

# INALIENABLE POSSESSION IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK: A LINGUISTIC AND REDACTION-CRITICAL STUDY

THOMAS TOPS<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract.** This article provides a linguistic and redaction-critical study of “inalienable possession” in the Gospel of Mark. “Inalienable possession” is a common linguistic phenomenon that occurs in many Indo-European languages but has rarely been examined in NT Greek. My contribution will inquire how the Greek language of Mark codes inalienable possession and which objects and relations of possession are conceptualised as inalienable. It will further examine how Matthew and Luke redacted Mark’s coding of inalienable possession.

**Keywords:** Inalienable Possession, Linguistics, Gospel of Mark, Philology, Redaction Criticism, Synoptic Gospels.

## Introduction

My contribution will provide a linguistic and redaction-critical analysis of “inalienable possession” in the Gospel of Mark. The first section will define the linguistic phenomenon of “inalienable possession” and briefly discuss the findings of previous scholars in relation to this category. The second section will explore whether, and if so how, inalienable possession occurs in the language of the Gospel of Mark. It will inquire how the Greek language of Mark codes inalienable possession and which objects and relations of possession are conceptualised as inalienable. The third section will examine how Matthew and Luke redacted Mark’s coding of inalienable possession. The conclusion will briefly summarise the results and formulate the relevance of the study of “inalienable possession” for NT scholarship.

<sup>1</sup> Funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – 512257962. Special thanks go out to Daniel M. Gurtner for proofreading the English of this article as well as his valuable comments. The article is dedicated to the retirement of my colleague Erik Eynikel, whom I have known as a respectable teacher of ancient languages and a scholar dedicated not only to the Greek language of the LXX, but also to archaeology and many other aspects of ancient culture. *Fruere otio viventium!*

## 1. A Definition of “Inalienable Possession”

The notion of possession is remarkably difficult to define. It “potentially covers a considerable range of conceptual relations such as ownership, availability, kinship and part/whole relationships”.<sup>2</sup> Within this category of possession, linguists distinguish between alienable (or established) and inalienable (or inherent) possession. For the former, explicit morphological markers of possession (e.g. “my book”) are used to indicate the possessor. The latter is often unmarked (e.g., “j’ai mal à la tête”). To say in French that one has a headache, one does not have to use a possessive pronoun (“j’ai mal à *ma* tête”); the article suffices. The possessive pronoun is superfluous because the French language conceptualises the head as an inalienable possession. Body parts, kin terms, part-whole and spatial relations often do not require a morphological marker of possession in Indo-European languages and are coded as inalienable possessions. These objects and relations of possession are characterised by the fact that they cannot exist independently from their possessor. Even when an arm is removed from the body, it is still someone’s arm. Languages differ as to which objects or relations of possession are coded as (in)alienable. The phenomenon is culturally conditioned.<sup>3</sup>

The linguistic phenomenon of inalienable possession in NT Greek was initially studied by Chiara Gianollo, who observed the following constructions exhibit inalienable possession: e.g., δεόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον (1 Thess 3:10);<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Maria C. BENVENUTO, “Possession,” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, ed. Georgios K. GIANNAKIS, published online 2013, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X\\_eagll\\_COM\\_0000285](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_0000285)

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Hansjakob SEILER, *Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language*, Language Universals Series 2 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1983), 20–21; Johanna NICHOLS, “On Alienable and Inalienable Possession,” in *In Honor of Mary Haas: From the Haas Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics*, ed. William SHIPLEY (Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 1988), 557–609; Johanna NICHOLS, *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time* (Chicago IL: University of Chicago, 1992), 116–123; Bernd HEINE, *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 83 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 10–25; Marianne MITHUN, “The Difference a Category Makes in the Expression of Possession and Inalienability,” in *Dimensions of Possession*, ed. Irène BARON, Michael HERSLUND and Finn SØRENSEN, Typological Studies in Language 47 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001), 285–310; Anne-Marie SPANOGHE, “(In)alienability and (in)determination in Portuguese,” in *Dimensions of Possession*, 227–242; Jan KRIVAN and Michal LÁZNIČKA, “Inalienable Possession,” in *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*, ed. Marc L. GREENBERG and Lenore A. GRENOBLE, published online 2020, [https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-slavic-languages-and-linguistics-online/\\*-COM\\_033708](https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-slavic-languages-and-linguistics-online/*-COM_033708) On the phenomenon in Latin, see Bernard BORTOLUSSI, “Esse + datif et ess + génitif en latin,” in *Être et avoir: Syntaxe, sémantique, typologie*, ed. Alain ROUVERET (Saint Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 1998), 67–94; Machtelt BOLKESTEIN, “Possessors and Experiences in Classical Latin,” in *Dimensions of Possession*, 269–283; Philip BALDI and Andrea NUTI, “Possession,” in *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 3, ed. Philip BALDI and Pierluigi CUZZOLIN (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010), 239–387.

<sup>4</sup> “Praying that we may see *your face*.”

τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν; (Acts 21:13);<sup>5</sup> οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς (Matt 8:8);<sup>6</sup> αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοιχθήσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (Luke 24:31).<sup>7</sup> In these examples, the genitive case of the personal pronoun precedes not only the noun to which it semantically and syntactically belongs but also the article of this noun.<sup>8</sup> This so-called prenominal order is common in Classical Greek, but quite rare in NT Greek.<sup>9</sup> Gianollo focuses especially on the Gospel of John, where she finds additional examples to support her thesis: e.g., κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας; (John 13:6);<sup>10</sup> κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη (19:33);<sup>11</sup> ἀλλ' εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἐνυξεν (19:34).<sup>12</sup> As we will see, Gianollo's thesis also applies to the Gospel of Mark.

Another indicator of inalienable possession in ancient Greek is the mere use of the article. Stéphanie Bakker has noticed that kinship relations, body parts, and weapons are coded as inalienable possessions in the Greek language of Herodotus: e.g., τούτους ὧν τοὺς ἄνδρας συμβουλεύω τοι μηδεμιῇ μηχανῇ ἄγειν ἐπὶ τοὺς πατέρας (*Hist.* 7.51.2);<sup>13</sup> αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες αἰεῖδουσι καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κροτέουσι (2.60.1);<sup>14</sup> μετὰ δὲ αἰχμοφόροι χίλιοι, καὶ οὗτοι ἐκ πάντων ἀπολελεγμένοι, τὰς λόγχας κάτω ἐς τὴν γῆν τρέψαντες (7.40.2).<sup>15</sup> She concludes that “possessive phrases that refer to inalienable possession lack an overt possessive marker, but do give expression to the identifiability of the referent by means of an article”.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>5</sup> “What are you doing, weeping and breaking *my heart*?”

<sup>6</sup> “I am not worthy to have you come under *my roof*.”

<sup>7</sup> “And *their eyes* were opened.”

<sup>8</sup> See Chiara GIANOLLO, “External Possession in New Testament Greek,” in *Papers on grammar XI*, ed. Gualtiero CALBOLI and Pierluigi CUZZOLIN (Rome: Herder, 2010), 101–129. The English translations are taken from Gianollo.

