

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 ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου . . . καὶ ἔσθων ἀκρίδας. 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 . . . πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, '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 ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, 'was teaching'. The only case where both Matthew and Luke retain the Marcan construction.

4. i 33 ἦν ὅλη 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 \aleph B L ἦλθεν, 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 ἦσαν δὲ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι, 'were sitting there and discussing'. Matthew alters: Luke retains ἦσαν καθήμενοι, but removes it to the opening of the story, v 17.

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

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

9. v 5 ἦν κράζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις, 'continually, night and day . . . he was crying out and cutting himself . . .' The verse is dropped in both derivative accounts.

10. v 11 ἦν 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 ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδιά πεπωρωμένη. No parallels.

12. ix 4 καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Both Matthew and Luke alter, Luke to the imperfect συνελάλουν, Matthew by suppressing ἦσαν and connecting the participle with the preceding verb.

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

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

15. x 32 b καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. No parallels.

16. xiv 4 ἦσαν ἀεὶ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς. No parallel in Luke: Matthew alters to the aorist.

17. xiv 40 ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι. 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 καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων. Altered by Luke to a participle, ὄντος μου (avoiding two verbs connected with καί), by Matthew, because he disliked the construction, to ἐκαθεζόμεν.

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 ὁ λεγόμενος 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 \aleph B D (not d) θ , a, 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.

22. xv 40 ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι. Retained by Matthew, probably for the reason suggested on no. 10 above: altered by Luke.

23. xv 43 ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος 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 ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας, 'which was hewn out' A.V. rightly: R.V. which had rendered the idiom rightly in I, 4, II, 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 ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ, Luke to the shorter but perhaps more ambiguous phrase ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ.

The number of instances cited shews 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 ἄνθρωπον κτλ., or v 30 ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἔλεγεν Τίς μου ἤψατο; 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 ἦν 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, ἦν with present participle and ἤρξατο 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 ἄρχομαι (ἤρξατο ἤρξαντο) with present infinitive as auxiliary for the imperfect (Matthew 10 times, Mark 26, Luke 18).*

1. i 45 ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν . . . Matthew omits the verse : Luke has a (roughly parallel) imperfect.

2. ii 23 οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὀδὸν ποιεῖν τιλλόντες . . . Matthew retains ἤρξαντο : Luke again substitutes an imperfect.

3. iv 1 καὶ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. Both Matthew and Luke omit the phrase.

4. v 17 καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν . . . Both the other Synoptists change into an aorist.

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

6. vi 2 καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ. No parallel in Luke : Matthew gives the imperfect.

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

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

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

10. viii 11 καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συνζητεῖν 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 ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ . . . Retained by Matthew : Luke has an aorist participle.

12. viii 32 καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ. So also Matthew : Luke omits the episode.

13. x 28 ἤρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ. In both the other accounts εἶπεν.

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

15. x 41 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο 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 ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν substitutes the aorist ἠγανάκτησαν.

16. x 47 (of Bartimaeus) ἤρξατο 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 ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας. Matthew again has the aorist: Luke by exception (and so in no. 18) retains the Marcan phrase.

18. xii 1 καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν Ἀμπελῶνα 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 ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. 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 ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Matthew retains ἤρξαντο: 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?'

21. xiv 33 ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν. Matthew once more retains ἤρξατο: Luke omits the whole verse.

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

23. xiv 69 καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἤρξατο 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 ἤρξατο 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 ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι The verse has nothing corresponding to it in the other two accounts.

26. xv 18 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτόν. Cf. no. 22: there, as here, Matthew has, instead of ἤρξαντο, an aorist. No parallel in Luke.

Out of these twenty-six instances, there are parallels in Matthew to nineteen, in Luke to fifteen: Matthew gets rid of ἤρξα(ν)το 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.

iii. *The verb δύναμαι as auxiliary (altogether Matthew 27 times, Mark 33, Luke 26).*

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 *ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι εἰς πόλιν φανερώς εἰσελθεῖν*. There was no physical impossibility: A.V., R.V., rightly 'could no more'. No parallel in Matthew or Luke.

2. iii 20 *ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μηδὲ ἄρτον φαγεῖν*. No parallels: but cf. Mark vi 31 *οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν* 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 στήναι . . . οὐ δύναται στήναι*. 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 *ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν*. Matthew retains Mark's construction but substitutes *ἐλθεῖν* for *δύνασθαι*: Luke turns the clause into a statement of fact *καὶ . . . κατεσκήνωσεν*. 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 ἠδύναντο*

ἀκούειν. 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 οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι 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 ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν (cf. v. 18). No parallel in Luke: Matthew substitutes the simple κοινῶ, because 'can defile' hardly means more here than 'does defile'.

