construct the ἦν (cf. 10). Matthew turns the sentence into oratio recta, ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες . . . Luke omits.
5. vi 8 καὶ παρῆγγελεν αὐτοῖς ἦν μηδὲν αἰρώσων εἰς ὅδὸν. Both the others substitute the oratio recta, μὴ κτήσησθε, μηδὲν αἴρετε.
6. vi 12 καὶ ἔσελθονες ἐκήρυξαν ἦν μετανοῶσιν. Luke omits the phrase: Matthew has no parallel.
8. vi 56 καὶ παρακάλουν αὐτὸν ἦν κἂν τοῦ κραστέου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἀψωνται. Here for the first time Matthew follows Mark.
9. vii 26 ἥψωτα αὐτὸν ἦν τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ . . . Matthew again substitutes the oratio recta.
10. vii 32 καὶ παρακαλοῦντιν αὐτὸν ἦν ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. Matthew omits the whole clause.
11. vii 36 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἦν μηδενὶ λέγοσιν. No parallel.
12. viii 22 καὶ παρακαλοῦντιν αὐτὸν ἦν αἰ τοῦ ἀψωτα. No parallel.
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15. ix 12 πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἦν πολλὰ πάθη. No parallel.


17. ix 30 καὶ οὖν ἦλθεν ἦν τις γυνή. Both the others omit the phrase.

18. x 35 θέλομεν ἦν ὅ ἦν αἰτήσωμεν σε ποιήσῃς ἥμιν. Matthew omits the clause, Luke the whole episode, including 19.

19. x 37 δὸς ἦμῖν ἦν εἰς σον εἴκ δεξιῶν . . . καθίσωμεν. And so Matthew, εἰπὲ ἦν καθίσωμοι . . .

20. x 48 καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ ἦν συνήση. So both Matthew and Luke, as in the next case.

21. x 51 ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς ἐπεν αὐτῷ Ὀραββώνι, ἦν ἀναβλέψω. I believe that the construction with ἦν depends (cf. no. 3) on the verb of the preceding verse θέλω ποιήσῃς. Both Matthew and Luke follow Mark closely here, and presumably constructed ἦν in the same way after θέλειν.

22. xi 16 καὶ οὖν ἦφιεν ἦν τις διενέχει σκέψοι διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. No parallels.

23. xi 28 ἢ τίς σου τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἐδωκέν ἦν ταύτα ποιής; The ἦν clause is strictly superfluous after ταύτην, and both Matthew and Luke seize on so good an excuse for omitting it.

24. xii 19 Μωνυσῆς ἔγραφεν ἦμῖν ὅτι ἦν . . . ἦν λάβῃ . . . It would appear that ἦν, which is not part of the O. T. quotation, must depend on ἔγραφεν. Matthew re-writes the quotation: Luke follows Mark, possibly supposing that ἦν λάβῃ was from the LXX.

25. xiii 34 καὶ τῷ θυρωφῷ ἐνετείλατο ἦν γρηγορῇ. No parallels.

26. xiv 12 ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἦν φάγης τὸ πάσχα; Luke omits the ἦν clause, Matthew substitutes the infinitive ἐταξάμενος.

27. xiv 35 προσοχέτο ἦν εἰ δυνατόν ἦστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἦ ἤρα. Where Mark as here, and occasionally elsewhere, makes a statement in oratio obliqua and follows it by the same thing in oratio recta, Matthew and Luke do not repeat both of the two but prefer that in oratio recta; Matthew, however, has clearly taken εἰ δυνατόν ἦστιν παρελθάτω from Mark's ἦν παρέλθῃ, so that in his case at least the ἦν clause is turned into a direct prayer.


0. xv 20 καὶ ἔξαγονσιν αὐτῶν ἦν σταυρώσωσιν. Both 30 and 29
could be rendered ‘in order that’, but in both cases the meaning is
just ‘to be crucified’ ‘to crucify’, and Matthew rightly interprets with
eis to steoatoavatar. There is no parallel in Luke.

31. xv 21 kai aγγαρεύοντω... Χιμωνα... ina ἕργ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.
As in 29 Matthew follows Mark: Luke substitutes an infinitive,
φέρεω.