<sup>9</sup> According to Gianollo's calculations, only 2.4% (Matthew), 2.2% (Mark), 6.7% (Luke), and 4.6% (John) of the possessive genitives in the canonical Gospels are used in a prenominal word order (see “External Possession,” 104).

<sup>10</sup> “Lord, do you wash *my feet*?”

<sup>11</sup> “They did not break *his legs*.”

<sup>12</sup> “But one of the soldiers pierced *his side* with a spear.” See GIANOLLO, “External Possession,” 118–121 and Chiara GIANOLLO, “Competing Constructions for Inalienable Possession in the Vulgate Gospels: Translator's Choices and Grammatical Constraints,” *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13/1 (2014) 93–114, at 108–112. The English translations are taken from Gianollo.

<sup>13</sup> “I advise you by no means to lead these men against *their fathers*.”

<sup>14</sup> “While the rest of the women, and the men, sing and clap *their hands*.”

<sup>15</sup> “After them thousand spearmen, also chosen from all Persians, carrying *their spear* downward to the ground.”

<sup>16</sup> See Stéphanie J. BAKKER, *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 180–182. Quotation at 180. The English translations are taken from Bakker.

Traditionally, grammarians of Classical Greek call this the “possessive” use of the article. The article (ὁ, ἡ, τό) often suffices when there is no doubt as to the possessor. No additional pronoun or any other morphological marker of possession is required in such instances.<sup>17</sup> “[T]he possessive use of the article” also occurs in NT Greek, but grammarians disagree on its frequency.<sup>18</sup> In general, grammarians provide few examples that are often limited to body parts and family relations.<sup>19</sup>

This particular use of the article, in which it has a deictic force to indicate the possessor, has only been studied systematically in the Gospel of John. There, it primarily occurs with respect to body parts and family relations,<sup>20</sup> but also for Jesus’ flesh (John 6:52),<sup>21</sup> mental states (16:21),<sup>22</sup> a fisherman’s net (21:6),<sup>23</sup> and clothes (21:7).<sup>24</sup> The mere use of the article without additional morphological markers of possession denotes inalienable possession in these examples. This is evident for

<sup>17</sup> See Herbert W. SMYTH, *Greek Grammar*, rev. by Gordon M. MESSING (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), §§1121, 1199d and Evert VAN EMDE BOAS *et al.*, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 329.

<sup>18</sup> On this disagreement, see Thomas TOPS, “A Philological Study of the Reflexive-Possessive Use of Personal Pronouns in the Fourth Gospel,” *NovT* 64/1 (2022) 18–35, at 21–24.

<sup>19</sup> See Thomas F. MIDDLETON, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*, new 3rd ed. rev. by H.J. ROSE (London: Rivington, 1841), 266; Archibald T. ROBERTSON, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 3rd ed. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919), 684, 769–770; William G. MACDONALD, *Greek Enchiridion: A Concise Handbook of Grammar for Translation and Exegesis* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1986), 115; Daniel B. WALLACE, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1996), 215–216; Andreas J. KÖSTENBERGER, Benjamin L. MERKLE, and Robert L. PLUMMER, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament* (Nashville TN: B&H Academic, 2016), 158.

<sup>20</sup> E.g., καὶ κλῖνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (“And he bowed *his head* and gave up *his spirit*”; John 19:30), οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν (+ αὐτοῦ P<sup>63</sup> N<sup>c</sup> A *et al.*) τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν (“For God so loved the world that he gave *his only Son*”; 3:16). Henceforth, the English translations are taken from the NRSV with some adjustments.

<sup>21</sup> πῶς δύναται οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι τὴν σὰρκα φαγεῖν; Trans.: “How can this man give us *his flesh* to eat?”

<sup>22</sup> ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτη λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς; ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Trans.: “When a woman is in labour, she has pain, because her hour has come. But when her child is born, she no longer remembers *her anguish* because of *her joy* of having brought a human being into the world.”

<sup>23</sup> βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὕρησθε. Trans.: “Cast *your net* to the right side of the boat, and you will find.”

<sup>24</sup> Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἀκούσας ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστιν τὸν ἐπενδύτην διεζώσατο [...]. Trans.: “When Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he put on *his clothes* [...]”. See TOPS, “A Philological Study”. On Jesus’ flesh in particular, see Thomas TOPS, “Jesus’ Authority over All His Flesh: A Linguistic and Literary-Historical Study of ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός in John 17,2a,” *RB* 131 (2024) 236–259.

body parts and Jesus' flesh. Even when Jesus dies on the cross and sacrifices his flesh, it is still *his* flesh, just as a person's arm remains that person's arm even if severed from the body. Mental states like anguish and joy are intrinsic to a person and depend on a person's existence. They are therefore inherent to a person. A fisherman's net as well as a person's clothes are always carried along by the fisherman and a person, respectively. The durability of this type of possession is coded in the language itself. Jesus is God's son and cannot be his son independently from God. It is thus not difficult to conceive why the Greek language of the Gospel of John conceptualises these objects and relations of possession as inalienable.

As the observations of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen suggest, the phenomenon of inalienable possession has a much broader application in the LXX version of the Pentateuch. The LXX translators of the Pentateuch often did not translate possessive pronouns from their Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>25</sup> Most of the examples that Soisalon-Soininen enumerates are most readily accountable as forms of inalienable possession: (i) body parts: e.g., ἐπὶ τὸν ὤμον ("on *her* shoulder"; Gen 21:14), πρὸς τοὺς πόδας ("at *his* feet"; Exod 4:25), τὸ οὖς ("*his* ear"; Exod 21:6); (ii) blood and flesh: e.g., τὸ αἷμα ("*its* blood"; Exod 29:16; Deut 15:23), τὰ κρέα ("*its* flesh"; Exod 29:31); (iii) family relations: e.g., ἐκ πατρός... ἐκ μητρός ("by *my* father... by *my* mother"; Gen 20:12), τέκνον ("*my* child"; Gen 22:8); υἱέ ("*my* son"; Gen 27:8); (iv) clothes and objects that one always cares with oneself: e.g., τὴν ῥάβδον ("*your* rod"; Exod 7:9), τὰ ὑποδήματα ("*your* sandals"; Exod 12:11), τὰ ἱμάτια ("*their* clothes"; Exod 19:14; Num 8:21); (v) mental states and emotions: e.g., ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως ("in the day of *my* calamity"; Gen 35:3), ἐνύπνιον ("*his* dream"; Gen 40:5); αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ πένθους ("the days of *his* mourning"; Gen 50:4), ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ὀργῇ ("in *his* wrath and anger"; Deut 29:22); (vi) properties of people: e.g., ἐκ νεότητος ("from *his* youth"; Gen 8:21); and (vii) part-whole relations: e.g., ἐκ πλαγίων ("on *its* side"; Gen 6:16), ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ("the horse and *its* rider"; Exod 15:21).

