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ABSTRACT


The first section surveys the scholarly study of the minor agreements. The second examines in particular the role played by textual assimilation, ancient compositional practices, and the oral tradition in the formation of agreements.

The third section evaluates the candidate’s published work against Frans Neirynck’s list of significant minor agreements in *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis* (Studiorum Novi Testamentum Auxilia, XIII), Leuven, Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1988. This carefully compiled list of minor agreements is then used so that the work of the candidate is further tested against the work of a number of scholars representing different source critical positions. Particular attention is paid to the work of Andreas Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”: Untersuchung zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems* (WUNT, II/62), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1994. This section concludes with an examination of the role that oral tradition may have played in the formation of a number of the striking agreements in Neirynck’s list.

Extensive appendices are provided: i) indicating where the candidate’s work needs correction, ii) examining Neirynck’s list from a number of source critical perspectives, and iii) exploring the range of variation and convergence in the minor agreements listed by Neirynck.

The thesis argues that the predominately literary paradigm used to explain the minor agreements needs to be modified to take into account recent work on ancient compositional practices, including the roles played by short and long-term memory, paraphrase, and the on-going impact of oral traditions.
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Introduction

1) Development of the Source Critical Edition

The opportunity to reflect critically on the development of the two volumes of Luke and Matthew is both timely and welcome. The volumes have been the result of teaching the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in the setting of MCD University of Divinity for more than twelve years. They come out of ongoing interaction, countless questions and discussions, and reflect a journey undertaken with students and colleagues. Each group has contributed by their questions that have prompted further reworking and refining of the texts. In this sense they will continue to be works in progress, open to on-going development. There have been many conversation partners in their development: first of all the texts of Matthew and Luke themselves, the vast body of secondary literature, and then the students in class and group discussions. Other no less important conversations have taken place in the Biblical Department of Yarra Theological Union about how best to assist students achieve a growing competency in the application of a wide range of exegetical methodologies.

The journey began with teaching the Gospels of Matthew and Luke for some years and wanting to keep the students grounded by working with the Gospel texts rather than being too quickly enmeshed in the secondary literature about them. The aim was to find a mechanism to assist the students to read the texts more closely, and to make better and more effective use of standard exegetical tools such as Synopses. Class handouts from these years indicate that for a given section of the Gospel of Luke or Matthew there were lists of additions, omissions and suggestions as to the redactional activity of the evangelists, as well as the overall structure of the units in question. While students appreciated these handouts the greatest degree of interest and enthusiasm would come from working with the texts themselves and, in particular, sections taken from Synopses. Guiding questions were simple but effective enough: What is the same? What is different? How would you explain these similarities and differences? Does this connect in any way with what you have already learned about Mark, Matthew or Luke in the examination of other pericopes?
In time, students requested copies of the rough source critical text of Luke’s Gospel I was developing for personal use (based on the RSV), that consisted in trying to identify in a fairly rudimentary fashion what was shared with Mark, what was deemed by some to be from the ‘Q source’, and what was unique to Luke. An examination of an early version of Luke’s Gospel made available to students reveals that the primary concern was the identification and separation of pericopes and the classification of materials into sources. Possible Q materials that had been judged as redacted by Luke were also indicated. In the early stages there were virtually no indications of the placement of various pericopes in their wider Markan or Matthean contexts. Despite its simplicity it proved a highly effective means of helping students to appreciate the development of the Gospel traditions, and opened the way to the exploration of the Lukan use of the developing traditions, the incorporation of these traditions, and their reworking and redaction.

After developing a working text for the Gospel of Luke, the next task was then to provide a companion text for students of Matthew’s Gospel. At this stage the unit offered at YTU on Matthew became one that was explicitly source critical and redaction critical in its focus. The class notes from the late 1990’s consisted in overviews of the section of the Gospel being studied, lists of the pericopes in the section and their location in Mark and Luke, and indications of additions and omissions. The text of Matthew given to students now started to include headings for the individual pericopes indicating the parallels in Mark and Luke as well as comments that were classified as structural notes. These largely arose from exploring with the students how the individual pericopes were structured from the perspective of the development of the wider narrative, and from form critical considerations, where it was considered appropriate or helpful. At the same time the structure of the discourses that are such a prominent and distinctive feature of that Gospel were examined, and the notes helped to provide markers of one reading of the underlying structure of the discourses.

As is often the case in life, one thing leads to another, and what had been developed for the Gospel of Matthew was also applied in turn to the Gospel of Luke, involving the addition of structural notes, and headings for the individual pericopes indicating the parallel passages in Mark and Matthew. The class handouts for Luke in
the early 2000’s started to include indications of when Luke varied in the Greek text from Matthew or Mark and that was the beginning of a growing desire to provide students with much more precision. This could only be satisfied by re-working the Greek texts of Matthew and working back to the English texts. While reference had always been made to the Greek texts in class, there had been no pressing need to provide a source critical volume of the Greek texts themselves. A sabbatical semester in 2008 provided the opportunity to begin work on a Source Critical Edition (SCE) of both Matthew and Luke including both the Greek and English texts. This created its own challenges in terms of creating the means to indicate similarities and differences in a way that would not be too burdensome for readers, yet providing more detail regarding the variations in tenses, compound verbs and the variations in terms of case and number with nouns and adjectives, and other parts of speech.

Working with the Greek text proved easier than developing conventions for the English text, and while the working hypothesis was that of the modified Two-Source theory the aim was to deal with the facts first, that is: to identify as accurately as possible what was unique, what was shared with Mark, what Matthew and Luke shared not found in Mark, and their variations within/on the Markan and shared materials. The primary aim was not that of defending one theory of Synoptic relationships against another so much as providing a means by which the complexity of these relationships was brought more clearly into relief.

Once a draft of the SCE was completed a successful application was made for a grant from MCD to assist in publishing the two volumes. The Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome was contacted to see whether they had any interest in publishing them in the Subsidia Biblica series. Prof James Swetnam SJ suggested that it would be helpful to include an introductory survey of recent developments in the area of Synoptic studies.

During the preparation of the SCE, my attention was not especially focussed on the minor agreements as a phenomenon though in working progressively through the texts of Matthew and Luke one cannot help but notice those instances where there is agreement in small details. If one subscribes to the theory of the existence of Q, then the larger episodes, pericopes and sayings shared by Matthew and Luke provide
little problem. Likewise the probability of some degree of overlap between Mark and Q materials also accounts for a number of minor agreements. Besides Q materials and Mark-Q overlaps, there are a number of further agreements between Matthew and Luke in materials otherwise judged to be Markan. In the preparation of the SCE the criteria used for identifying these minor agreements was principally that of high verbal agreement. Thus the SCE attempted to identify where Matthew and Luke agreed either in a shared variation to a Markan word, or where they agreed in having material not found in Mark. Where this material exhibited some degree of variation this was also indicated. The initial work was undertaken with limited awareness of the on-going debates about the significance of the minor agreements. At one level this was a disadvantage, and yet on another level it was an examination of the texts of Matthew and Luke without being weighed down by the burden of engaging with the considerable range of opinion as to how to identify, enumerate and interpret these agreements within the wider context of the Synoptic debate. No doubt this would have been helpful in some respects, and yet there is something to be said for engaging in a task with fresh eyes rather than one’s perspective being determined by the work of others.

The working hypothesis that has largely guided my work has been that of the Two-Source theory, and while this has proved generally satisfactory, the minor agreements function as a salutary and necessary reminder that the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels to one another, and the on-going development of the Jesus tradition, is much more complex than theory strictly permits.

The invitation to write a critical reflection on the SCE in partial fulfilment of the examination requirements for the PhD has provided the opportunity to engage seriously with the wider debate on the minor agreements, and to test and evaluate my own work in the light of other studies undertaken in this area.

2) Methodology

The first section of the paper provides an overview of the emergence of the minor agreements as a focus in Synoptic studies once Markan priority became the
dominant paradigm. This section will briefly treat the range of solutions that have been offered, the identification of agreements, and the tendency to rank agreements in terms of their significance.

The second section of the paper argues that the major utilization theories provide a partial explanation for the formation of the minor agreements, suggesting that other factors such as the textual tradition and transmission of the texts also need to be considered as providing partial explanations for some of the agreements. Research has been undertaken more recently regarding compositional practices in antiquity that provided a much-needed point of reference against which the primarily literary paradigm of the major utilization theories can be tested. This research provides a solid foundation for those who have argued that the literary paradigm needs to be modified to reflect more adequately the role played by the oral tradition in the formation of the minor agreements.

The third section of the paper is a critical reflection on the SCE itself, using Neirynck’s list of significant minor agreements that provides a representative sample set of agreements against which both the SCE and the works of a number of scholars could be tested. The aim being to determine whether these agreements were identified, the criteria used in their identification, and the means by which they were interpreted.

Neirynck’s list is compared to the SCE to determine where they agree and disagree in the identification of agreements so as to identify and evaluate more clearly the criteria used in the preparation of the SCE and to determine where corrections will need to be made in subsequent editions (Appendix I).

