

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

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

NOTES AND STUDIES

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

(continued).

- X. *Usage of Mark*: (1) *Titles of address to Christ*; (2) *Diminutives*; (3) *The verb at the end of the sentence*; (4) *iva 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 ἀποστρέφειν, pp. 275, 276, I consulted the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* under *abnego*, and the

reference there given to Wölflin's article in his *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie* iv (1887) pp. 574-577. Wölflin did not, I think, fully grasp the relation between *abnego* and ἀποστρεφῆν in early Christian writers: but his collection of examples of *abnego*, 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 1 (xlviii 4) 'non solum non abnegare quae sunt aliena, sed etiam si sua auferantur illis [?] aliis] non expostulare'.

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 filius 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 teo: bene obseruauit praeceptum, Caesari reddens quae sunt Caesaris, Deo uero quae sunt Dei abnegans'.

ii. In dealing with the compounds of πορεύεσθαι (p. 289) I omitted εἰσπορεύεσθαι (Mark 8, Matthew 1, Luke 5). Mark i 21 (no parallels): iv 19 (Matthew omits, Luke substitutes πορευόμενοι, 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^o substitutes εἰσερχόμενον, 2^o retains εἰσπορευόμενον, 3^o omits): xi 2 (Matthew omits, Luke retains). Luke certainly does not dislike the form, for twice where Mark has εἰσερχεσθαι (Mark x 23, xiv 14) he substitutes εἰσπορεύεσθαι. Matthew on the other hand, it seems, avoids very generally any compound of πορεύεσθαι (though he shews no reluctance to use πορεύεσθαι itself), preferring the compounds of ἔρχεσθαι, especially εἰσερχεσθαι and προσέρχεσθαι.

(1) *Titles used in addressing Christ.*

i. 'Παββεΐ ('Παββουνεΐ)

(*Mark four times: Matthew once [by Judas]: Luke never.*)

1. ix 5 'Παββεΐ, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι. Matthew κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

2. x 51 'Παββουνεΐ, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω. Matthew and Luke κύριε.

3. xi 21 'Παββεΐ, ἴδε ἡ σικκῆ ἣν κατηράσω ἐξήρανται. Matthew changes the form of the sentence: no parallel in Luke.

4. xiv 45 'Παββεΐ: καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. Luke omits the address of Judas: Matthew, here only, retains the vocative 'Παββεΐ.

ii. Διδάσκαλε

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

5. iv 38 Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα; As in 1 above, Matthew has κύριε, Luke ἐπιστάτα.

6. ix 17 Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν 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, εἶδαμέν 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 ἐφυλαξάμην . . . Omitted by the other two, no doubt because the formal address had been used only three verses before.

10. x 35 Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἴνα ὁ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμεν . . . Omitted by Matthew: no parallel in Luke.

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) ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες Διδάσκαλε . . . So both the other two, for just the same reason as in the last case.

13. xii 32 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε . . . Retained by Luke again on the same principle as before: no parallel in Matthew.

14. xiii 1 Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε ποταποὶ 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 Ἑλληνίς, 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.

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 ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; So Luke: no parallel in Matthew.

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

18. x 47 Υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν 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 διδάσκαλος, 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. θυγάτριον

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

1. v 23 τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει. Both Matthew and Luke substitute θυγάτηρ.

2. vii 25 ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον. Matthew again θυγάτηρ: no Lucan parallel.

ii. ἰχθύδιον

(Mark once, Matthew once).

3. viii 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα. 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, ἔγειρε. καὶ εὐθὺς 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 παῖς, and omits the second.

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

7, 8. vi 28 ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ· καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν 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 ἀπεκρίθη 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 ὑποδεδεμένους 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 . . . ἐσθίουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων. And similarly the parallel in Matthew. Both ψίξ and ψιχίον appear to be rare words, but Suidas recognizes both forms: cod. D has ψιχων in both Gospels.

vii. ὠτάριον

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

12. xiv 47 ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον. So **N B D 1**; and in the parallel passage John xviii 10 **N B C* L W**. The rest have ὠτίον, following Matthew. Luke has οὖς in xxii 50 without variant, in the next verse D (with the Old Latins) again gives οὖς, 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 ὠτάριον is not only a diminutive, but a diminutive of a diminutive. οὖς 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 (οὖς ἀπτικῶς, ὠτίον ἑλληνικῶς is quoted from a grammarian by Wetstein on Matt. xxvi 51): ὠτάριον 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 ὠτάριον 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 οὖς.