As to (i)–(ii), it is clear that these categories can be understood as forms of inalienable possession. Even when severed from the body, body parts still belong to the person from whom they were removed. A similar argument can be given for flesh and blood. As for (iii), family relations are inalienable in the sense that a person remains someone's mother even if that person dies or is taken away custody

<sup>25</sup> See Ilmari SOISALON-SOININEN, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987 herausgegeben von Anneli Aejmelaeus und Raija Sollamo* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 86–103. Soisalon-Soininen counts about 170 examples in Genesis, 170 examples in Exodus, 191 examples in Leviticus, 80 examples in Numeri, and 60 examples in Deuteronomy. Thus, it cannot be called a marginal phenomenon in the Greek language of the LXX Pentateuch. However, Soisalon-Soininen does not associate it with "inalienable possession". To my knowledge, the only LXX study that briefly mentions "inalienable possession" is Theo VAN DER LOUW, "Constructions Denoting 'To Have' (Predicate Possession) in the Greek Genesis," *JSCS* 49 (2016) 5–21, at 8.

over her children. For (iv), the “inalienability” is less clear at first sight. The idea behind clothes or a walking stick as inalienable possessions seems to be that one always carries them along. They have a certain permanency as one’s possessions. As to (v) and (vi), one can say that emotions, mental states, as well as properties of a person depend on the existence of that person. They are intrinsic to a person. A similar argument can be given for (vii). Inherent to the whole of a thing are its parts. The sides of an ark cannot exist independently from the ark itself. Similarly, a rider cannot exist without the horse. In all these examples, one does not need an additional morphological marker of possession to indicate the possessor. Even the article is sometimes omitted.

Given the closeness of Mark’s Greek to the Greek of the LXX, it seems reasonable to anticipate that Mark would exhibit categories of inalienable possession similar to those recognised in the LXX.<sup>26</sup> That is the task of our next section.

## 2. The Gospel of Mark

Surprisingly, studies on the Greek language and the style of the Gospel of Mark do not devote any detailed attention to how possession is expressed in the Gospel.<sup>27</sup> The only syntactical aspect of possession in Mark that has received attention is the evangelist’s abundant use of personal pronouns with possessive meanings. And this phenomenon is usually observed for its distinction from Classical Greek, which would only use pronouns if they are necessary for clarification or emphasis. A few examples from Mark illustrate this point: οὗ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἰμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ (1:7), Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ (– αὐτου 1 118 1582) καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ (– αὐτου Θ 565)... (3:31), ... ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου [καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ σου] ... (3:32), ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς (– αὐτης P<sup>45</sup> & D\* D<sup>c</sup> W Δ Θ 1 13 28 69 118 346 565 700 788 1582 2358) πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (7:25).<sup>28</sup> This redundant use of personal pronouns with a possessive

<sup>26</sup> About 90% of Mark’s vocabulary can be found in the LXX. Almost all of the Markan words that are not found in the LXX are compound or derivate words from roots present in the LXX. On this topic, see Alfredo DELGADO GÓMEZ, “The Vocabulary of Mark’s Gospel, the LXX, and the Greek of Its Time,” *Bib* 102/3 (2021) 356–385.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. Maximilian ZERWICK, *Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil: Ein Beitrag zur stilistischen Durcharbeitung des Neuen Testaments*, Scripta Pontificii Institutii Biblici 38 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1937); Marius REISER, *Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums im Licht der hellenistischen Volksliteratur*, WUNT II/11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984); J. Keith ELLIOTT (ed.), *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*, NovTSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1993); Paul L. DANOVE, *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark: Applications of a Case Frame Analysis*, JSNTSup 218 (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001); James W. VOELZ, “The Characteristics of the Greek of St. Mark’s Gospel,” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliott*, ed. Peter DOBLE and Jeffrey KLOHA, New Testament Tools, NTTSD 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 137–153.

<sup>28</sup> See John C. DOUDNA, *The Greek of the Gospel of Mark*, JBLMS 12 (Philadelphia PA: SBL, 1961), 36–39 and Elliott C. MALONEY, “A Study of Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax” (PhD

meaning can possibly be explained as a Hebrew influence on the Greek style of the Gospel of Mark.<sup>29</sup> The Hebrew constantly uses pronominal suffixes to indicate the possessor, even in cases in which the possessor is more than obvious to the reader.<sup>30</sup> Another possible explanation, and not excluding the first one, is the almost vernacular style of the Gospel of Mark. Vernacular Greek does not shun the use of superfluous words.<sup>31</sup>

Mark's Greek has affinities with Attic/Classical Greek as well.<sup>32</sup> One of the Classical Greek devices that Mark imitates is the anaphoric or deictic use of the article. Quite frequently, Mark employs the article instead of proper names: e.g., ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (Mark 10:3), οἱ δὲ εἶπαν (10:4), οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ (10:37), ὁ δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν (10:48), ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα (14:61). In all these cases, the article anaphorically refers back to (an) earlier mentioned person(s) (e.g., Jesus, the Pharisees).<sup>33</sup> As the following subsections will illustrate, the deictic force of the

diss., Fordham University NY, 1979), 161–163, 169–172. The examples are culled from Doudna and Maloney. Henceforth, the reading of NA<sup>28</sup> is taken as a starting point. The variant readings that are relevant for my discussion are added between brackets. The latter are taken from Reuben J. SWANSON (ed.), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*, vol. 2, *Mark* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995) and the CNTTS Greek New Testament critical apparatus (The Center for New Testament Textual Studies NT Critical Apparatus by the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary [2010]; consulted via BibleWorks 10).

<sup>29</sup> On this possible Hebrew influence, see further Nigel TURNER, “The Style of Mark,” in *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*, 215–237, at 219–231. The article was originally published in James H. MOULTON, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh: Clark, 1976). For a critical evaluation of the view that Mark's Greek contains Semitisms, see REISER, *Syntax* and Stefan ALKIER and Thomas PAULSEN (ed.), *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Matthäus: Neu übersetzt und mit Überlegungen zur Sprache des Neuen Testaments, zur Gattung der Evangelien und zur intertextuellen Schreibweise sowie mit einem Glossar*, *Frankfurter Neues Testament 2* (Leiden/Paderborn: Brill/Ferdinand Schöningh, 2021), 9–13. For a general discussion of the Semitic features of NT Greek, see James W. VOELZ, “The Language of the New Testament,” *ANRW* 25.2:893–977, at 957–964 and Max WILCOX, “Semitisms in the New Testament,” *ANRW* 25.2:978–1029.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. TURNER, “The Style,” 227: “The high incidence of the oblique cases of *autos* is a Semitic tendency due to the pronominal suffix, although the similar tendency in the vernacular doubtless exerted some influence.”

<sup>31</sup> See the previous note.

<sup>32</sup> See VOELZ, “The Characteristics,” 149–152 and James W. VOELZ, “Standard/Classical Greek Construction in the Gospel According to Mark and Their Importance for Interpretation,” *NovT* 62 (2020) 343–360.

<sup>33</sup> Mark's use of this Classical Greek device was previously observed by TURNER, “The Style,” 233. It is also used in other NT writings: see Heinrich VON SIEBENTHAL, *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019), 183–184. On the “anaphoric” or “deictic” use of the article in Classical Greek, see SMYTH, *Greek Grammar*, §1120 and VAN EMDE BOAS *et al.*, *The Cambridge Grammar*, 337–338.

article is also used to denote inalienable possession in the Gospel. These subsections will provide an exhaustive discussion of inalienable possession in the manuscript tradition of Mark, starting with the categories in which inalienable possession occurs the most.