As a means of testing Neirynck’s list of significant agreements, the works of a number of scholars representative of different points of view were consulted, including the earlier work of Streeter and Hawkins. The Two-Source theory is represented by the works of Fitzmyer and Bovon for Luke, and Luz and Nolland for Matthew. McNicol, Dungan and Peabody were used to represent the Neo-Griesbachian perspective on Luke, and Boulder on Luke for proponents of the Farrer theory. Ennulat and Luz were chosen to represent those who accept Markan priority,
but who also argue for a post-Markan recension to explain a number of the agreements. These points of view are incorporated into the body of the paper, and their work collated into an Appendix II for ease of reference and comparison.

Neirynck’s list is then used as the sample set by which the SCE is tested against Ennulat’s major work on the minor agreements, once again exploring the criteria used to identify the minor agreements and evaluating the possibility of a Markan recension. The last element of this section of the paper is devoted to the exploration of the possible role played in the formation of the minor agreements by the oral tradition, paying attention to the studies of Bovon, Soards, Brown, Luz and Stein.

This critical reflection will argue that:

1) In the identification of minor agreements the primary criterion should be that of verbal agreement, though instances where there is a high level of agreement in content, but not vocabulary, should also be considered;

2) minor agreements have multiple causes (rather than being due solely to coincidental and independent redaction, a recension of Mark or Lukan dependence on Matthew);

3) the testing of the major utilization theories on compositional grounds supports a view of multiple causes; and

4) the predominant literary paradigm used in analysing Synoptic relationships does needs to be re-evaluated, or at least expanded and softened, thereby giving greater prominence to the role of the oral tradition in the formation of minor agreements.

The appendices that accompany this paper are:

Appendix I

An examination of Neirynck’s list of significant agreements compared to the SCE with a view to identifying where the SCE needs modification or correction, as well as a brief rationale and criteria used in the identification or non-identification of these agreements.
Appendix II

A list of Neirynck’s significant agreements indicating whether the SCE identified them. This includes cross-references to a number of scholars representing different points of view regarding the identification and interpretation of these minor agreements.

Appendix III

A summary chart of the variations found in the minor agreements listed by Neirynck. This appendix serves to highlight the range of convergence and variation in the minor agreements. This appendix indicates the types of agreement, when there is no verbal agreement and whether these agreements were indicated in the SCE.
Section One: Overview of the study of the minor agreements

1) The minor agreements and the emergence of Markan priority

The study of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark provides a fascinating point of entry into the complexity of the relationships between the Synoptic Gospels. It has been the subject of intense scrutiny and debate that has largely coincided with the shift from the Augustinian and Griesbach hypotheses, with their shared premise of Matthean priority, to that of Markan priority in its various forms. As long as Luke was judged to be dependent on Matthew, minor agreements were clearly evaluated as reflecting that literary dependence and interpreted accordingly. Since both Luke and Mark were held to be secondary to Matthew, agreements between them reflected either Luke’s dependence on Matthew and Mark in the traditional Augustinian model, or Mark’s conflating both Matthew and Luke as Griesbach had suggested. As soon as Markan priority was postulated and came into prominence as the leading hypothesis, the occasions on which Matthew and Luke corresponded against Mark demanded investigation and explanation.

In 1898 Hawkins identified 238 agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark. Of these some 100 instances were judged to be slight verbal agreements, explained as being (a) accidental; (b) obvious and natural amplification; or (c)

---

grammatical improvements of the comparative harshness of Mark’s Greek. A further 118 agreements were listed for which the same explanations might also be sufficient if there were no other more significant instances. Hawkins drew attention to the remaining 20/21 instances of agreement that led him to the conclusion that a common source other than Mark was used by Matthew and Luke. This naturally led to the next question of exploring the nature and origin of this source.

The possibility of an Ur-Marcus, another source other than the Logia (or ‘Q’) source, or the dependence of Matthew or Luke on one another, were all considered. Hawkins suggested two possible explanations: (a) the possible impact of copying in the textual tradition and/or the more probable impact of the oral transmission of the Gospels on the text or, (b) a recension of the text of Mark. After over 100 years of study on the Synoptic Problem it is worth noting that Hawkins’ identification of the possible explanations for the agreements has lost none of its cogency and still serves to outline the major contours of the debate.

Neirynck’s detailed survey in 1974 observed that the most coherent explanations regarding the minor agreements were still those of J. Schmid, who argued that the majority were due to independent editing on the part of Matthew and Luke and the limited influence of Q, apart from a few exceptions best explained by later scribal assimilation. Friedrichsen would come to similar conclusions in 1989, stating that from the perspective of the Two-Source theory the primary explanation for the agreements is redaction-critical rather than source or text-critical. His survey points to coincidence in redaction as the primary explanation for agreements, with supplementary explanations provided by the impact of oral tradition, the influence of Q, and some degree of textual corruption.

While many Two-Source theorists were more or less satisfied with this predominantly redactional paradigm to explain the phenomenon of the agreements, proponents of other theories of Synoptic relationships see them as the result of literary

---

dependence. As the supporters of the Farrer hypothesis have argued, Markan priority can be accepted with the minor agreements as being largely explicable on the basis of Luke’s dependence on Matthew. Goulder and Goodacre have examined the minor agreements and have pressed them into service in support of what they consider to be the telling blow to the Achilles’ heel of the Two-Source theory, and claim to have dispensed with Q at the same time. Neo-Griesbachians would not agree with the premise of Markan priority, but would concur with Goulder and Goodacre in interpreting the minor agreements as being largely due to Lukan dependence on Matthew. In 1991 Neirynck identified that the battle lines had been clearly drawn between the independent redaction of Mark by Luke and Matthew and the competing theories of Luke’s dependence on Matthew, Deuteromark, and a Deutero-Markan

6 M. Goulder, On Putting Q to the Test, NTS 24 (1978), 218-234. M. Goodacre, Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm, (JSNT, 133), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996. See chapter three pp. 89-130, for an evaluation of Goulder’s work on the minor agreements. Not unexpectedly, a strong reply was not long in forthcoming; see F. Neirynck, Goulder and the Minor Agreements, ETL 73 (1997) 84-93, reprinted in Id., Evangelica III 1992-2000 Collected Essays by Frans Neirynck (BETL, 150), Leuven, Peeters, 2001, 307-318. One can see that considerable reflection has gone on in the development of ways of determining Luke’s dependence on Matthew: (1) Matthean, un-Lukan wording; (2) Order; (3) Clusters of not very Lukan words; (4) Luke’s dependence on Matthew’s redaction; (5) undoubtable links and the coincidence of hapax (p. 307). These criteria are all helpful in identifying language that is not characteristically Lukan and provide a firmer foundation for claims that Luke may have depended on Matthew. On the other hand this does not eliminate other explanations such as the use of a shared oral tradition, or a possible recension of Mark. See A. Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”: Untersuchung zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems (WUNT, II/258), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1994. Ennulat’s research demonstrates that the same hypothesis see M. Goulder and the Minor Agreements, Beyond the Q Impasse – Luke’s Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies, Valley Forge, Trinity Press, 1996, pp. 25-35. For a strong rebuttal of the Griesbach hypothesis see C.M. Tuckett, The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal (SNTS MS, 44), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983. The minor agreements are specifically treated on pp. 61-75, and Tuckett concluded that the Griesbach Hypothesis has its own problems in dealing with the minor agreements. Mark’s proposed mode of editing his sources is deemed to be inconsistent and his redaction unexpected. See also Friedrichsen, Matthew-Luke Agreements, pp. 345-348.

7 From the point of view of the Griesbach hypothesis the minor agreements are the result of the Lukan use of Matthew. This does not mean, however, that Lukan redaction or non-Matthean material is thereby eliminated. See A.J. McNicol - D.L. Dungan - D.B. Peabody (eds.), Beyond the Q Impasse – Luke’s Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies, Valley Forge, Trinity Press, 1996, pp. 25-35. For a strong rebuttal of the Griesbach hypothesis see C.M. Tuckett, The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal (SNTS MS, 44), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983. The minor agreements are specifically treated on pp. 61-75, and Tuckett concluded that the Griesbach Hypothesis has its own problems in dealing with the minor agreements. Mark’s proposed mode of editing his sources is deemed to be inconsistent and his redaction unexpected. See also Friedrichsen, Matthew-Luke Agreements, pp. 345-348.

8 The idea of a Deuteromark has been championed by A. Fuchs, Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik (AnBib, 49), Rome, 1971, see Id., Spuren von Deuteromarkus I-V, Munster, Lit Verlag, 2004-2007. For an evaluation of this theory and its proponents see Friedrichsen, The Matthew-Luke Agreements, pp. 360-365. For an assessment of Fuchs see F. Neirynck, Deuteromarcus et les accords Matthieu-Luc, ETL 56 (1980) 397-408 reprinted in Evangelica I, (BETL, 60) Leuven, Peeters 1982, 769-780. Neirynck suggests that the theory emerges as a means of dealing with the minor agreements as post-Markan corrections. C.M. Tuckett, The Current State of the Synoptic Problem, pp. 9-50, in Foster, New Studies. Tuckett, p. 34, observes that Fuchs seems to have expanded the hypothesis to the extent that now all agreements, both major and minor are to be understood as being due to Deutero-Markus. Tuckett highlights some difficulties with the theory as presented by Fuchs, particularly from the point of view of the inconsistency to be found in the ways in which the editor works with the Markan text.
Deutermark and a Deutero-Markan recension are distinguished by the extent of redaction that has been involved, where Deutermark is understood as a more radical and comprehensive reworking of the Gospel of Mark.10

From any of these perspectives the agreements are understood to be a secondary phenomenon, and attest to the on-going development of the tradition11. If the priority of Mark is assumed, then agreements are secondary, whether due to redaction or the use of a recension of Mark. Some agreements would also have arisen in the transmission of the text by means of textual corruption and assimilation, and others through the on-going influence of the oral tradition. The secondary nature of the agreements can also be seen to be the case if agreements are the consequence of Luke’s dependence on Matthew, as proponents of the Griesbach hypothesis or the Farrer theory would suggest.