8. ix 39 οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογήσάί 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 ἡδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον παρῆναι . . . So Matthew: no parallel in Luke. 'Might have been sold' A.V. and R.V., rightly.

10. xiv 7 ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε . . . εὖ ποιῆσαι. 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 ἰσχύω 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 οὐκ ἰσχυσαν, both the other Synoptists substitute οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν, perhaps from οὐκ ἡδυνήθημεν of Mark ix 28. Did the father use a stronger word than the apostles?

iv. *The verb θέλω as auxiliary (altogether Matthew 39 times, Mark 25, Luke 28).*

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 θέλομεν: Mark vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῶς μοι is really mistranslated by the 'I will' of both A.V. and R.V.: x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν 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 ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο, 'she would have killed him, but could not' (A.V. is right: R.V. 'desired to kill him' is wrong); vii 24 οὐδένα ἤθελεν γινῶναι καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν, 'he would have remained incognito, but could not'; xiv 7 ὅταν θέλῃτε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς πάντοτε εἶποιήσαι, '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 ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς, 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 οὓς ἤθελεν 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 ἤθελεν, and so for A.V. 'whom he would' I would substitute 'whom he willed'.

vi 26 οὐκ ἠθέλησεν ἀθετηῆσαι 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 εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν. A.V. is right with 'will come after me', rather than R.V. with 'would come after me'. Note that in the next verse ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ σῶσαι is strictly parallel to ὃς δ' ἂν 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 θέλω is *practically* an auxiliary verb, and nothing else. So ix 35, x 43.

ix 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον. Both A.V. and R.V. 'what they listed': that is, in modern English, 'what they liked'. Not 'what they willed'.

x 36 τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν; Our authorities vary a good deal in these words, but the reading is borne out by x 51 τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω; xiv 12 ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες εἰποιάσωμεν; xv 9 θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν; and possibly xv 12 τί οὖν [θέλετε] ποιήσω; 'What would ye I should do?' or in more modernized English 'What do you want me to do?'¹ The extraordinary reading of $\aleph B \Psi$ in x 36 τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω ὑμῖν; is relegated to the margin of W-H, and must presumably be a conflation between two readings ποιήσω and με ποιῆσαι.

xii 38 τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελότων 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 θέλω ἵνα.² It is found three times in Mark, vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἐξαυτῆς δῶς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάνου, ix 30 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ, x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν, 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 ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε (καθὼς θέλετε) ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, where perhaps the phrase of Q was already so ingrained in Christian use as not to permit of change: once in John, xvii 24. Now θέλω νά is the modern Greek for the future tense: obviously the κοινή of the first century A.D. was already moving in that direction, and Mark of all the Evangelists most nearly represents the κοινή unaffected by literary tradition. The usage of auxiliary verbs was already beginning to establish itself.

v. *The verb ἔχω (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 ἔχω, which shares with the words hitherto treated a disproportionate frequency of usage in

¹ In ix 5 the ordinary texts give καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, and Luke too has καὶ ποιήσωμεν: but Matthew has εἰ θέλεις ποιήσω, and whence did he derive εἰ θέλεις, unless he read in Mark either θέλεις ποιήσω with D b ff i, or θέλεις ποιήσωμεν with Θ *Sam* 13 565? 'Would you like us to make three tabernacles?'

² The use of 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: iii 1 ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα, viii 17 πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; That does a little bit suggest *arefactam habens manum*, and Matthew and Luke both instinctively substitute the adjective ξηρά 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 ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. So Matthew: but Luke gets rid of ἔχων by writing ἦν 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 πράσσοντας 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 χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν . . . ἰατροῦ . . . οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες—probably a proverbial phrase, and for that reason also more difficult of change.

3. ii 19 ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφῖον 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 ᾧ ὁ νυμφῖος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν. But the use with εἶναι is the use satisfactory to Luke, cf. i, 5, 9, 13.

4. ii 25 χρεῖαν ἔσχεν. Omitted by Matthew and Luke, and characteristically Marcan: but quite classical with a genitive following, ii 17, xi 3, xiv 63, and retained on each occasion by both Matthew and Luke.

5. iii 1, 3 ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα (see above, at the top of the page), τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν: on the first of the two occasions Luke vi 6 substitutes ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά, cf. i, 3. See the next note.

6. iii 10 ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας, cf. iii 22 Βεεζεβοὺλ ἔχει, iii 30 πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει, v 15 τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα, vii 25 εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον

αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ix 17 ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἄλαλον. Of these six cases of ἔχειν neither Matthew nor Luke (where they have parallels at all) retain any one. Luke paraphrases with οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ὑπὸ . . . ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν (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 οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν. Both Matthew and Luke substitute the cognate verb ἀφίεσθαι. 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 οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, οὐκ ἔχουσι ῥίζαν. 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 ἔρχεσθαι.