## 2.1 Body Parts

Among body parts, especially “hands” are coded as inalienable possession:

- Mark 3:5 ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα (+ σου κ A C D Y Δ θ Π 1 13 28 35 69 118 124 157 346 579 700 788 1005 1071 1346 1582 2372).<sup>34</sup>
- Mark 6:5 εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἄρρώστοις ἐπιθείς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.<sup>35</sup>
- Mark 7:3 καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυνγῆ νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν.<sup>36</sup>
- Mark 7:32 καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῆ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα.<sup>37</sup>
- Mark 8:23 ἐπιθείς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ (– αὐτω + αὐτου A K 1071) ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν [...] <sup>38</sup>
- Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας (+ αὐτου N W) ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.<sup>39</sup>
- Mark 10:16 καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ’ αὐτά.<sup>40</sup>
- Mark 14:3 συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχευεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς.<sup>41</sup>
- Mark 14:40 ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι.<sup>42</sup>
- Mark 14:46<sup>43</sup> οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.<sup>44</sup>  
B κ<sup>c</sup> D L W Θ 565 700  
οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

<sup>34</sup> “Stretch out *your hand*.”

<sup>35</sup> “Except that he laid *his hands* on a few sick people and cured them.”

<sup>36</sup> “And all the Jews, do not eat unless they thoroughly wash *their hands*.”

<sup>37</sup> “And they begged him to lay *his hand* on him.”

<sup>38</sup> “He laid *his hands* on him and asked him [...]”

<sup>39</sup> “Then he laid *his hands* on his eyes again.”

<sup>40</sup> “And he took them up in his arms, laid *his hands* on them, and blessed them.”

<sup>41</sup> “And she broke open the jar and poured the ointment on *his head*.” Only D changed the word order to τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ.

<sup>42</sup> “For *their eyes* were very heavy.” The manuscripts D F\* Y K N U\* M W Γ Π 2 28 69 118 157 565 700 change the word order to οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν.

<sup>43</sup> The textual tradition of Mark 14:46 is presented interlineally because of its complexity.

<sup>44</sup> “And they laid *their hands* on him and arrested him.”

κ\* C

οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

A Y K Π

οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

E F<sup>c</sup> G H M<sup>c</sup> U Γ 118 124 157 579

- Mark 14:65 καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον.<sup>45</sup>
- Mark 15:19 καὶ ἔτυπον αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν καλάμῳ καὶ ἐνέπτυσον αὐτῷ καὶ τιθέντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ.<sup>46</sup>
- Mark 16:18 [καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν] ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν κἄν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάβῃ, ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἔξουσιν.<sup>47</sup>

Many of these passages indicate that the article is sufficient to indicate possession. If this is the case, the grammatical subject of the main verb in the sentence is the implied possessor.<sup>48</sup> Some MSS add a personal pronoun with a possessive meaning, but this pronoun is redundant. In the last example, the article is missing and a relationship of possession is still implied. In 14:3, 40, 65; 15:19, we furthermore find illustrations of Gianollo’s thesis that NT Greek codes inalienable possession by putting the personal pronoun in a prenominal position.<sup>49</sup>

Other, less frequent examples of body parts that are coded as inalienable possession also occur, as follows:

- Mark 7:6 οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ.<sup>50</sup>
- Mark 7:19 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν (+ αὐτοῦ Θ).<sup>51</sup>
- Mark 9:18 καὶ ἀφρίζει καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας (+ αὐτοῦ A C<sup>c</sup> E F G H K L M N S

<sup>45</sup> “And some began to spit on him and to cover *his face*.” The manuscripts A D K M N W Γ Π Θ 565 700 change it into a postnominal construction.

<sup>46</sup> “And they struck *his head* with a reed and spat on him, and bowing *their knees* worshipped him.” The manuscripts C\* and C<sup>c</sup> change the word order into τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

<sup>47</sup> “They will pick up snakes in *their hands*, and if they drink any deadly thing, it will not hurt them; they will lay *their hands* on the sick, and they will recover.”

<sup>48</sup> An exception to this rule is Mark 3:5.

<sup>49</sup> For this thesis, see *supra* 1.

<sup>50</sup> “This people honours me with *their lips*.”

<sup>51</sup> “Since it does not enter *his heart* but *his stomach*.” Manuscripts D and Δ change the word order into τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.

U Y Θ Π Ω 2 28 35 118 157 700 1005 1071 1424 2358 2372).<sup>52</sup>

Mark 13:17 οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.<sup>53</sup>

Mark 15:29 καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν  
(–αυτων D 1346) καὶ λέγοντες [...]<sup>54</sup>

The above-quoted passages conceptualise “lips”, “stomach”, “teeth”, “womb”, and “head” as inalienable possessions by using only the article. Some MSS add a personal pronoun, but these pronouns appear to be redundant. Especially for the “head”, many MSS have a personal pronoun with a possessive meaning. Again, we find an expression (ἐν γαστρὶ) for which the article is missing but a relationship of possession is implied. In 7:19, we furthermore find a corroboration for Gianollo’s thesis: αὐτοῦ [...] τὴν καρδίαν. The heart is presented as an inalienable possession of a person.

## 2.2 Family Members

A little less frequent than body parts, family members are coded as inalienable possessions:

Mark 3:35 ὃς [γὰρ] ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ  
(+ μου C E F G H K M S Y Π Ω 2 35 124 157 1005 1071 1424 2358  
2372) καὶ μήτηρ (+ μου H\* 35 1005 1071 2372) ἐστίν.<sup>55</sup>

Mark 6:4 οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς  
συγγενέσιν αὐτοῦ (–αυτου κ\* A C<sup>c</sup> D E F G H M\* S U W Y Θ Π Ω 1 2  
13 35 69 118 157 346 565 700 788 1005 1582 2358 2372) καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ  
αὐτοῦ.<sup>56</sup>

Mark 7:11 ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ (+αυτου D) ἢ τῇ μητρὶ (+αυτου Θ Y K 157  
565 700) [...] <sup>57</sup>

Mark 7:12 οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ (+αυτου A E F G H K M S  
U Y Π 1 2 33 35 124 157 579 1005 1071 1582 2358 2372) ἢ τῇ μητρὶ  
(+αυτου A E F G H K M S U Y Π 2 33 35 124 157 579 1005 1071 2358  
2372).<sup>58</sup>

<sup>52</sup> “And he foams and grinds *his teeth*.”

<sup>53</sup> “Woe to those who have in *their womb* and to those who are nursing in those days!”

<sup>54</sup> “Those who passed by derided him, moving *their heads* and saying [...]”

<sup>55</sup> “Whoever does the will of God is my brother, *my sister*, and *my mother*.”

<sup>56</sup> “Prophets are not without honour, except in their hometown, and among *their own kin*, and in their own house.”

<sup>57</sup> “if anyone tells *his father* or *his mother* [...]”