2) Global solutions: one cause or many?

Boring has argued that there is no reason to assume that the agreements would have come from — or be explained by — one abstract principle or cause.12 More recently he has furthered that argument by suggesting that the agreements are most likely to be best explained by a number of factors, which are also relevant to the

---

9 The idea of a Deutero-Markan recension is treated in FRIEDRICHSEN, The Matthew-Luke Agreements, p. 360; see NEIRYNCK, The Two-Source Theory, pp. 8-9, and TUCKETT, The Current State, pp. 33-36, for a brief survey of the challenges that have been offered to the Two-Source theory by these proposals. A major study on the minor agreements that has argued for such a recension is ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”. See pp. 417-430 for the conclusions of his study, a summary of the results of his research, and an outline of its stylistic and Christological features.


11 See F. NEIRYNCK, The Two-Source Theory, pp. 40-41; FRIEDRICHSEN, The Matthew-Luke Agreements, p. 391, where Friedrichsen indicates careful study supports this conclusion. On the other hand his review of alternative solutions to the minor agreements (p. 367) notes how there is no consensus among scholars as to whether the agreements are prior or secondary to our present text of Mark’s Gospel.

12 See BORING, The Synoptic Problem, p. 599, where it is suggested that a “plurality of explanations” does not make that position inherently weak. See R.H. STEIN, Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2001, pp. 136-141, who lists coincidental redaction, the overlapping with Q, textual corruption, and overlapping oral traditions as possible explanations. Even NEIRYNCK, The Two-Source Theory, p. 41, who has consistently argued for the minor agreements as the result of post-Markan redaction, does not exclude some influence from the oral tradition, or a recension of Mark, or even some subsidiary influence of Matthew on the text of Luke.
Synoptic Problem generally. Tuckett’s recent survey of the Synoptic Problem would agree that there is a growing consensus on the provisional nature of any single hypothesis and the ability to reconstruct the processes that accompanied the formation of the Synoptic Gospels in their final form. On one hand, not postulating more sources than is necessary is deemed to be elegant, logical, and sound methodologically. On the other hand no one theory has been able to carry the day without alternative theories being proposed and more complex theories continuing to emerge.

3) Coherence and redaction?

The need to test any proposed global solution for the minor agreements by means of the criterion of coherence has been forcefully argued by Boring. This criterion is used to examine whether any consistent patterns can be found in the minor agreements. In order for a global solution to be convincing some consistency and coherence needs to be demonstrated. Friedrichsen would agree in putting the onus on those who argue for the “unitary character” of the agreements to demonstrate it in the face of the range of diversity among the agreements. If a simple theory is going to provide the hermeneutical key to resolving the challenge of the agreements then it will be able to stand up to close scrutiny according to this criterion. The Two-Source theory explains the existence of the agreements as being due to a number of causes and for this reason coherence would not be expected other than within a particular cause, such as improvements to the Greek of Mark. Boring justifiably draws attention

14 Tuckett, The Current State, In this well-written survey from the point of view of one of the leading Two-Source theorists, he notes that one area of increasing convergence after one hundred years of study on the Synoptic Problem is the provisional nature of any hypothesis, and the recognition that there may be a huge chasm between historical reality and our ability to reconstruct it. See pp. 49-50 for his conclusions.
15 A recent example is that proposed by D. Burkett, Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark, New York - London, T. & T. Clark, 2004, who argues for a multi-source theory where Proto-Mark is preserved in two recensions with Proto-Mark A used by Matthew, and Proto-Mark B used by Luke. Both recensions then make a contribution to the final form of Mark. This theory also includes the use of Q and materials unique to both Matthew and Luke. For a presentation of the theory vis a vis theories of Markan priority, Matthean priority, and Proto-Mark see pp. 133-142. For a survey of the study of the minor agreements see pp. 7-12.
16 Boring, The Synoptic Problem, p. 598.
18 See Boring, The Synoptic Problem, pp. 593-595, and later in The “Minor Agreements”, pp. 237-238, where this is applied to the major utilization theories.
to the Mark-Q overlaps as being an exception, and they would be a sub-set of the minor agreements where some degree of coherence would be anticipated. The major alternatives to the Two-Source theory do require some degree of coherence. If the agreements are due to Matthew and Luke making use of a Deutero-Mark, or a recension of Mark, then some degree of consistency is to be expected, and it needs to be demonstrated for these proposals to be convincing. Even those who argue for a recension would acknowledge that the redactional activity of the evangelists is a factor that makes such a demonstration difficult to achieve. The amount of variation between the Synoptic Gospels, even where there is agreement, ensures that independent redaction is a factor that must continue to be reckoned with.

Hawkins accepted Markan priority and from that standpoint he suggested that one part of the puzzle provided by the minor agreements could be explained by coincidental redactional changes on the part of Matthew and Luke to Mark’s Greek. This particular view has been widely accepted, developed and refined over the last hundred years\(^{19}\). As further research on the minor agreements has been undertaken; shared patterns of changes to Mark’s Greek have been identified. Specifically Lukan and Matthean traits have continued to be noted and they have been then used as a point of reference when determining the likelihood of dependence in one direction or another\(^{20}\).


\(^{20}\) \textit{Ennulat} uses this frequently in his examination of the minor agreements as a criterion for determining that a post-Markan recension is a likely solution. On the other hand, the same data is capable of being interpreted in other ways. The work of the Neo-Griesbachians A.J. McNicol (ed.) with D.L. Dungan and D.B. Peabody, \textit{Beyond the Q Impasse – Luke’s Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies}, Valley Forge, Trinity Press, 1996, speak in terms of “one way indicators” (see pp. 22,24,82,115,135,229,269,270). From the point of view of the Farrer theory, see \textit{Goodacre, Goulder and the Gospels}, pp. 92-101.
4) Identification and enumeration of agreements

The question of the identification and enumeration of the minor agreements is a complex matter in its own right. Studies have ranged in identifying the number of agreements from 230 to 2354, and while that might seem an extremely wide range it depends on what is counted as an agreement. That the agreements exist is beyond question, but what constitutes an agreement? Boring has noted that agreements exist “not as an ontological entity behind the text, but as an abstract set of relations in the texts or between them or in front of them, in the mind of the researcher.” As an example Boring examined Mk 1,41 and demonstrated how anywhere from two to sixteen agreements can be identified depending on what criteria are used. This is a cogent and forceful reminder that, while there is general agreement regarding the existence of agreements, consensus has yet to be achieved in terms of what constitutes one.

In an earlier study, Boring had already asked the critical questions when it comes to the enumeration of agreements: (a) To what extent should each Gospel be divided into smaller units to facilitate comparison? (b) How far does the context

---


23 BORING, The “Minor Agreements”, p. 231.

extend in searching for agreements? (c) In the same context, must words be the same or can analogous structures be considered agreements? (d) Must Matthew and Luke make the same change for it to be considered an agreement? (e) When do Matthean and Lukan forms of a word represent the same vocabulary? (f) Are all the negative agreements (omissions) to be considered as agreements?

In the earlier studies, verbal correspondence appears to have been the leading criterion in determining an agreement. Whilst this will always provide the primary point of reference, it cannot be used exclusively. In time both positive and negative agreements have been counted and this has had considerable impact on the enumeration of the minor agreements. Some lists extend to include those occasions when similar grammatical constructions have been used, or where an idea or characteristic is shared even though there is no verbal agreement. In some lists of agreements a phrase may be counted as a single agreement, in others each of the elements may be counted. With his characteristic acuity, Boring has argued that agreements also have to be weighed and that an argument can be made that the words that make up a shared phrase should not be counted as a number of separate agreements. Boring is surely correct in his judgement that agreements need to be defined and specified before they are counted. While there may not be widespread agreement about the enumeration used, steps should be taken to provide some clarity about the definitions one is using in determining agreements.

Acknowledges that the more subdivisions that are made in triple tradition passages, the more agreements can be made practically to disappear. A well-recognized example of this is provided in the mention of Jesus lodging (ἡγάλαζον / ἡγάλης) in Bethany in Mt 21,17 and Lk 21,37. For some the rarity of the word argues that it must be an agreement, even if the agreement is found in a different context. ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements” p. 252, is convinced this is a sign of a recension of Mark.

BORING, The Synoptic Problem, p. 591; TUCKETT, The Current State (n. 31), p. 23, draws attention to the weakness of counting Matthean and Lukan differences to Mark as agreements when they disagree in wording. He also makes mention of his doubts about the validity of counting all the words in a pericope not included by Matthew and Luke as individual agreements rather than as a single agreement.

See ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements” pp. 5-9, for a graphic presentation of the positive and negative agreements in the Markan pericopes. See also BORING, The Synoptic Problem, pp. 592-593; and TUCKETT, The Current State (n. 31), p. 23.