9. iv 40 οὐπω 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 ἢ πίστις ὑμῶν;

10. v 3 τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. Again Luke changes noun with ἔχειν to verb ἔμενεν, viii 27.

11. v 23 ἐσχάτως ἔχει. A colloquial phrase, unique in N. T., and condemned by purists as not found in Attic writers: see Rutherford *The New Phrynicus* p. 481. Both Matthew and Luke alter it.

12. vi 34 ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, '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 ἔστιν ποιμήν (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 εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλείον ἢ . . . But in viii 16, 17 ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσι, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε (no Lucan parallel), Matthew substitutes ἐλάβομεν, ἐλάβετε.

14. ix 50 ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλα. No parallel: but perhaps Matthew's ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ τὸ ἄλας τῆς γῆς (Matt. v 13) represents the Q form of the same Saying.

15. x 21 ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, 22 ἦν 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 ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα, while Matthew retains in substance the second (with κτήματα

for *χρήματα*) but changes the first to *πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα* and the third to *πλούσιος*. Obviously the common instinct of both was to modify at some point or another Mark's superabundant use of *ἔχειν* in this context.

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

17. xii 6 *ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν*. 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 *εἶχεν υἱόν*, but *ἦν αὐτῷ υἱός*.

18. xiv 8 *ὃ ἔσχεν ἐποίησεν*, '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 ὃ ἔσχεν . . .* 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 ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις*, 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

εἰδέναι, γινώσκειν, ἐπιγινώσκειν, substantially identical in sense in Mark.

We are all familiar with the distinction in classical Greek between *εἰδέναι* 'to know by intuition' and *γινώσκω* '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 *οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;* (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 *εἰδέναι* in N. T.: *εἰδήσω* is only once found (Heb. viii 11), and that in a quotation from the LXX. But if *γνώσομαι* is used as the future of *εἰδέναι*—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 ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἵαται ἀπὸ τῆς μᾶστιγος . . . εἰδῶτα ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῆ.

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 γινώσκω may tend to be used where the sphere of knowledge, σώματι or πνεύματι, is expressed.

3. xiii 28, 29 ; 33, 35 γινώσκειται ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν . . . γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις . . . οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς [ἐστίν] . . . 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 γινώσκετε: cf. iv 27, ix 6, x 38, xi 33, xii 24, xiii 32, xiv 40.

4. xii 12 ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν, and xv 10 ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτόν (where Matthew at any rate thought that ἦδει was the proper word to use) contrasted with ii 10 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας and xi 32 ἅπαντες γὰρ ἠδείσαν τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν. Here I read ἠδείσαν confidently with D W @ 565 700 and O. L. including *k*: for (i) the alternative reading εἶχον is easily explained as introduced from Matthew, (ii) ἠδείσαν suits better than εἶχον 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 γινούς, ἐπιγινούς, εἰδώς, as used of our Lord.

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

v 30 καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγινούς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξεληθούσαν . . .

viii 17 καὶ γινούς λέγει αὐτοῖς τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε ;

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

¹ Even if εἰδώς is not the correct reading in this passage, the participle reappears in v 33 (quoted above) and vi 20 of Herod ἐφοβείτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδώς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον. So for the other two verbs cf. vi 54 εὐθὺς ἐπιγινόντες αὐτόν and xv 45 γινούς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυριῶνος.

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—*εἰδώς* being the present, *γνούς* and *ἐπιγνούς* the aorist: *γινώσκων*, *ἐπιγινώσκων*, are not found in Mark. In other words, when Mark wanted to write a present participle, he used that of *οἶδα*: when he was writing an aorist, he turned to *γινώσκω* or *ἐπιγινώσκω*. Just as with *οἶδατε* and *γινώσεσθε*, so with *εἰδώς* and *γνούς*, 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 ἔγνωσαν πολλοί* (if we read *ἔγνωσαν* with B D and *fam.* 1) *καὶ περὶ ἧ . . . συνέδραμον* and vi 54 *εἰθὺς ἐπιγινόντες αὐτὸν περιέδραμον . . .*

C. H. TURNER.

'ΑΓΑΠΗΤΌΣ

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* 27¹ (Charon talking of his son) *οὗτος (εἶπεν) ὁ ἄνδρες ἐμοὶ μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἀγαπητός, ὡς ἴστε.*

C. H. TURNER.

THE 'SHORTER TEXT' OF ST LUKE XXII 15-20.

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 πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ 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 πῖω . . . ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ; but he also deliberately duplicated the whole utterance—ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα φαγεῖν . . . λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως 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 bénédiction 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