- Mark 10:2 ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι.<sup>59</sup>
- Mark 10:7 ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ (– αὐτου D M N 565) καὶ τὴν μητέρα (+ αὐτου κ M 579) [καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ].<sup>60</sup>
- Mark 10:12 καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς (– αὐτης Θ 700) γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.<sup>61</sup>
- Mark 10:19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου (– σου D 579) καὶ τὴν μητέρα (+ σου κ\* C F N W Θ 28 124 565 1071).<sup>62</sup>
- Mark 12:19 ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ ἀφῆ τέκνον, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα (+ αὐτου A D E F G H K M S U Y Π Ω 2 13 28 33 35 69 118 124 157 346 579 788 1005 1071 1424 2358 2372) καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.<sup>63</sup>
- Mark 13:12 καὶ παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς.<sup>64</sup>

The relations of kinship between parents and their children as well as the relationship between man and wife in marriage are conceptualised as inalienable. In 3:35, the inalienable relationship between brothers and sisters as well as the inalienable relationship between mothers and their children are used to metaphorically represent the relationship between Christ and his followers. In the passages quoted above, the article suffices to denote the relationship of possession. Some MSS either add or remove a personal pronoun. Yet, this makes no difference in meaning. In 3:35; 10:2; 13:12, the article is left out and only the bare noun phrase is used to denote the relationship of inalienable possession between family members.

### 2.3 Teacher–Disciple Relationship

Although significantly less frequent than body parts or family relations, the relationship of the teacher Jesus with his disciples is sometimes coded as a form of inalienable possession:

- <sup>58</sup> “You no longer permit him to do anything for *his father* or *his mother*.”
- <sup>59</sup> “Is it lawful for a man to divorce *his wife*?”
- <sup>60</sup> “For this reason a man shall leave *his father* and *his mother* and be joined to his wife.”
- <sup>61</sup> “And if she divorces *her husband* and marries another, she commits adultery.”
- <sup>62</sup> “Honour *your father* and *your mother*.”
- <sup>63</sup> “If someone’s brother dies, leaving a wife but no child, his brother may take *his wife* and raise up offspring for his brother.”
- <sup>64</sup> “And a brother will betray *his brother* to death, and a father *his child*, and children will rise against *their parents* and have them put to death.”

- Mark 4:34 χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις (– ιδιοις 700) μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πάντα.<sup>65</sup>
- Mark 6:35 καὶ ἡδὴ ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (– αυτου A W 1 28 1582) ἔλεγον [...]<sup>66</sup>
- Mark 8:1 προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς (+ αυτου A B E F G H K M S U W Y Θ Π Ω 2 13 33 35 69 118 124 157 346 565 579 700 788 1005 1071 1424 2358 2372) λέγει αὐτοῖς [...]<sup>67</sup>
- Mark 8:27 ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (– αυτου A) [...]<sup>68</sup>
- Mark 8:33 καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (– αυτου 579) ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει [...]<sup>69</sup>
- Mark 9:28 καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (– αυτου W) κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν [...]<sup>70</sup>

Inherent to being a teacher is that one has disciples. Thus, it is not surprising that some MSS do not use personal pronouns but only the article to indicate to whom the disciples belong. In such cases it seems that the use of the personal pronoun is superfluous.

## 2.4 Clothing

Less frequent than the former categories, “clothing” is coded as inalienable possession in (some of the MSS of) the following passages:

- Mark 5:30–31 καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξεληοῦσαν ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἔλεγεν· τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων; καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἤψατο.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>65</sup> “Without parables he did not speak to them, but he explained everything in private to *his disciples*.”

<sup>66</sup> “When it grew late, *his disciples* came to him and said [...]”

<sup>67</sup> “He called *his disciples* and said to them [...]”

<sup>68</sup> “He asked *his disciples* [...]”

<sup>69</sup> “Looking at *his disciples*, he rebuked Peter and said [...]”

<sup>70</sup> “When he had entered the house, *his disciples* asked him privately [...]”

<sup>71</sup> “Immediately aware that power had gone forth from him, Jesus turned about in the crowd and said, ‘Who touched *my clothes*?’ And his disciples said to him, ‘You see the crowd pressing in on you; how can you say, Who touched me?’”

- Mark 6:8      καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ράβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην (+ υμῶν Δ) χαλαρόν.<sup>72</sup>
- Mark 11:7     καὶ φέρουσιν τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐπιβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν (– αυτων W 1 28 1582).<sup>73</sup>
- Mark 11:8     καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν (– αυτων L W) ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν.<sup>74</sup>
- Mark 15:20    καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ (– αυτου D).<sup>75</sup>

Jesus' clothes are conceptualised as inalienable possession in 5:30–31. They are part of his being. Touching his clothes means touching Jesus. The prenominal construction μου [...] τῶν ἱματίων validates Gianollo's thesis that this type of construction is used to express inalienable possession. The idea in 6:8 is that items like a belt are always worn by a person. Therefore, virtually no MSS add a pronoun to indicate the possessor; the article suffices. The ἱμάτια, on the other hand, can be taken off and thrown on a donkey (11:7) or on the road (11:8). Although some MSS still omit the personal pronoun, there seems to be more need for it to indicate the possessor. However, one can retort that also in the latter two passages the article suffices and the personal pronoun is redundant. In 15:20, the purple cloak that does not belong to Jesus is contrasted with his own clothes. Manuscript D omits the personal pronoun without the contrast being removed. This indicates that the pronoun is superfluous.

## 2.5 Spatial Relations

Spatial relations of left and right are often coded as forms of inalienable possession:

- Mark 10:37     δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἶς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἶς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν (+ σου A C E F G H K M N S U Y Π Ω 2 13 28 35 69 118 124 157 346 579 700 788 1005 1071 1582c<sup>c</sup> 2358 2372) καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου.<sup>76</sup>
- Mark 10:40     τὸ δὲ καθίσει ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ ἐξ ἐναντύμων (+ μου Ψ 2 35 118 157 1071; + ημων 579) οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>72</sup> “He ordered them to take nothing for the road except a staff; no bread, no bag, no money in *their belt*.”

<sup>73</sup> “And they brought the colt to Jesus and threw *their cloaks* on it.”

<sup>74</sup> “And many people spread *their cloaks* on the road.”

<sup>75</sup> “After mocking him, they stripped him of the purple cloak and put *his own clothes* on him.”

<sup>76</sup> “Grant us to sit, one at *your right* and one at *your left*, in your glory.”

<sup>77</sup> “But to sit at my right or at *my left* is not mine to grant, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared.”

- Mark 15:27      καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστὰς, ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἓνα ἐξ ἐναντύμων αὐτοῦ (– αυτου C<sup>c</sup> D Θ 1 118 565 1582).<sup>78</sup>
- Mark 16:5      καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιῶις περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν, καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν.<sup>79</sup>

Spatial relations like right or left are inherent to objects, people, and spaces. The left and the right side of Jesus cannot exist independently of Jesus and are therefore conceptualised as inalienable possessions. No explicit morphological marker of possession is required. The article is missing in these examples probably because the noun phrase is used in a prepositional phrase.<sup>80</sup> Only the last example of 16:5 has the article. There, the right side of the space of a tomb is articulated as inherent to the tomb by coding it as a form of inalienable possession.