BORING, The Synoptic Problem, pp. 592-593. See also The “Minor Agreements” pp. 228-231, where he makes the point that the difficulties are not appreciated until one attempts to enumerate agreements, and pp. 234-235 regarding the need for declaring one’s criteria. In the preparation for my own volumes, the enumeration was not attempted, but some initial steps were taken in terms of classifications. The category represented by the code ‘vm’ within the volumes goes some way to helping readers identify when Luke and Matthew agree in a variation of a Markan lexical element. These types of agreements
5) What agreements are significant?

Since the time of Hawkins a further question associated with that of enumeration is that of evaluating whether an agreement is a significant one. The question is usually asked with specific reference to the significance of the agreements for a given source theory, and its comprehensiveness or viability in the face of such agreements. As we have seen, Hawkins highlighted some 21 instances that gave rise to speculation of there being another source used by Matthew and Luke. Neirynck, building on the work of S. McLoughlin’s compilation of the lists of significant agreements from Hawkins, Burton, M.-J. Lagrange and B. de Solages, highlighted some 52 significant agreements. The classification of these agreements as significant generally indicates that these agreements are not easily explained by the Two-Source theory as it is generally conceived. Depending on one’s point of view, these agreements are considered to provide justification for modifying the theory so as to accommodate alternate and supplementary elements, or, as is the case with Neo-Griesbachians and Farrer proponents, to use the minor agreements to question the existence or Q or Markan priority, or both. The number of significant agreements will vary depending on whether they can be adequately accounted for by coincidental redaction or not. Goulder identified some 12 passages in which Luke agreed with Matthew against Mark in using uncharacteristic or unnatural language, using Matthean language, or deviations in order that could indicate the Lukan use of Matthew.

---

need to be distinguished from phrases or other elements not present in Mark. How they are to be interpreted remains open to debate, though *prima facie* these are more likely to be coincidental and grammatical than due to literary dependence.

30 HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae*, pp. 210-211.
In section three of this paper Neirynck’s list of significant agreements will be used as the set of minor agreements against which SCE, and the research of other scholars, will be tested. There it will be argued that many of these agreements, while noteworthy, do not necessarily sound the death knell for the Two-Source theory, but can be adequately explained in the light of the compositional practices of the period and the on-going contribution of the oral tradition.

Section Two: Textual criticism, composition practices, oral tradition and the study of the minor agreements

1) Textual criticism and the study of the minor agreements

Streeter claimed that a large number of minor agreements were due to textual corruption and paid attention to some thirty examples that could be explained text critically. While Streeter’s claims have been questioned he rightly drew attention to the role played by text critical considerations in dealing with the phenomenon of the minor agreements. There is a range of opinion as to the degree to which minor agreements can be explained as the result of scribal activity. However, it is widely accepted as being a factor that has to be included in considerations of the Synoptic Problem in general, and in the minor agreements in particular.

Text critical and source critical studies do intersect more than is generally acknowledged. There are two text critical considerations that need to be borne in mind in the study of the minor agreements. The first is that of avoiding the assumption that the critical texts of the Gospels at our disposal correspond to the final

---

34 For the critique of this position see Neirynck, The Minor Agreements, pp. 37-39. As Burkett, Rethinking the Gospel Sources, p. 9, observes, it looks as though Streeter’s appeal to textual corruption as an explanation for agreements is really a means of saving a theory rather than a genuine attempt to determine the original text. He rightly points to the work of W.R. Farmer, The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis, New York, Macmillan; London, Collier-Macmillan, 1964; repr. Dillsboro, NC, Western North Carolina Press, 1976, pp.146-147, who noted how few of Streeter’s suggestions have been incorporated into the on-going work of textual critics.
forms of Matthew, Mark and Luke. The text of Mark is poorly attested in the first two centuries. Even if it is established that Matthew and Luke used Mark’s Gospel as a primary source it is by no means certain that they had access to the same, or very similar, form of Mark’s Gospel.

The second consideration is that assimilation and corruption are clearly a part of the history of the transmission of these texts, and will have played some role in both the formation and elimination of agreements. Neirynck’s 1991 study on the minor agreements included an appendix that noted the variant readings and their impact on the creation and elimination of minor agreements by comparing the N-A text with that of the Huck-Greeven text. According to this appendix the N-A text created 19 agreements (with an additional 8 agreements noted) and removed 19 agreements (with an additional 3 agreements noted). The Huck-Greeven text removed 35 agreements (with an additional 14 agreements noted) and created 46 agreements (with an additional 9 agreements noted). The N-A text has maintained the same judgements as the previous edition with no changes for the minor agreements cited by Neirynck. The tendency towards harmonisation in general, and in the direction of Matthew’s Gospel in particular, is often acknowledged. In defence of the Majority Text theory Wisselink’s study has argued that assimilation has not occurred towards

---

35 See C.M. TUCKETT, *The Minor Agreements and Textual Criticism*, in G. STRECKER (ed.), *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993, 119-141. On p. 137 he makes the point very clear in speaking of “hypothetical reconstructions” and our critical texts as being the best approximations to the text that we can reasonably achieve. BORING, *The “Minor Agreements”*, p. 246, draws attention to the need for caution here given that we cannot be sure that Luke and Matthew had access to the same text of Mark, or that our current critical editions are close to that of the Gospel of Mark, or that our present reconstructions of the texts of Matthew and Luke approximate the original texts. Understandably this needs to be born in mind in examining even the presence of minor agreements, let alone how to explain them adequately; P.M. HEAD, *Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*, in FOSTER, *New Studies*, 115-156, agrees and observes that text critics tend to think that synoptic scholars have sorted out the Synoptic Problem, and that synoptic scholars, for their part, can fall into the misapprehension that our critical texts can be used as though they are the final texts (p. 117).


37 F. NEIRYNCK, *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis*, pp. 93-100. There is also an additional list of variant readings from the Huck-Greeven text noted on pp. 97-98 that comprise some 51 variant readings for Mark, 20 for the text of Matthew and 17 for the text of Luke.

any one Gospel to a significant degree, though Matthew’s Gospel would have the highest number of assimilations as the tradition develops, and the least number of assimilations towards it. Wisselink would also strongly dispute the claim that the Byzantine text-type is inferior on the basis of harmonization or assimilation.\(^{39}\)

How much light text critical factors shed on the minor agreements in general remains to be seen, but agreements such as τίς ἐστιν ὁ παῖς σας σε; in Mt 26,68/Lk 22,64 have been the source of heated debate.\(^{40}\) In this particular instance, and in others, Fee suggests that there is the danger of falling into circular logic where one’s preferred theory ends up determining the textual judgement.\(^{41}\)

An example such as this suggests that the two areas of synoptic studies and textual criticism do overlap and that both disciplines share a common historical concern. As Fee puts it: “in the final analysis, text critics and Synoptic critics are...”\(^{42}\)

\(^{39}\) Wisselink, Assimilation, p. 93. D.B. Wallace, The Majority-Text Theory: History, Methods and Critique, in JETS 37/2 (1994) 185-215, reviews the arguments of those defending the Majority Text theory and assesses Wisselink’s work as probably the most solid defense of the theory indicating that assimilation occurs in both Byzantine and Alexandrian text types (pp. 196-197). Wallace’s own conclusion pulls no punches claiming that “the traditional-text theory is just barely within the realm of historical possibility.” (See p. 213).


historians and must ultimately come down on the side of what they think is most probable, given all the data now in possession\textsuperscript{43}.

Speaking of the data now in possession provides a helpful reminder that there are many more unknown factors than we would like, and that one cannot exclude the impact of the oral tradition, or collective oral memory for that matter, in making text critical assessments\textsuperscript{44}. It may be that some minor agreements are the direct result of scribal activity, and that it is the oral tradition, rather than literary dependence, that provides the best explanation for these minor agreements.

2) Compositional practices in antiquity and the minor agreements

In 1911 Sanday accurately observed that our appreciation of the circumstances in which the Gospels were written is very limited and often unduly influenced by the compositional practices of our own time\textsuperscript{45}. These sentiments have been echoed over the years and T. Luce in 1977 observed that most source critics failed to ask how the evangelists worked when proposing their various theories. This observation provides a timely reminder for the resolution of the Synoptic Problem generally, and the minor agreements in particular\textsuperscript{46}. More recently Neville has suggested that this area of New Testament research has not made adequate use of the information that is available from research into the compositional practices of antiquity\textsuperscript{47}. Fortunately the gap has now been well bridged by the works of Downing, Mattila, Neville, Derrenbacker and

\textsuperscript{43} FEE, Modern Textual Criticism, p. 181. In general terms his engagement with the texts of Matthew and Luke comes down on the side of Markan priority as the best solution at a text critical level.

\textsuperscript{44} FEE, Modern Textual Criticism, p. 181. See also Id., A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem, in D.E. ORTON (ed.), The Synoptic Problem and Q, Leiden-Boston-Koln: Brill, 1999, 163-179. He speaks of the continuing tenacity of the oral tradition alongside the developing literary tradition (p. 175).