One word, diminutive in form, is not included in the above list, namely *παιδίον*. All three Synoptists use it regularly,¹ but again there is a significant distinction to be drawn: *παῖς* 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 Jæirus' daughter Mark has (besides *θυγάτηρ*, *θυγάτριον*, and *κοράσιον*) four instances of *παιδίον*, Matthew has *θυγάτηρ* and *κοράσιον*, Luke has *θυγάτηρ* and (twice) *παῖς*. The child was twelve years old, so that Luke made the dividing line between *παῖς* and *παιδίον* at an earlier point than twelve. Again in the miracle of ix 17-27 the boy healed had suffered ἐκ παιδιότητος (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) ὁ πατήρ τοῦ παιδίου. We are not surprised that both Matthew and Luke call the boy not *παιδίον* but *παῖς*. 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'.¹

In the result Mark's fondness for diminutive forms is well established ; at least with *ὑπάριον* 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 ἄπτεσθαι*

(*Mark eleven, Matthew ten, Luke ten.*)

ἄπτεσθαι 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.

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

2. iii 10 *ὥστε ἐπιπίπτει αὐτῷ ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἀψωνται ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας*. No parallel in Matthew : but Luke again changes the order *πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτουν ἄπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ*.

[v 27 *ἤψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ*. So by exception (though the addition of *τοῦ ἱματίου* makes the exception less marked), and so naturally the other two Synoptists here retain the same order of words.]

3. v 28 *ἐὰν ἀψωμαι κἀν τῶν ἱματίων 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 \aleph B C L Δ Θ —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 *κὰν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ ἄψωμαι*.

4. v 30 *Τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων*; Luke substitutes *Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου*; Matthew drops the verse.

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

6. vi 56 *ἵνα κὰν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται*. No Luke: but Matthew makes the expected change *ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ*.

7. vi 56 *β καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἤψαντο 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 *πύσας ἤψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ*. Compare v 27 above: no parallel in either Matthew or Luke.]

8. viii 22 *παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἄψηται*. Again no parallels.

9. x 13 *προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδιά ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄψηται*. So W-H with \aleph B C L Δ Θ 124 and Luke: Matthew *ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς*. But Tischendorf in Mark has *ἄψηται αὐτῶν* with the mass of authorities, including D W Old Latins and Origen. Decision is difficult: yet can we suppose that Luke found before him in Mark *ἄψηται αὐτῶν*, and altered it to *αὐτῶν ἄψηται*?

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

10. i 44 *σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ*. So Matthew: but Luke *δεῖξον σεαυτόν*.

11. ii 5, 9 *ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι*, with Matthew: Luke *ἀφένονται σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου*.

12. iii 11 *ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν*. No parallels.

13. iv 30 *ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν*; No parallel in Matthew: Luke *τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτὴν*;

14. iv 41 *ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούει*. So in effect Matt.: Luke again inverts verb and personal pronoun, *ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ*.

15. v 4 *οὐδείς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι*. No parallels.

16. v 10 *ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ . . .* No parallel in Matthew: Luke *ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς . . .*

17. vi 17 *ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν*. No parallel.

18. vi 20 *ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν*. Matthew in effect retains the construction while he alters the sense, *ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον*. No Luke.

19. vii 18 οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι. No parallel.
20. ix 18 a ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ. Matthew omits: Luke, though with a change to the direct construction, ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν.
21. ix 18 b ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν. Omitted by Matthew: Luke again transposes, ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό.
22. ix 19 ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; So in effect Matthew: Luke ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς;
23. ix 32 ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσαι. Matthew has another phrase: Luke transposes ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτήσαι αὐτόν.
24. ix 37 ὃς ἂν ἐν τῶν παιδίων τούτων δέξηται. Here both the other Synoptists transpose, ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ἐν παιδίῳ τοιοῦτο (Luke τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον).
25. x 2 εἰ ἕξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολύσαι. No Luke: but Matthew ἀπολύσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ.
26. x 32 ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λεγεῖν. Matthew and Luke both omit ἤρξατο, but both put the personal pronoun last, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς.
27. xi 28 τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν: . . . Both Matthew and Luke transfer τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην to the end, after the verb.
28. xii 12 a ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι. So Matthew: Luke ἐζήτησαν . . . ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας.
29. xii 12 b ὅτι πρὸς αὐτούς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν. Matthew omits the noun, Luke transposes it εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.
30. xii 13 ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ. So Matthew: but Luke ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου.
- 31 (cf. 23). xii 34 οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσαι. Matthew ἐπερωτήσαι αὐτὸν οὐκέτι, Luke ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν.
32. xiv 1 πῶς αὐτὸν . . . ἀποκτείνωσιν. So in substance Matthew, but with τὸν Ἰησοῦν for αὐτόν: Luke τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν.
33. xiv 10 ἵνα αὐτὸν προδοῖ [παραδοῖ] αὐτοῖς. Both the others invert dative and accusative: Luke τὸ πῶς αὐτοῖς παραδῶ αὐτόν, Matthew ἐγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν.
34. xiv 11 πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαιρῶς παραδοῖ. So Matthew ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῶ: but Luke εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτόν.
35. xiv 12 ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον. No parallel in Matthew: but Luke ἐν ἧ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.
36. xiv 14 ὅπου τὸ πάσχα . . . φάγω. Luke by exception agrees: it is here Matthew who inverts, ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα.
37. xiv 30 τρεῖς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. Both the other Synoptists invert: Matthew τρεῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ με, Luke τρεῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με.
38. xiv 42 ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικεν. No parallel in Luke: Matthew ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με. Strictly speaking this instance does not come

under the heading of verb and object, as ἤγγικεν is intransitive ; but the change of order in Matthew seems significant.