## 2.6 Jesus' Spirit

In the manuscript tradition of two passages, Jesus' spirit is coded as an inalienable possession:

- Mark 2:8      καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ (– αυτου D W) ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγει [...] <sup>81</sup>
- Mark 8:12      καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ (– αυτου D M\* W Γ 1 118 1582) λέγει [...] <sup>82</sup>

Although only a few MSS omit the personal pronoun, it is probably not a coincidence. Given that the spirit is inherent to a person in biblical anthropology (e.g., Matt 5:3; Mark 8:12; John 11:33), the article suffices to indicate the possessor.

## 2.7 Jesus' Elect

The ones that Jesus elected for himself are presented as inalienable possession in the following passage:

- Mark 13:27      καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐπισυναΐξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς [αὐτοῦ] (– αυτου D L W Ψ 1 28 565 1582\*) ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>78</sup> “And with him they crucified two bandits, one on *his right* and one on *his left*.”

<sup>79</sup> “As they entered the tomb, they saw a young man, dressed in a white robe, sitting at *its right side*; and they were alarmed.”

<sup>80</sup> Cf. SMYTH, *Greek Grammar*, §1128: “The article is very often omitted in phrases containing a preposition.” This is also the case in NT Greek: see WALLACE, *Greek Grammar*, 247.

<sup>81</sup> “At once Jesus perceived in *his spirit* that they were thus discussing among themselves; and he said to them [...]”

<sup>82</sup> “And he sighed deeply in *his spirit* and said [...]”

The disagreement in the manuscript tradition about the personal pronoun might be caused by the question whether the relationship between Jesus and his elect is stable enough that it can be considered inalienable or not. In any case, the elect cannot exist independently from Jesus. Even when Jesus dies, they are still the ones elected by him.

## 2.8 A Branch and Its Leaves

As a part-whole relationship, the relationship of a branch to its leaves is coded as a form of inalienable possession:

Mark 13:28 ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἦδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἀπαλὸς γένηται καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα (+ εν αυτη D Θ 28 124 565 700), γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν.<sup>84</sup>

The leaves are considered to be a part of the branch to the extent that they grow out of it. Therefore, only the article is required to indicate that the leaves have the branch as their possessor. Some MSS add εν αυτη to indicate that the leaves grow out of the branch but this information is superfluous for the reader.

## 2.9 Weapons

In one example, a sword is coded as the inalienable possession of one of the bystanders of Jesus during Jesus' arrest:

Mark 14:47 εἷς δὲ [τις] τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν (– την D W 118 124 565) μάχαιραν ἔπαισεν τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτόριον.<sup>85</sup>

As with clothing, the idea of a sword as an inalienable possession is to be understood as an item that someone always carries with oneself. The article suffices to indicate the possessor and some MSS even omit the article. The example of αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτόριον furthermore corroborates Gianollo's thesis that a prenominal word order designates inalienable possession.

<sup>83</sup> “And then he will send out the angels, and gather *his elect* from the four winds, from the end of the earth to the end of heaven.”

<sup>84</sup> “From the fig tree learn the parable: as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth *its leaves*, you know that summer is near.”

<sup>85</sup> “But one of those who stood near drew *his sword* and struck the slave of the high priest, cutting off *his ear*.” Only 1071 changes the word order into a postnominal order.

## 2.10 Testimonies

The following example illustrates how testimonies are coded as inalienable possession:

Mark 14:56 πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι (+ αὐτῶν 69) οὐκ ἦσαν.<sup>86</sup>

Essential to those who testify are their testimonies. Therefore, it is no surprise that almost all the MSS do not add a personal pronoun to indicate the possessor. The article suffices for this purpose.

To summarise our results. We have seen that Mark codes inalienable possession by using: (i) only the article as a modifier of the noun phrase; (ii) the bare noun phrase without the article; and (iii) the genitive case of a personal pronoun with a possessive meaning in a prenominal word order. The objects and relations that Mark conceptualises as inalienable possessions are body parts, family members, clothing, weapons, testimonies, and spatial and part-whole relations. Additionally, Mark conceives of the elect, the disciples, and the spirit in relation to Jesus as inalienable possessions. The next section will examine how Matthew and Luke redacted Mark's coding of inalienable possession.

## 3. Matthew's and Luke's Redaction of Mark

My examination will restrict itself to the Markan passages of which Matthew and Luke significantly changed Mark's coding of inalienable possession.<sup>87</sup> The first subsection will list these passages and their Matthean and Lukan redaction (3.1), while the second subsection will discuss them (3.2).

### 3.1 Significant Changes of Mark

(1) *Mark 3:5 parr.*

Mark 3:5 ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα (+ σου κ A C D Y Δ θ Π 1 13 28 35 69 118 124 157 346 579 700 788 1005 1071 1346 1582 2372).

Matt 12:13 ἔκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα.

<sup>86</sup> "For many gave false testimony against him, and *their testimonies* were not the same."

<sup>87</sup> With "significantly" is meant for instance the addition of a personal pronoun with possessive meaning or a change of Mark's word order from a prenominal to a postnominal word order. The textual variations in the manuscript tradition of Matthew and Luke are taken from the CNTTS Greek New Testament critical apparatus as well as Reuben J. SWANSON (ed.), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*, vol. 1, *Matthew* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995) and Reuben J. SWANSON (ed.), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*, vol. 3, *Luke* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995).

Luke 6:10 ἔκτεινον τὴν χειρὰ σου.

(2) *Mark 6:8 par.*

Mark 6:8 καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ράβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην (+ υμων Δ) χαλκόν.

Matt 10:9 μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν.

(3) *Mark 7:11 par.*

Mark 7:11 εἰάν τις ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ (+ αὐτου D) ἢ τῇ μητρὶ (+ αὐτου Θ Y K 157 565 700) [...]

Matt 15:6 οὐ μὴ τιμήσει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ. (- αὐτου θ 1 118 1424 1582) [...]

(4) *Mark 8:1 par.*

Mark 8:1 προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς (+ αὐτου A B E F G H K M S U W Y Θ Π Ω 2 13 33 35 69 118 124 157 346 565 579 700 788 1005 1071 1424 2358 2372) λέγει αὐτοῖς [...]

Matt 15:32 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (- αὐτου κ W Θ 700) εἶπεν [...]

(5) *Mark 10:2 par.*

Mark 10:2 ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι.

Matt 19:3 εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν;

(6) *Mark 10:7 par.*

Mark 10:7 ἔνεκεν τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ (- αὐτου D M N 565) καὶ τὴν μητέρα (+ αὐτου κ M 579) [καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ].

Matt 19:5 ἔνεκα τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα (+ αὐτου C E Δ Y 1 13 28 33 35 69 124 157 346 788 1005 1071 1424 1582 2372) καὶ τὴν μητέρα (+ αὐτου W) καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ.

(7) *Mark 10:12 par.*

Mark 10:12 καὶ εἰάν τις ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς (- αὐτης Θ 700) γαμῆσιν ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.

Luke 16:18 καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.

(8) *Mark 10:19 par.*

Mark 10:19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου (- σου D 579) καὶ τὴν μητέρα (+ σου κ\* C F N W Θ 28 124 565 1071).

Matt 19:19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα (+ σου C<sup>c</sup> W Y 13 33 69 124 346 565 788 1424 2372) καὶ τὴν μητέρα (+ σου 1424).