\textsuperscript{47} D.J. NEVILLE, Mark’s Gospel – Prior or Posterior? A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order (JSNT SS, 222), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, p. 121, notes that what has been studied about the writing habits in the ancient world is not negligible. In other words, there is a sufficient amount that is now known to be able to make reasonable suppositions about the writing activity of the evangelists. R.A. BURRIDGE, What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography, Cambridge - Grand Rapids MI, Eerdmans, 2004, p. 169, agrees that writing in antiquity was a more complex task and that modern scholars may well work with books and paper strewn over the floor, but it would have been a different matter in antiquity, especially in working with documents that were without verses, chapter headings and pages.
Gregory, who have incorporated the fruits of studies into the practices of Plutarch, Suetonius, Livy, Hieronymus of Cardia, Lucian and Josephus, providing a much more informed vantage point from which the practices of the evangelists can be better understood and evaluated. It is by no means an exact science, but these studies provide some much needed parameters so that P.G. Walsh’s call for “establishing boundaries between reasonable certainty and ingenious speculation” can be addressed with greater confidence.

It is incumbent upon source critics to test their theories of Synoptic relationships against what can reasonably be determined regarding contemporary compositional practice. As Mattila has pointed out, the challenge of placing the formation of the Gospels in a historically credible world has to be faced. It is unlikely that the compositional practices of their authors would be more complex than those of their more sophisticated contemporaries.

One of the gains for New Testament source critics from these studies is a much more nuanced appreciation of the physical constraints under which the Gospels would have been composed. Tables and desks were not normally used and a person could work directly with only one scroll at a time, and that most likely upon their knee.

For ancient writers the scrolls were cumbersome and difficult to work with, and the posture of sitting with a scroll supported on one’s knees would make constant,

---


49 Mattila, *A Question*, p. 207, does note the attempts by biblical scholars such as F.G. Downing, *Redaction Criticism: Josephus Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels*, I, in *JSNT* 8 (1980) 45-65, when examining the work of Flavius Josephus in *Jewish Antiquities* from the point of view of sources, but acknowledges the difficulty in using this as a model for the Synoptic Gospels since classical authors tended to rewrite their sources.


51 Mattila, *A Question*, p. 217. In this she built upon the work of Luce, *Livy*.

or even frequent, visual contact with a written source difficult to achieve. For this
reason some degree of memory would have been involved, with sources being
consulted from time to time, and most likely, on a paragraph by paragraph basis.

Neville has argued that for much of the time authors depended heavily on
both short-term and long-term memory, and that this could be of both literary sources
and oral performance. The scenario that emerges is one in which direct visual
contact with perhaps one text, remembering other texts that were previously read or
dictated, and drawing on the oral tradition, all play a possible role in the formation of
agreements. For these reasons, Kirk has argued that more attention should be paid to
the role of memory in attending to the patterns of variation and agreement in the
Synoptic Gospels, and that scribal activity involved memory based on both oral and
literary traditions. Derrenbacker agrees, indicating that authors tended to follow one
written source at a time. The physical constraints already outlined would explain why
this would be the case. Memory played a critical role in being able to overcome
these physical limitations.

In the light of these constraints Pelling’s suggestion that memory would come
into play if multiple documents and sources were involved, becomes much more
likely, especially if two sources did not deal with the same event in the same

33 Regarding frequent visual contact, see Derrenbacker, Ancient Compositional Practices, p. 437; Sanday, The Conditions, p. 18; Neville, Mark’s Gospel, p. 125; Mattila, A Question, p. 215.
34 Mattila, A Question, p. 215.
36 See Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem p. 466, where he highlights the tendency to look at synoptic relations out of a literary model that sees copying and editing somehow sealed off from oral media dynamics. For him this is clearly a contributing factor as to why the Synoptic Problem has proven to be so difficult to resolve (p. 460). In his conclusions he also argues that the major utilization theories suffer from a lack of awareness and understanding of ancient media realities (p. 482).
Thucydides had already claimed that in writing on the Peloponnesian War were, by and large, all part of the normal range of acceptable compositional activity. Assistance would be required and might be provided in various ways by people holding scrolls, locating relevant passages, and the possible use of dictation as an aid for the one writing.

Thus the work that has been done on the compositional practices of antiquity has highlighted not only the physical circumstances under which the evangelists worked, but also the ways in which sources were incorporated into new documents. Downing and others have indicated that paraphrasing, précis, expansion and omission were, by and large, all part of the normal range of acceptable compositional activity.

Thucydides had already claimed that in writing on the Peloponnesian War:

With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said. And with reference to the narrative of events, far from permitting myself to derive it from the first source that came to hand, I did not even trust my own impressions, but it rests partly on what I saw myself, partly on what others saw for me, the accuracy of the report being always tried by the most severe and detailed tests possible. My conclusions have cost me some labour from the want of coincidence between accounts of the same occurrences by different eye-witnesses, arising sometimes from imperfect memory, sometimes from undue partiality for one side or the other. *History of the Peloponnesian War* Book 1, Chapter 1, 22.

---


59 NEVILLE, *Mark’s Gospel*, p. 119, points to the work of T.C. SKEAT, *The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production*, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 42 (1956), 179-208, who argued that dictation may have occurred side by side with copying directly from a written source. See also MATTILA, *A Question*, pp. 215-216, who notes how PELLING, *Plutarch’s Method*, p. 95, argued that Plutarch would have made significant use of assistants and dictation in the composition of the *Lives of Noble Greeks and Romans*; T.C. MOURNET, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q* (WUNT II/185) Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2005, p. 147, also argues that composition was “typically by way of dictation.”

60 DOWNING, *Compositional Conventions*, p. 22, also Id., *A Paradigm Perplex: Luke, Matthew and Mark*, in NTS 38 (1992) 15-36, p. 18, where he speaks of paraphrase even when working with a single source, and Id., *Writer’s Use or Abuse of Written Sources*, in FOSTER, *New Studies*, 523-548, especially pp. 524-531; MATTILA, *A Question*, pp. 210-211 makes use of the work of LUCE, *Livy*, pp. 205-206, who has categorized the ways that Livy adapts Polybius, being those of close adaptation, recasting, and extensive abridgement. J.S. KLOPPENBOURG, *Variation in the Reproduction of the Double Tradition and an Oral Q*, in *ETL* 83 (2007) 53-80 (see p. 77), speaks of “generous paraphrase” as the common practice and “when one examines the practices of writers in antiquity, a more proximate explanation of such variability is found in the widespread practice of rhetorical paraphrase of sources, or the practice of authors revising their own works following private oral performance of those works before a select group of associates, which assisted them in crafting more persuasive or felicitous formulations” (pp. 79-80). This conclusion is confirmed by BAUM, *Der mündliche Faktor*, p. 407, who tabulates the amount of verbal agreement in a number of parallel texts from antiquity (pp. 45-46).

Lucian spoke in a similar fashion regarding the creativity that could be exercised in the writing of speeches:

When it comes in your way to introduce a speech, the first requirement is that it should suit the character both of the speaker and of the occasion; the second is (once more) lucidity; but in these cases you have the counsel’s right of showing your eloquence. Lucian, De hist. conscrib. 58.62

In the light of the widespread phenomenon of paraphrasing, demonstrating literary dependence becomes no easy matter. A literary source may have been used, but the adaptation and paraphrasing of it might be so extensive that it then becomes extremely difficult to unravel the redaction that has taken place.63 On the other hand, it does provide a possible explanation for the pattern of variation and correspondence that is encountered in the minor agreements.

This widespread practice of paraphrasing speeches is clearly in evidence in the Synoptic Gospels but the studies in contemporary compositional practice have highlighted the anomaly of high, and yet inconsistent, levels of verbatim agreement, especially in the words of Jesus.64 In antiquity speeches provided authors with the opportunity for creative freedom to be exercised, yet the Synoptic Gospels demonstrate a pattern that, at least partly, goes in the other direction. Presumably, this stemmed from a desire to preserve the Jesus tradition.

a) Testing the major theories of Synoptic relationships from a compositional perspective

The major utilisation theories of Synoptic relationships have been tested against what can be learned from compositional practices of the period of the formation of the Gospels. The works of Downing, Derrenbacker, Neville, Mattila, and Kirk have all examined the major proposals with a view to decreasing the degree of unbridled or untested speculation.