39. xiv 47 ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ δάριον. So Matthew : but Luke ἀφείλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν. Possibly Mark meant αὐτοῦ to depend upon ἀφείλεν, and if so his phrase would stand : but certainly Luke interpreted him in the other sense.

40. xiv 63 τί ἐτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων ; with Matthew. Even here, where change seems less necessary, Luke alters to τί ἐτι ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας χρεῖαν ;

41. xiv 65 οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔβαλον. No parallels.

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

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

44. xvi 7 ἐκεῖ 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 πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν, where the others give αὐτὸν ἐποιεῖτε (ἐποίησατε) σπήλαιον ληστῶν. 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) *ἵνα* (*Mark* 1½ columns, *Matthew* barely 1, *Luke* 1; *John* nearly 3).
But in the following list *ἵνα* is only included when not used with its proper sense of purpose.

I. iii 9 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα πλοίαριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ.
No parallels.

2. v 18 παρεκάλει ὁ δαίμονισθεὶς ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾗ. Luke ἐδέετο . . . εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ. No parallel in Matthew.

3. v 23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ . . . ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ—so I think Mark means to construct the ἵνα (cf. 10). Matthew turns the sentence into *oratio recta*, ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθεσ . . . Luke omits.

4. v 43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο. Nothing parallel in Matthew: Luke again has infinitive παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

5. vi 8 καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν. Both the others substitute the *oratio recta*, μὴ κτήσησθε, μηδὲν αἴρετε.

6. vi 12 καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοώσιν. Luke omits the phrase: Matthew has no parallel.

7. vi 25 θέλω ἵνα ἔξαιτῆς δῶς μοι ἐπὶ πίνακι . . . Matthew omits θέλω ἵνα and writes δός μοι ὧδε ἐπὶ πίνακι. Luke has no parallel for the six cases 7–12.

8. vi 56 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται. Here for the first time Matthew follows Mark.

9. vii 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ . . . Matthew again substitutes the *oratio recta*.

10. vii 32 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. Matthew omits the whole clause.

11. vii 36 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν. No parallel.

12. viii 22 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἄψηται. No parallel.

13. viii 30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ. Matthew for the second time agrees, διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν . . . Luke, as in 2 and 4, substitutes the infinitive, παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο.

14. ix 9 διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ ἃ εἶδον διηγῶσινται. Matthew changes to a command in the *oratio recta*, μηδενὶ εἶπητε τὸ ὄραμα, Luke to a statement of fact, οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν . . . οὐδὲν ὦν ἐώρακαν.

15. ix 12 πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ. No parallel.

16. ix 18 καὶ εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν. Matthew omits the ἵνα clause, Luke (with ἐδεήθη for εἶπα) here retains it.

17. ix 30 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ. Both the others omit the phrase.

18. x 35 θέλομεν ἵνα ὁ εἰς αἰτήσωμέν σε ποιήσης ἡμῖν. Matthew omits the clause, Luke the whole episode, including 19.

19. x 37 δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἰς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . καθίσωμεν. And so Matthew, εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν . . .

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

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

22. xi 16 καὶ οὐκ ἤφειεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. No parallels.

23. xi 28 ἢ τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῆς; The ἵνα clause is strictly superfluous after ταύτην, and both Matthew and Luke seize on so good an excuse for omitting it.

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

25. xiii 34 καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορή. No parallels.

26. xiv 12 ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα; Luke omits the ἵνα clause, Matthew substitutes the infinitive φαγεῖν.

27. xiv 35 προσήχητο ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα. 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 ἐστιν παρελθάτω from Mark's ἵνα παρέλθῃ, so that in his case at least the ἵνα clause is turned into a direct prayer.

28. xv 11 οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς. So in substance Matthew, with ἔπεισαν for ἀνέπεισαν: Luke has the *oratio recta*, ἀνέκραγον δὲ πανπληθεὶ λέγοντες Αἶρε τοῦτον ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν Βαραββᾶν.

29. xv 15 καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰ. φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ. So Matthew: Luke παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

ο. xv 20 καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα 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 *εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι*. There is no parallel in Luke.