(9) *Mark 10:37 par.*

Mark 10:37 δὸς ἡμῖν ἵνα εἶς σου ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἶς ἐξ ἀριστερῶν (+ σου A C E F G H K M N S U Y Π Ω 2 13 28 35 69 118 124 157 346 579 700 788 1005 1071 1582<sup>c</sup> 2358 2372) καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου.

Matt 20:21 εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοὶ μου εἶς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου (– σου κ B) καὶ εἶς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου (– σου D E θ 1 1582\*) ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.

(10) *Mark 11:7 par.*

Mark 11:7 καὶ φέρουσιν τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐπιβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν (– αυτων W 1 28 1582).

Matt 21:7 ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια (+ αυτων κ<sup>c</sup> C E<sup>c</sup> F G H K<sup>c</sup> K\* L M N S U W Y Δ Π Ω 1 2\* 13 28 33 35 69 118 124 157 346 565 579 700 788 1005 1071 1424 1582 2358 2372/ + εαυτων E\*), καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν.

(11) *Mark 12:19 par.*

Mark 12:19 ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ ἄφῃ τέκνον, ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα (+ αυτου A D E F G H K M S U Y Π Ω 2 13 28 33 35 69 118 124 157 346 579 788 1005 1071 1424 2358 2372) καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.

Matt 22:24 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν· ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστήσει σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.

(12) *Mark 14:3 par.*

Mark 14:3 συντρίψασα τὴν ἀλάβαστρον κατέχευεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς.<sup>88</sup>

Matt 26:7 καὶ κατέχευεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένον.

(13) *Mark 14:47 parr.*

Mark 14:47 εἶς δέ [τις] τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν (– την D W 118 124 565) μάχαιραν ἔπαισεν τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον.<sup>89</sup>

Matt 26:51 καὶ ἰδοὺ εἶς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ καὶ πατάξας τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον.

<sup>88</sup> τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ D.

<sup>89</sup> τὸ ὠτίον αὐτοῦ 1071.

Luke 22:50 και ἀφεῖλεν τὸ οὖζ αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν.<sup>90</sup>

(14) Mark 14:65 par.

Mark 14:65 και ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ και περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον.<sup>91</sup>

Matt 26:67 τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ.

(15) Mark 15:19 par.

Mark 15:19 και ἔτυπτον αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν καλάμῳ και ἐνέπτυσον αὐτῷ και τιθέντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ.<sup>92</sup>

Matt 27:30 και ἔτυπτον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

(16) Mark 15:27 parr.

Mark 15:27 και σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστὰς, ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν και ἓνα ἐξ ἐωνύμων αὐτοῦ (– αὐτοῦ C<sup>c</sup> D Θ 1 118 565 1582).

Matt 27:38 τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν και εἷς ἐξ ἐωνύμων.

Luke 23:33 ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν και τοὺς κακούργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὃν δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν.

### 3.2 Interpretation of the Results

One cannot draw broad conclusions about Luke's and Matthew's coding of inalienable possession on the basis of the minimal evidence of the 16 examples listed in the previous subsection. These examples only say something about how Luke and Matthew redacted Mark's coding of inalienable possession. For Matthew, one can safely say that he has the tendency to add personal pronouns where Mark uses only the article (see examples 1–5, 9, 11). In examples 6, 8, 10, and 16, we meet with the reverse phenomenon: Matthew omits the personal pronouns that we find in the Markan text. In examples 12, 14 and 15, Matthew adjusts Mark's pronominal order to a postnominal order. All in all, Matthew changes Mark's coding of inalienable possession to a fairly large extent. The most plausible explanation is that Matthew's Greek is more influenced by the Hebrew language than Mark's. As a result, Matthew adds personal pronouns with a possessive meaning where idiomatic Greek could have done without them.

<sup>90</sup> αὐτοῦ τὸ οὖζ A M U W Γ Δ Θ Π Ψ 2 28 157 565 700 1424; αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄπιον D K.

<sup>91</sup> τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ A D K M N W Γ Π Θ 565 700; τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ D.

<sup>92</sup> τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ C\* C<sup>c</sup>.

For Luke, less data is available. He adds a personal pronoun only once in example 1 and removes it twice in examples 7 and 16. Only in example 13 does Luke change Mark's prenominal order to a postnominal order. In sum, Luke barely changes Mark's coding of inalienable possession. This agrees with Luke's literary Greek style and the scholarly view that Luke was a native speaker of Koine Greek.<sup>93</sup> Luke does not abundantly add personal pronouns where idiomatic Greek does not need them.

## Conclusion

Within the manuscript tradition of the Gospel of Mark, inalienable possession is certainly a linguistic phenomenon that is coded in the language. It is signalled by the use of the article without any additional morphological marker of possession. In some cases, the bare noun phrase without the article is used to denote inalienable possession. Additionally, and characteristic of NT Greek in general, Mark employs possessive genitives in a prenominal order to code inalienable possession. In this fashion, Mark conceptualises the following objects and relations of possession as inalienable: body parts, family members, clothing, weapons, testimonies, and spatial and part-whole relations. He also conceives of the disciples, the elect, and the spirit as inalienable possessions of Jesus. Matthew's Greek has the tendency to remove Mark's coding of inalienable possession because it is strongly influenced by the Hebrew, whereas Luke's Greek preserves it in most of the cases in agreement with its literary style.

The methodology adopted by the present study can be used to examine how other NT writings code and conceptualise inalienable possession. As illustrated, the phenomenon of inalienable possession is important for understanding the redactional activity of Luke and Matthew as well as for explaining variations in the textual tradition of the Gospels. This certainly applies to other writings as well. "Inalienable possession" can further be a criterion to discern the authorship of a writing. For instance, if one can establish how Paul codes and conceptualises inalienable possession in the letters that are certainly Pauline (e.g., Galatians, 1–2 Corinthians, Romans), this could be used as a criterion to evaluate whether Paul wrote the letters of which the authorship is contested (e.g., 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, Ephesians).

<sup>93</sup> On the literary style of Luke's Greek, see Sean A. ADAMS, "Atticism, Classicism, and Luke-Acts: Discussions with Albert Wifstrand and Loveday Alexander," in *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, ed. Stanley E. PORTER and Andrew W. PITTS, Linguistic Biblical Studies 6 (Brill: Leiden, 2013), 91–111 and Jenny READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Luke in His Own Words: A Study of the Language of Luke-Acts in Greek*, LNTS 672 (London: T&T Clark, 2022). Despite that Luke was probably a native speaker of Koine Greek, there are obvious Semitisms in his Greek: see Albert HOGETERP and Adelbert DENAUX, *Semitisms in Luke's Greek: A Descriptive Analysis of Lexical and Syntactical Domains of Semitic Language Influence in Luke's Gospel*, WUNT 401 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).

Thus, “inalienable possession” is a linguistic category that needs to be taken into consideration by NT scholars.