---


63 See Gregory, What is Literary Dependence? p. 103.

64 Mattila, A Question, p. 209; Kloppenborg, Variation in the Reproduction, p. 73, observes that when compared to the use of sources in Diodorus, Josephus, IQapGen ar and Ps-Philo, Matthew and Luke are “dramatically out of step.” Ancient historians and biographers rarely exceeded 40% of verbatim agreement in use of their sources.
i) Derrenbacker

Derrenbacker’s work has highlighted that either/or distinctions between literary and oral paradigms do not correlate with compositional practices in antiquity. This underscores Mattila’s call to put the evangelists’ work into a credible context, even if it pushes source critics into more complex compositional models than they would prefer.\(^{65}\) One of Derrenbacker’s observations regarding the major theories of Synoptic relations is that they all have to contend with the problem of micro-conflation, that is, the editorial activity required to combine the sources in the ways that they propose.\(^{66}\) For proponents of the Griesbach hypothesis the difficulty is that of Mark as an epitomiser, or one who condenses Matthew and Luke, which Derrenbacker deems to be “mechanically problematic and unattested in ancient literature.”\(^{67}\) The Farrer theory fares better by affirming Matthew’s use of Mark, but the problem then is Luke’s proposed compositional method in moving regularly from one source to another, with texts stored in memory. While Derrenbacker deems this to be “technically correct”, and it sounds as though it is both simple and consistent with contemporary practice, it would be extremely difficult to put into practice.\(^{68}\) The Two-Source theory has its own difficulties on compositional grounds. Luke’s working in alternating blocks of Mark and Q fits within general practice, but it is Matthew’s reworking of the order of Q (presuming that Luke follows the order of Q), and the Mark and Q overlap passages, that provide the major difficulty for Derrenbacker, rather than the minor agreements as such. This sort of overlapping is otherwise unattested in the material surveyed by Derrenbacker.\(^{69}\) In his opinion, the theory that displays the least amount of problematic conflation is that of the Two-Source theory, though its compositional problem is always that of explaining Matthew’s conflation of Mark and Q in the overlap texts. In his earlier work *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, he posited that Matthew worked from memory of a written text of Q as a means of dealing with the compositional activity of

---


\(^{68}\) DERRENBACKER, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, pp. 442-443; see also DOWNING, *Writer’s Use or Abuse of Written Sources*, p. 525.

Matthew. Derrenbacker has continued to maintain that line, whilst acknowledging at the same time the redactional activity of both Matthew and Luke.

The different order and organisation of Luke and Matthew provides some further difficulty, given that generally the sequence of one’s source was followed in antiquity. If Luke is dependent on Matthew, as either the Griesbach or Farrer theories would suggest, the order has been significantly changed. If Matthew depends on Mark and Q, as the Two-Source theory maintains, then Matthew is also out of step with this facet of contemporary practice. Derrenbacker’s research indicates both the strengths and the limits of using the compositional conventions in antiquity in a mechanistic fashion in order to explain the processes involved in the formation of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Ultimately Derrenbacker avoids having to choose between a literary paradigm on one hand, and an oral one on the other. The “gap” is bridged by memory used in conjunction with other literary techniques conventional in antiquity.

ii) Downing

Downing has consistently argued that the Two-Source theory provides the best explanation for the Synoptic Problem and has critiqued the shortcomings of the Farrer hypothesis on compositional grounds, with special attention being paid to the work of Goulder, whose seemingly simple solution is judged to be extremely complex when put into practice. Streeter had earlier argued that Luke’s dependence on Matthew was most unlikely, given significant difference in order in their insertion of non-Markan material into their own narratives. He suggested that if Luke had depended on Matthew and Mark then materials were taken out of settings in which they fitted, and placed in new ones having no special “appropriateness.” Such a compositional practice was deemed to be the work of “crank.” Goulder’s article The Order of a Crank set out to address what Goulder saw to be the flaws in Streeter’s argument in
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70 DERRENBACKER, Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem, pp. 253-255.
73 DOWNING, A Paradigm Perplex, pp. 30-31. He contends that while Goulder’s suggestion of Luke attempting to harmonize Matthew and Mark would correspond with conventional compositional practice, Goulder’s Luke appears to work in exactly the opposite manner, producing what is a “discordant narrative” (p. 22); C.L. BLOMBERG, The Synoptic Problem: Where We Stand at the Start of a New Century, in D.A. BECK - D.R. BECK (eds.), Rethinking the Synoptic Problem, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2001, p. 33, agrees that Goulder’s suggestions defy credibility.
74 STREEETER, The Four Gospels, p. 183.
order to provide justification for the claim of Lukan dependence on Matthew. Downing remains unpersuaded by Goulder’s work for two reasons. The first is that the process that Goulder proposes that Luke used in combining Mark and Matthew is much too complex for an author of the first century, given that written sources were freely edited and paraphrased. The second is that the minor agreements, deemed to be so awkward by Goulder, can be situated within the compositional practice of the period without the necessity to jettison the idea of Mark or Q. It is here that he makes particular note of different versions of the Gospel of Mark, as well as the influence of the oral tradition.

Recently Downing has returned to exploring the predominance of paraphrase in the use of written sources in antiquity, and the role played by orality. He suggests that what makes the Synoptic Gospels so noteworthy is the amount of “close repetition” found among them. Mattila is convinced by Downing’s arguments pointing out the unlikelihood of the Griesbach hypothesis and the Farrer hypothesis, but is not convinced that the Two-Source theory fits as snugly as Downing would maintain. Neville is also appreciative of the work done by Downing in this area, even if he considers that Downing’s preference for the Two-Source hypothesis has probably overly influenced his negative assessment of the viability of other hypotheses.

iii) Kirk

In his work on Memory, Scribal Media and the Synoptic Problem, Kirk submits the Two-Source theory, the Farrer theory and the Griesbach hypothesis to scrutiny from the point of view of ancient media practices and procedures. He laments that recent literature supporting the Two-Source theory has paid insufficient attention to the role of memory, though he notes Derrenbacker’s work as a notable and
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76 Downing, A Paradigm Perplex, p. 35, deals with the possibility of different versions of Mark and the oral tradition. For Downing’s judgement on the complexity of Goulder’s suggestion see pp. 30-31.
77 F.G. Downing, Writers’ Use or Abuse of Written Sources, in FOSTER, New Studies, 523-548.
78 Downing, Writers’ Use or Abuse of Written Sources, p. 529.
79 Mattila, A Question Neglected, p. 206.
80 Neville, Mark’s Gospel, p. 130, expresses the reservation that in the light of his enthusiasm for the Two-Source theory other significant data has been ignored.
welcome exception\textsuperscript{81}. One of the perennial challenges for the Two-Source theory is Matthew’s significantly different order. An approach sensitive to ancient media would bring into play the role of memory, thereby alleviating some of the problems posed by the different order of Matthew’s Q material\textsuperscript{82}. That being said, Kirk would not take this to mean that the use of an open scroll of Q would be excluded\textsuperscript{83}.

The Farrer-Goulder hypothesis is criticised by Kirk for being overly focussed on redactional and authorial activity as the primary explanation for the patterns of variation and agreement. The reason for this critique is that this hypothesis does not pay due attention to the role played by the oral tradition. He would go so far as to claim that this effectively alienates the scribes from the “tradent framework” in which their creativity was exercised\textsuperscript{84}. Memory is indeed pressed into service by Goulder and his followers to explain the ways in which Luke will introduce material from Matthean passages into Markan material, but it is memory of written material rather than allowing sufficiently for the impact of the oral tradition. In this way minor agreements are explained as “reminiscences” of Matthew. Kirk raises the objection that if this were the case one would expect “a more consistent pattern of small-scale, involuntary harmonizations to Matthew”\textsuperscript{85}. Goulder’s suggested re-working of Matthew, and Luke’s re-ordering of material, is criticised for being unwieldy and “an extraordinarily difficult operation”, open to question from a critical media analysis\textsuperscript{86}. Like Streeter, Kirk maintains that it would be difficult to imagine Luke being able to separate Matthean and Markan material in his source in this manner. All this does not eliminate the theory as a possible explanation, but highlights some of the practical difficulties from a media perspective, given that the Lukan changes would have been so memory intensive\textsuperscript{87}. In particular, the Farrer hypothesis is notable for the number of backwards movements through Matthew’s order that would have to be attributed to

\textsuperscript{81} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 471, where he makes specific mention of Derrenbacker, Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem (See pp. 237-239).

\textsuperscript{82} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 472.

\textsuperscript{83} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 473.

\textsuperscript{84} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 475. See also p. 464, where Kirk cites the work of A.N. Doane, The Ethnography of Scribal Writing and Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Scribe as Performer, in Oral Tradition 9 (1994) 420-439, (n. 2), p. 436, who speaks of scribes producing texts in written form that acted as a performance that combined both eye and ear, script and memory. While the focus of this work was for another historical period and literary context, for Kirk it still serves to broaden the perception that scribal activity is solely literary.

\textsuperscript{85} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, pp. 475-476.

\textsuperscript{86} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 476.

\textsuperscript{87} Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 476.
Kirk maintains that the Two-Source theory compares much more favourably than the Farrer theory in terms of relative Gospel order in that it is easier to comprehend Matthew’s methods in working with Mark and Q, than Luke re-working Matthew’s order in the ways that Goulder suggests. Goodacre’s work is also surveyed by Kirk, and while Goodacre’s embrace of the oral tradition is acknowledged with approval, the lack of attention to the role played by memory is criticised.