Some of these instances of ina, and perhaps especially the last three,
are not so clearly non-purposive as the rest, and it is hardly surprising
that Matthew here and there (8, 13, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 31) accepts the
construction, as even Luke, though more rarely, does sometimes (16,
20, 21, 24). But the general instinct of both is to make a change,
Matthew twelve times out of twenty, Luke thirteen times out of
seventeen. Sometimes they merely omit: in other cases they sub­
stitute the oratio recta (so especially Matthew, five times: Luke twice)
or an infinitive (so especially Luke, four times: Matthew once or
twice).

But what then is the explanation of Mark’s fondness for ina after
verbs like παρακαλέων διαστέλλεσθαι παραγέλλειν ἐπιστμᾶν ἑντέλλεσθαι
and others? I cannot help thinking that we have here another illustra­
tion of the influence of the Latin of Rome on Mark’s Greek: for in
Latin we have rogo ut, oro ut, impero ut, moneo (admoneo) ut, suadeo
ut, and so on.

No doubt ina in the Koiné generally was coming into much more
general use than it had enjoyed in Attic Greek: any grammar of New
Testament Greek will illustrate the point that ina is no longer confined
to the sense of purpose, and references need not be accumulated here.
But writers on New Testament Greek are (naturally) inclined to exag­
gerate the extent to which it is a single self-contained whole: if these
‘notes on Marcan usage’ have done nothing else, they have, I hope,
established the result that the Greek of one of the three Synoptic
writers does shew broad, almost fundamental, differences from the
Greek of the other two. And the more we emphasize the enlarged use
of ina throughout the range of the Koiné, the more pressing, as it seems
to me, is the need for accounting for the contrast in this respect
between Mark and Luke. If Mark’s extended use of ina is not to be
explained as a vulgarism, some other way of explaining it must be
sought.

Now there are two or three directions in which recent investigations
cited in Moulton’s Prolegomena to the Grammar of N. T. Greek (1906)
offer instructive parallels. Thumb (Moulton, p. 205) concludes that
there were two rival tendencies, with a geographical dividing line
between them, in this matter, Asiatic Greek leaning to a larger use of
the infinitive, Western and European Greek to the universalizing of ἰνα (it will be noted that Luke, as pointed out above, sometimes replaces the ἰνα of Mark by an infinitive), the European use having in modern Greek ousted the other alternative. To a similar result are we led by Kälker's emphasis (Moulton, p. 206) on the frequency of ἰνα in Polybius—for Polybius spent a large proportion of the years of his adult life in Italy. Add to this that Mark has been shewn, half a dozen pages back, to adopt, often enough to call for explanation, an order of words in his Greek which is not a Greek order but a Latin: and I submit that the thesis needs consideration that his exaggerated use of ἰνα should be traced back to the same source, his years of residence in Rome. 1

These scholars who, like Moulton himself (p. 20) 1 and Rademacher (Neutestamentliche Grammatik p. 11), restrain within very narrow limits the influence of Latin on Hellenistic and New Testament Greek have perhaps not sufficiently investigated the possibility of this influence being specially great in individual writers such as St Mark: and it is only with regard to St Mark in contrast to the other two Synoptists that I plead for a reconsideration of the case.

(5) Absence of λέγων (λέγοντες) after verbs introducing a statement or a question, where Matthew and Luke add or substitute it.

i. ἀγανακτέων


ii. ἀπεκρίνεσθαι


iii. βοῶν

5. xv 34 ἔβοησεν δ' Ἡροδών φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἡλει Ἡλει . . . Matthew ἀνεβόησεν δ' Ἡροδών φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων . . . No parallel in Luke: but cf. no. 3.

1 Moulton (p. 21 and p. 21 n. 3) admits that some writers are more disposed than he is himself to allow some place to Latin influence, e.g. Blass Grammatik des NTlichen Griechisch p. 4; and on more general lines W. Schulze Graeca Latina.
iv. διαλογίζεσθαι

6. ii 6 διαλογίζομενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς αὐτῶν Τί οὗτος οὗτος λαλεῖ; Luke ἢδεν οὐ γέρα διαλογίζεσθαι λέγοντες Τίς... Matthew εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς οὕτως...


v. διαστέλλεσθαι


vi. ἐπερωτάω (ἐρωτάω)

9. v 9 ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν Τί ὁνοματός σοι; Luke ἐπερώτησεν αὐτὸν ὅ Ἰ. λέγων Τί σοι ὁνομα ἢστιν; Nothing parallel in Matthew.


11. viii 5 ἢρώτα αὐτοῖς Πόσους ἐχετε ἄρτους; Matthew substitutes λέγει for ἢρώτα. There is no Luke.