Thomas TOPS  
Faculty of Catholic Theology  
Universität Regensburg;  
North-West University, Potchefstroom  
Germany / South Africa

## Bibliography

- ADAMS, Sean A., “Atticism, Classicism, and Luke-Acts: Discussions with Albert Wifstrand and Loveday Alexander.” In *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, edited by Stanley E. PORTER and Andrew W. PITTS. Linguistic Biblical Studies 6, 91–111. Brill: Leiden, 2013.
- ALKIER, Stefan and Thomas PAULSEN, ed., *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Matthäus: Neu übersetzt und mit Überlegungen zur Sprache des Neuen Testaments, zur Gattung der Evangelien und zur intertextuellen Schreibweise sowie mit einem Glossar*. Frankfurter Neues Testament 2. Leiden/Paderborn: Brill/Ferdinand Schöningh, 2021.
- BAKKER, Stéphanie J., *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek: A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 15. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- BALDI, Philip and Andrea NUTI, “Possession.” In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*. Vol. 3, edited by Philip BALDI and Pierluigi CUZZOLIN, 239–387. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010.
- BENVENUTO, Maria C., “Possession.” In *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, edited by Georgios K. GIANNAKIS, published online 2013, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X\\_eagll\\_COM\\_00000285](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2214-448X_eagll_COM_00000285)
- BOLKESTEIN, Machtelt, “Possessors and Experiences in Classical Latin.” In *Dimensions of Possession*, edited by Irène BARON, Michael HERSLUND and Finn SØRENSEN. Typological Studies in Language 47, 269–283. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- BORTOLUSSI, Bernard, “Esse + datif et ess + génitif en latin.” In *Être et avoir: Syntaxe, sémantique, typologie*, edited by Alain ROUVERET, 67–94. Saint Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 1998.
- DANOVE, Paul L., *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark: Applications of a Case Frame Analysis*. JSNTSup 218. Sheffield: Academic Press, 2001.
- DECKER, Rodney J., *Mark 1–8: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco TX: Baylor, 2014.
- , *Mark 9–16: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco TX: Baylor, 2014.
- DELGADO GÓMEZ, Alfredo, “The Vocabulary of Mark’s Gospel, the LXX, and the Greek of Its Time.” *Bib* 102/3 (2021) 356–385.
- DOUDNA, John C., *The Greek of the Gospel of Mark*. JBLMS 12. Philadelphia PA: SBL, 1961.
- ELLIOTT, J. Keith, ed., *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*. NovTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- EMDE BOAS, Evert van, Albert RIJKSBARON, Luuk HUITINK, and Mathieu DE BAKKER, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- GIANOLLO, Chiara, “External Possession in New Testament Greek.” In *Papers on grammar XI*, edited by Gualtiero CALBOLI and Pierluigi CUZZOLIN, 101–129. Rome: Herder, 2010.

- , “Competing Constructions for Inalienable Possession in the Vulgate Gospels: Translator’s Choices and Grammatical Constraints.” *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13/1 (2014) 93–114.
- HEINE, Bernd, *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- HOGETERP, Albert and Adelbert DENAUX, *Semitisms in Luke’s Greek: A Descriptive Analysis of Lexical and Syntactical Domains of Semitic Language Influence in Luke’s Gospel*. WUNT 401. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- KÖSTENBERGER, Andreas J., Benjamin L. MERKLE, and Robert L. PLUMMER, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament*. Nashville TN: B&H Academic, 2016.
- KŘIVAN, Jan and Michal LÁZNIČKA, “Inalienable Possession.” In *Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*, edited by Marc L. GREENBERG and Lenore A. GRENOBLE, published online 2020, [https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-slavic-languages-and-linguistics-online/\\*-COM\\_033708](https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-slavic-languages-and-linguistics-online/*-COM_033708)
- LOUW, Theo van der, “Constructions Denoting ‘To Have’ (Predicate Possession) in the Greek Genesis.” *JSCS* 49 (2016) 5–21.
- MACDONALD, William G., *Greek Enchiridion: A Concise Handbook of Grammar for Translation and Exegesis*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1986.
- MALONEY, Elliott C., “A Study of Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax.” PhD diss. Fordham University NY, 1979.
- MIDDLETON, Thomas F., *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*, new 3rd ed. revised by H.J. ROSE. London: Rivington, 1841.
- MITHUN, Marianne, “The Difference a Category Makes in the Expression of Possession and Inalienability.” In *Dimensions of Possession*, edited by Irène BARON, Michael HERSLUND and Finn SØRENSEN. Typological Studies in Language 47, 285–310. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- MOULTON, James H., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 4. Edinburgh: Clark, 1976.
- NICHOLS, Johanna, “On Alienable and Inalienable Possession.” In *In Honor of Mary Haas: From the Haas Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics*, edited by William SHIPLEY, 557–609. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 1988.
- , *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago, 1992.
- READ-HEIMERDINGER, Jenny, *Luke in His Own Words: A Study of the Language of Luke-Acts in Greek*. LNTS 672. London: T&T Clark, 2022.
- REISER, Marius, *Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums im Licht der hellenistischen Volksliteratur*. WUNT II/11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984.
- ROBERTSON, Archibald T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 3rd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919.
- SEILER, Hansjakob, *Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language*. Language Universals Series 2. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1983.

- SIEBENTHAL, Heinrich von, *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019.
- SMYTH, Herbert W., *Greek Grammar*, revised by Gordon M. MESSING. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- SOISALON-SOININEN, Ilmari, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987 herausgegeben von Anneli Aejmelaesus und Raija Sollamo*, 86–103. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
- SWANSON, Reuben J., ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. 1. *Matthew*. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995.
- , ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. 2. *Mark*. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995.
- , ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. 3. *Luke*. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1995.
- SPANOGHE, Anne-Marie, “(In)alienability and (in)determination in Portuguese.” In *Dimensions of Possession*, edited by Irène BARON, Michael HERSLUND and Finn SØRENSEN. *Typological Studies in Language* 47, 227–242. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001.
- The Center for New Testament Textual Studies NT Critical Apparatus by the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2010.
- TOPS, Thomas, “A Philological Study of the Reflexive-Possessive Use of Personal Pronouns in the Fourth Gospel.” *NovT* 64/1 (2022) 18–35.
- , “Jesus’ Authority over All His Flesh: A Linguistic and Literary-Historical Study of ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός in John 17,2a.” *RB* 131 (2024) 236–259.
- TURNER, Nigel, “The Style of Mark.” In *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*, ed. J. Keith ELLIOTT. *NovTSup* 71, 215–237. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- VOELZ, James W., “The Language of the New Testament,” *ANRW* 25.2:893–977. Part 2, *Principat*, 25.2. Edited by H. TEMPORINI and W. HAASE. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.
- , “The Characteristics of the Greek of St. Mark’s Gospel.” In *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliott*, edited by Peter DOBLE and Jeffrey KLOHA. *New Testament Tools, NTTSD* 47, 137–153. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- , “Standard/Classical Greek Construction in the Gospel According to Mark and Their Importance for Interpretation.” *NovT* 62 (2020) 343–360.
- WALLACE, Daniel B., *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- WILCOX, Max, “Semitisms in the New Testament.” *ANRW* 25.2:978–1029. Part 2, *Principat*, 25.2. Edited by H. TEMPORINI and W. HAASE. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.
- ZERWICK, Maximilian, *Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil: Ein Beitrag zur stilistischen Durcharbeitung des Neuen Testaments*. *Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici* 38. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1937.