Kirk suggests that one of the weaknesses of the Griesbach theory of Synoptic relationships is the perfunctory manner in which the role of memory is treated by its proponents. The work of Peabody, Cope and McNicol is mentioned, where they distinguish oral tradition from the literary traditions, but they then focus almost exclusively on the latter. Their work is criticised because it is predicated on modern print media with little attention being paid to scroll and codex format, or to the orally appropriated manuscripts of antiquity.

iv) Neville

In his survey of compositional conventions and the Synoptic Problem, Neville pays a considerable amount of attention to the work of Downing, and tests his preference for the Two-Source theory. Neville is not so sure that Downing’s critique of the Griesbach theory, with Mark alternating between two written sources, can be sustained, given that Mark’s manner of conflation is theoretically possible. He also argues that W.R. Farmer’s and E.P. Sanders’ responses to E.A. Abbott’s critique of the Griesbach hypothesis serve to blunt Downing’s objections to Mark “unpicking” his two main sources in the manner that Downing maintains he would have had to.
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88 Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 477.
89 Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 477.
90 Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, pp. 478-479.
91 Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem, p. 479.
94 Neville, Mark’s Gospel, p. 138, points out that Downing himself conceded that the possible conflation by Mark would have been relatively simple. See Downing, A Paradigm Perplex, p. 20.
do. As far as the Farrer hypothesis is concerned, Neville would concede that Downing’s critique is convincing insofar as conventional techniques are concerned, but that his perception as to which theory is the simplest is open to challenge. While Neville steers clear of promoting one source theory over another, he correctly draws attention to a number of factors that must be considered. Written sources were not used slavishly, and both long and short-term memory played a significant role in the composition of the Gospels. Materials may have been written or dictated, and the writing process most likely involved some form of oral “performance” of the particular passage being treated.

b) Summary

The cumulative effect of these studies in contemporary compositional practice confirms that the minor agreements are capable of being reasonably explained by a number of causes, and that independent redactional activity is unlikely to be their only, or even primary cause. The agreements are capable of being explained by means of the major utilisation theories, but the Two-Source theory is still preferred as a more likely candidate on compositional grounds. This, however, does not gainsay the difficulties that the Two-Source theory itself faces. One of the important contributions to the debate concerning the agreements would be the need to pay more than lip service to the role that oral tradition continued to play in the formation of the Synoptic Gospels. There has been a tendency to focus primarily on a literary paradigm, and compositional studies have gone a fair way towards redressing that imbalance. What this may suggest is that what has been otherwise interpreted as solely redactional activity, at a literary level, may need to be reassessed, with at least some openness to the possibility of oral tradition and performance.

Another factor that these studies have drawn attention to is the role played by both short and long-term memory in the use of both oral tradition and written sources. If J. Small’s conclusions are correct, then remembered passages were not expected to be reproduced verbatim, and handing on the substance of the speech or saying was
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95 Neville, Mark’s Gospel, pp. 139-140. See E.P. Sanders, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition (SNTS MS, 9), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969, p. 130.
97 Neville, Mark’s Gospel, p. 145.
deemed to be of higher value\textsuperscript{98}. This would certainly be a possible means of explaining the phenomenon encountered of both significant variation and correspondence in the minor agreements that are the result of the exercise of memory of either written passages, or traditions passed on orally. Ancient compositional practice has been shown to involve great freedom with regard to the paraphrasing of sources, and this too, would explain some of the range of agreement and correspondence that is encountered in the minor agreements. Mattila has highlighted the need to place the Synoptic Gospels within a credible literary world (written \textit{and} oral), and much has now been done to provide a context in which the work of the evangelists can be better understood and appreciated.

\textbf{3) Oral tradition and the minor agreements}

As Mattila drew attention to the general need to place the composition of the Gospels within a credible world the same can be said to apply to how oral traditions were preserved, transmitted and incorporated into the written Gospels. While the study of the relationships of the Synoptic Gospels has predominately been undertaken with a view to literary solutions, research during the last two centuries has not ignored the possibility of the on-going contribution of the oral tradition. During this period there have been a number of attempts to develop a better understanding of how orality functions that have met with varying measures of success and support. Both Dunn and Mournet have provided helpful surveys of the study of the oral tradition that range from the early form critics to the present day\textsuperscript{99}. What these studies have brought into relief is that Dunn’s call to reset the default paradigm is an invitation to take seriously the critical and on-going role of oral tradition and performance in the formation of the Gospels\textsuperscript{100}. Proposals as to how the oral tradition functions range from the work of the early form critics, the seminal studies of Milman Parry and Harry Lord in Homeric literature, through to Gerhardsson’s proposals based on Rabbinic practice, and more

\textsuperscript{98} SMALL, \textit{Wax Tablets of the Mind}, p. 7.


\textsuperscript{100} J.D.G. DUNN, \textit{Altering the Default Setting: Re-envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition}, in NTS 49 (2003) 139-175.
recently the work of Kenneth Bailey on informal controlled oral tradition. Most recently the work of Armin Baum has researched the Synoptic Problem from the point of view of the contribution of oral tradition\textsuperscript{101}. His study examines the general paradigm of literary dependence and seeks to explain the range of Synoptic phenomena on the basis of comparison with ancient literature, and with a wide range of examples taken from oral poetry research, cognitive psychology and experimental psychology studies into the role and function of memory.

So, since the development of form criticism, there has been a preparedness to accept the role played by the oral tradition in the formation of the Gospels. At the same time there is a sense of caution that we have yet to arrive at a sufficiently accurate description of how oral tradition functioned in the period of the formation of the New Testament. This naturally leads to a sense of reserve when relying on the oral tradition to explain the formation of the minor agreements.

\textit{a) Recent research into the oral tradition}

i) Dunn

In 1993 Dunn wrote an article entitled \textit{Altering the Default Setting} and the major study \textit{Jesus Remembered} in which he accepted Markan priority and the Two-Source theory, but argued for the on-going influence of the oral tradition and performance in the preservation and transmission of the Jesus tradition. Dunn goes so far as to suggest that this is true not only for the Synoptic Gospels, but for Q itself\textsuperscript{102}. The pattern encountered in the Gospel texts of stability and flexibility are deemed to be incontrovertible indicators of how oral tradition continued to manifest itself in the developing tradition\textsuperscript{103}. In this Dunn has built upon the work of Kenneth Bailey who


\textsuperscript{103} DUNN, \textit{Jesus Remembered}, pp. 253-254.
sees oral tradition as both flexible and having fixed elements\textsuperscript{104}. Kloppenborg is not convinced\textsuperscript{105}, and Neville argues that while Dunn claims adherence to the Two-Source theory Neville is inclined to see it as an oral tradition hypothesis that has been supplemented by Matthew and Luke’s literary dependence on Mark and Q\textsuperscript{106}. For his part Derrenbacker is wary of Dunn’s too-sharp distinction between literary and oral cultures, and suggests that he runs the danger of creating a false dichotomy\textsuperscript{107}. Gregory notes that what makes the activity of reconstructing the ways in which the oral tradition functioned more difficult is the possibility that what is sometimes interpreted as being the impact of oral tradition may be better understood as the result of memory of a written source, rather than dependence on oral tradition\textsuperscript{108}. Burkett has expressed his reservations about Dunn’s reconstruction as to how the oral tradition operated, given that it is based on the work of Bailey and his theory of “informal controlled tradition”\textsuperscript{109}. This theory has been severely critiqued by Weedon\textsuperscript{110}.
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\textsuperscript{104} See Dunn, Jesus Remembered, pp. 205-210 for a summary of the work of K.E. Bailey, Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospel, in Asia Journal of Theology 5 (1991) 34-54 and Id., Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels, in ExpT 106 (1994-95) 363-367. Dunn admits that Bailey’s work is largely anecdotal but argues that it accords well with other studies into the oral tradition (p. 209). He notes how Bailey’s work shows how the general perception of oral tradition as flexible is refined and expanded to include fixed elements as well.

\textsuperscript{105} J.S. Kloppenborg, Variation in the Reproduction of the Double Tradition and an Oral Q?, in ETL 83 (2007) 53-80, in particular pp. 79-80, is not convinced that Dunn’s arguments are valid with regard to an oral form of Q, and argues that the varying degrees of verbal similarity can be explained by other means within a largely literary paradigm.

\textsuperscript{106} D. Neville, The Demise of the Two-Document Hypothesis? Dunn and Burkett on Gospel Sources, Pacifica 19 (2006) 78-92. See pp. 84-85. His review of Dunn’s work acknowledges that the “gist of his argument is incontrovertible” p. 83, but he suggests that Dunn wants to “both eat his cake and have it for later” p. 85, and points out that the two-document hypothesis is, by its very nature, a literary paradigm.

\textsuperscript{107} Derrenbacker, The “External and Psychological Conditions Under which the Synoptic Gospels were written”, pp. 453-454. Kirk, Memory, Scribal Media and the Synoptic Problem, p. 469, agrees that Dunn makes too sharp a distinction.

\textsuperscript{108} See Gregory, What is Literary Dependence?, p. 102. In this is at pains to make clear that this does not deny the impact and influence of the oral tradition, and that room for oral tradition can be made within a hypothesis of literary dependence.

\textsuperscript{109} See Bailey, Informal Controlled Oral Tradition, pp. 34-54. Bailey distinguished three approaches to the oral tradition. The first being informal uncontrolled oral tradition describing the form-critical Bultmannian approach to the formation of the New Testament; the second being formal controlled oral tradition seen in the Scandinavian school as characterized by the work of Riesenfeld and Gerhardsson; and the third being that of informal controlled oral tradition which distinguished the early Christian tradition. According to the last approach, oral tradition was not controlled by a set teacher, but the community itself provided informal controls and boundaries. See Mournet, Oral Tradition, pp. 90-91, for a concise summary of Bailey’s work.

Such observations tend to add weight to the proposition that a number of factors have to be considered as contributing to the formation of the minor agreements, as well as the on-going search for appropriate methodologies for the exploration and identification of the oral tradition.

ii) Mournet

In an extensive survey Mournet examines the work of the early form critics such as Bultmann and Dibelius, recognising their acknowledgement of the oral tradition, but criticising them for misunderstanding its character and manner of transmission as essentially linear, becoming more complex as the tradition develops.