12. viii 29 ἐπηρώτα ἀυτοῖς 'Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Matthew and Luke substitute λέγει (ἐπέν) for ἐπηρώτα.

13. ix 28 κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτῶν ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐδυναθήμεν ἐκβάλειν αὐτῷ; Once more Matthew κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπον Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς... No parallel to this verse in Luke.

14. x 2 ἐπηρώτων αὐτῶν Εἰ ἐξεστὶν ἀνθρᾶ ὑναίκα ἀπολύει; πειράζοντες αὐτῶν. Matthew προσῆλθον αὐτῷ... πειράζοντες αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες Εἰ ἐξεστὶν... Again no Luke.

15. x 17 προσθέαραμών εἰς καὶ γοναπετήσας αὐτῶν ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν Διδάσκαλος... Luke adds λέγων (ἐπηρώτησεν τις αὐτῶν ἄρχων λέγων Διδάσκαλος...), Matthew as elsewhere substitutes εἶπεν (εἰς προσέλθον αὐτῷ εἶπεν Διδάσκαλος...).

16. xii 28 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτῶν Ποια ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρῶτη... Matthew for once repeats Mark's phrase; Luke, in a more or less parallel passage, substitutes ἀνέστη... λέγων.

17. xiii 3 ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος... Εἰς τὸν ἡμῶν πότε... Both Matthew and Luke add λέγοντες: Luke keeps ἐπηρώτησαν, for which Matthew has his favourite phrase προσῆλθον αὐτῷ.

18. xv 2 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτῶν ὁ Πελάτος Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἱ.; Both the others retain the verb (Luke ἢρώτησεν), but both add λέγων.

[vii. ἐπιτιμάω

19. i 25 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Φιλιώθητι καὶ ἐξακολούθησε. So Tischendorf with Ν*Α*, but the rest agree with Luke ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰ. λέγων... , and that may probably be right: though the caution must
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be given that the Old Latins frequently add *dicens* where Mark's text is without it (so *ē* in ix 29, x 17, xii 28, xv 2: not in x 2, xiii 3), presumably following the idiom of their language.]

viii. κατακρίνειν

20. xiv 64 *ο* *δὲ πάντες κατέκρινον αὐτὸν ἐν χορὸν εἶναι θανάτου.* Matthew turns it with *λέγειν* into the *oratio recta* oi *δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· ἔνοχος θανάτου ἔστιν.* No parallel in Luke.

[x. κηρύσσειν

21. i 14, 15 κηρύσσον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι Πεπλήρωσεν ὁ καιρός... So again Tischendorf with *N* c Origen, against the rest, who add λέγων or καὶ λέγων before ὅτι; Matthew ἥρετο κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν. Once more, as with ἐπιτιμάν, the want of clear Marcan parallels weights the balance against the reading of *N.*]

xi. κράζω (with λέγειν, however, 5/8)


23. 24. xv 13, 14 ἐκραζαν· Σταύρωσον αὐτὸν... περισσῶς ἐκραζαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. Here Matthew has λέγονσιν πάντες... περισσῶς ἐκραζῶν λέγοντες; Luke has ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες on the first occasion, and phrases the second differently.

x. λαλεῖν

25. xiv 31 *ο* *δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἔλαλει. Ἐάν δέη με συναποθανείν σοι...* Matthew λέγει αὐτῷ ο Ἐπιτροπάς Ἐν δέη με... , and so Luke, though he has only a rougher parallel, ὅ δὲ ἐπέν αὐτῷ.

Perhaps no very striking results emerge. Nearly half the instances cited are in connexion with a single verb ἐκπερισσῶς (ἐρωτάω), and here we may safely say that Mark uses it without λέγω, the other two tend either to add λέγω (so Luke 4/6) or to substitute it (so Matt. 7/9). As to the remaining ten verbs, it is not meant to be suggested that Mark's normal usage is to employ them without λέγω: but even if the instances are exceptional, they are at the same time numerous enough to justify the impression that he can on occasion use any verb which implies 'saying' without adding the actual phrase 'saying', while with Matthew and Luke the rule is almost absolute the other way. And just as with Mark's ἐκπερισσῶς, so with the other verbs, Matthew prefers the substitution of λέγω, Luke the addition. Mark's omission of λέγω is no Latinism, but is probably just colloquial rather than literary language. But it accounts for some half-dozen of these agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark which have disturbed the judgement of so many critics.

C. H. TURNER.