31. xv 21 καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσιν . . . Σίμωνα . . . ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. As in 29 Matthew follows Mark: Luke substitutes an infinitive, *φέρειν*.

Some of these instances of *ἵνα*, 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 substitute 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 *ἵνα* after verbs like *παρακαλεῖν διαστέλλεσθαι παραγγέλλειν ἐπιτιμᾶν ἐντέλλεσθαι* and others? I cannot help thinking that we have here another illustration 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 *ἵνα* in the *Κοινή* 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 *ἵνα* 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 exaggerate 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 *ἵνα* throughout the range of the *Κοινή*, 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 *ἵνα* 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 *ἴνα* (it will be noted that Luke, as pointed out above, sometimes replaces the *ἴνα* 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 *ἴνα* 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 *ἴνα* 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. ἀγανακτεῖν

1. xiv 4 ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς εαυτούς Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη . . . ; Matthew ἠγανάκτησαν λέγοντες Εἰς τί . . . No Luke.

ii. ἀποκρίνεσθαι

2. viii 4 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Πόθεν τούτους δυνήσεταιί τις . . . Matthew λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Πόθεν ἡμῶν . . . No Luke.

3. ix 17 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου. Matthew προσῆλθεν . . . λέγων, Luke ἐβόησεν λέγων.

4. xii 29 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρώτη ἐστίν Matthew ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ Luke ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν . . .

iii. βοᾶν

5. xv 34 ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Ἥλει Ἥλει . . . Matthew ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰ. 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 διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν τί οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ; Luke ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι λέγοντες τίς . . . Matthew εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Οὗτος . . .

7. viii 16 διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν. Matthew διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν. No Luke.

v. διαστελλεσθαι

8. ix 9 διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδέν ἃ εἶδον διηγῆσονται. Matthew ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰ. λέγων· Μηδενὶ εἶπητε τὸ ὄραμα. No Luke.

vi. ἐπερωτάω (ἐρωτάω)

9. v 9 ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν τί ὄνομά σοι; Luke ἐπερώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰ. λέγων τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; Nothing parallel in Matthew.

10. vii 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. Matthew προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγουσα Κύριε, βοήθει μοι. No Luke.

11. viii 5 ἠρώτα αὐτοῦς Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; Matthew substitutes λέγει for ἠρώτα. There is no Luke.

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

13. ix 28 κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό; Once more Matthew κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπον· Διὰ τί ἡμεῖς . . . No parallel to this verse in Luke.

14. x 2 ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι; πειράζοντες αὐτόν. Matthew προσῆλθον αὐτῷ . . . πειράζοντες αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντες εἰ ἔξεστιν . . . Again no Luke.

15. x 17 προσδραμών εἰς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν Διδάσκαλε . . . Luke adds λέγων (ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων λέγων Διδάσκαλε . . .), Matthew as elsewhere substitutes εἶπεν (εἰς προσελθὼν αὐτῷ εἶπεν Διδάσκαλε . . .).

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

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

18. xv 2 ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πειλᾶτος Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰ.; Both the others retain the verb (Luke ἠρώτησεν), but both add λέγων.

[vii. ἐπιτιμάω

19. i 25 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε. So Tischendorf with **N*****A***, but the rest agree with Luke ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰ. λέγων . . ., and that may probably be right: though the caution must

be given that the Old Latins frequently add *dicens* where Mark's text is without it (so *k* 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 οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκρινον αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου. Matthew turns it with λέγειν into the *oratio recta* οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Ἐνοχος θανάτου ἐστίν. No parallel in Luke.

[ix. κηρύσσειν

21. i 14, 15 κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς . . . So again Tischendorf with $\aleph^* c$ Origen, against the rest, who add λέγων or καὶ λέγων before ὅτι; Matthew ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν. Once more, as with ἐπιτιμᾶν, the want of clear Marcan parallels weights the balance against the reading of \aleph .]

x. κράζω (with λέγειν, however, 5/8)

22. xi 9 ἔκραζον Ὡσαννά. Matthew and Luke both add λέγοντες, and Luke substitutes αἰνεῖν τὸν θεόν for κράζειν.

23, 24. xv 13, 14 ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν . . . περισσῶς ἔκραξαν Σταύρωσον αὐτόν. Here Matthew has λέγουσιν πάντες . . . περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες; Luke has ἐπεφώνουν λέγοντες on the first occasion, and phrases the second differently.

xi. λαλεῖν

25. xiv 31 ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει Ἐάν δέη με συναποθανεῖν σοι . . . Matthew λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος Κἂν δέη με . . ., and so Luke, though he has only a rougher parallel, ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

Perhaps no very striking results emerge. Nearly half the instances cited are in connexion with a single verb ἐπερωτάω (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 ἐπερωτάω, 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.