Mournet judges the seminal contribution of Gerhardsson on the oral and written transmission of traditions in Rabbinic Judaism to be anachronistic, and too Judeo-centric for a tradition that quickly developed and expanded in the context of the Roman Empire. Gerhardsson’s work is also deemed to be limited because of what is judged to be an inappropriate comparison with materials that were already well established as ‘sacred’. Another weakness identified by Mournet is that there is no evidence of Jesus establishing a structured school, as Gerhardsson would suggest. For Mournet the most telling weakness in Gerhardsson’s work is that the oral tradition is studied from a fundamentally textual perspective.

Mournet’s survey draws attention to the contribution of Milman Parry and Harry Lord to a more adequate understanding of the manner in which Homer worked as an oral composer with long-standing oral tradition. The understanding that the
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and because this only makes the basis of the revision oral rather than literary. Another weakness is seen to be that of not providing criteria for distinguishing the influence of oral rather than literary tradition. Burkett is also dissatisfied with Dunn’s dismissal of the possibility of there being more than one version of Mark available and, lastly, that the similarities in order in the Synoptic Gospels could have a literary basis (pp. 119-120). As Burkett acknowledges he does not exclude the impact of the oral tradition, but his own complex theory regarding the Synoptic relations is one that is primarily literary (p. 121).

111 Mournet, *Oral Tradition*, p. 62; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, p. 194, also laments Bultmann’s use of a primarily literary model and it being perceived as one layer building on the previous one working from simplicity to complexity.


113 Mournet, *Oral Tradition*, pp. 67-73, refers to the work of M. Parry, *Whole Formulaic Verses in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song*, in Transactions of the American Philological Association 64
basic compositional unit of oral traditions was not necessarily isolated sayings, but blocks or sequences of material, has provided a helpful model for appreciating how the Jesus tradition might have been preserved.\(^\text{114}\)

Like the work of Gerhardsson Lohr’s research on oral techniques in the Gospel of Matthew is criticised by Mournet for its basically textual focus, and for mistaking Matthew’s redactional grouping of materials into discourses as being the direct result of the use of the oral tradition.\(^\text{115}\) Ernest Abel’s research on the psychology of memory and rumour transmission is also examined, as is its application to New Testament materials. The suggestion that oral communication tends to become shorter over time is questioned, as are Abel’s suggestions regarding the process of ‘rumor transmission’ from an African perspective, and its applicability to New Testament texts.\(^\text{116}\)

The contribution of Kelber is particularly noted by Mournet with its focus on the “disproportionately print-oriented hermeneutic”, but found to be lacking in terms of the wedge it drives between orality and textuality.\(^\text{117}\) Kelber’s particular understanding of the conflict between the oral and written tradition that underlies the formation of the Gospel of Mark is seriously questioned.\(^\text{118}\) Mournet and Dunn rightly challenge Kelber with regard to his suggestion that Matthew and Luke would have used Mark if Mark was known to be antagonistic towards the oral authorities.\(^\text{119}\)

Joanna Dewey’s work, building on the studies of Kelber and Ong, has focussed on the oral structure of the Gospel of Mark as a whole rather than examining pericopes in isolation. Mournet commends it for its attempt to strike a balance between orality and literacy in the formation of the Gospels\textsuperscript{120}. Achtemeier’s work is similarly judged to make a significant contribution in that any wedge being driven between oral and written traditions is questioned\textsuperscript{121}.

Having provided a survey of the literature Mournet suggests that it has come to an impasse. The oral tradition is accepted to be part of the transmission history of the Jesus’ tradition, but appropriate and agreed methodologies have yet to be developed to determine what would indicate the influence of oral tradition or performance when analysing specific passages. Variability might be a sign of the influence of the oral tradition, but variation can as easily be explained as being due to redactional activity, paraphrase or long-term or short-term memory.

Mournet is to be commended in that his study sets out to develop an appropriate methodology whereby the proposals of Bailey and Dunn regarding informal controlled oral tradition can be tested. This is with regard to the variability and stability of Synoptic materials generally, and Q materials in particular. The methodology adopted was that of selecting three groups of passages\textsuperscript{122}. Group “A” were passages identified by Dunn as possibly oral in origin\textsuperscript{123}. Group “B” passages were ones that Dunn suggested to be clearly Q texts and literarily dependent\textsuperscript{124}. Group “C” passages acted as a control group made up of selected passages from Kloppenborg that no one has elected to use as texts influenced by the oral tradition\textsuperscript{125}.


\textsuperscript{121} MOURNET, Oral Tradition, pp. 88-89; P.J. ACHTERMIEER, Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity, in JBL 109 (1990) 3-37. See also NEVILLE, Mark’s Gospel, pp. 114-120, for a positive assessment of the work of Achtemeier in pointing us away from “a slavish dependence on written sources.”(p. 120).

\textsuperscript{122} See MOURNET, Oral Tradition, pp. 204-213, for an outline of the methodology adopted.


\textsuperscript{124} (1) On Following Jesus Mt 8,19b-22/Lk 9,57b-60a, (2) Jesus’ Witness concerning John Mt 11,7-19/Lk 7,24-35, (3) Jesus’ Thanksgiving of the Father Mt 11,25-27//Lk 11,24-26, (4) The Return of the Evil Spirit Mt 12,43-45/Lk 11,24-26, (5) Jesus’ Lament over Jerusalem Mt 23,37-39//Lk 13,34-35, (6) The Parable of the Good and Wicked Servant Mt 24,45-51/Lk 12,41-46.

\textsuperscript{125} (1) ‘If any Man would Come After Me’ Mt 16,24-24//Mk 8,34-9,1/Lk 9,23-27, (2) ‘The Time of the Coming: the Parable of the Fig Tree’ Mt 24,32-36//Mk 13,28-32//Lk 21,29-33, (3) ‘The Parable of
These passages were chosen because of the wide range of verbatim agreement i.e. between 12% to 80%. When the three groups of passages were compared Mournet was able to conclude that Group “A” ‘oral’ passages displayed more variability than either the Group “B” ‘literary’ passages, or the Group “C” ‘control’ group. Mournet then follows Dunn in judging this to be due to the performance of the “living” tradition. In his conclusions Mournet suggests that his research, and the methodology adopted, supports the proposals of Bailey and Dunn. There is a recognition that these findings are not definitive for determining the oral tradition origins of some the passages selected, but that they confirm the role played by the oral tradition in the transmission of the Gospel traditions.

iii) Baum

Armin Baum’s doctoral research published in 2008 also explores the role played by the oral tradition in the formation of the Synoptic Gospels. His study involves a multi-disciplinary approach that examines analogies from ancient literature (Josephus, Chronicles, the literature concerning Alexander the Great), rabbinic literature, experimental psychology, and oral poetry in South Yugoslavia, North America and West Africa, to see what light they can shed on the Synoptic Problem. Some of the most important findings of the study are that while a purely literary solution to the Synoptic Problem is possible, it is unlikely, and that the different analogies adopted demonstrate that certain characteristics in the Synoptic materials cannot be explained without the influence of the oral tradition, and the use of memory. The fact that there is a significantly higher level of agreement in speeches,
citations of the Old Testament, and material regulated through poetry and parallelism suggests that the oral tradition has been influential in shaping these traditions. Baum’s study confirms a number of the suggestions that have already been highlighted in the studies on contemporary compositional practice in antiquity, and it is to be commended for its methodological rigour and for providing a solid statistical base from which to evaluate the patterns being examined.

The work of Baum has gone a long way towards demonstrating ways that the oral tradition could have contributed to the formation of the Synoptic Gospels. Whether the oral tradition contributed to the degree that he suggests is likely to be disputed. The justification for using the range of oral poetry cited is unfortunately not

(f) Over half the words of Jesus are formulated according to the rules of Semitic parallelism and Baum’s studies in cognitive psychology indicate that poetic texts are more easily remembered. He suggests that Jesus used mnemonic devices (C.III pp. 197-217), as did his rabbinic contemporaries (E.II 2.h pp. 350-351).

(g) One third of Jesus’ teaching come in the form of parables that are concrete and easy to visualize, and this also applies to the narrative material in the Synoptic Gospels. Work in cognitive psychology reveals that concrete images are more easily remembered than abstract statements and that visual encoding requires less work than verbal encoding. In the light of this Baum suggests the synoptic tradition is better suited to oral transmission than the letters of Paul (C.V. pp. 232-243).

(h) With regard to the parallel traditions in the Synoptic Gospels he would further argue that the pattern of differences and agreements in the triple tradition and the double tradition regarding the selection of material is paralleled in ancient literature, oral poetry and rabbinic literature (A.I.1.a pp. 8-9).

(i) Matthew and Mark and Mark and Luke share an average of 9 out of 10 pericopes and 9 out of 10 common sentences in the same order, and there is no way of distinguishing whether this is due to oral or literary factors, though he would distinguish verbal disagreements and correspondences as another matter.

(k) Verbal agreement averages in Synoptic materials around 30-50 percent though the content is very similar (A.I.3.b pp. 18-20) and this is judged to be typical of memory activity where the content is remembered more closely than the actual words (C.VI.1 pp. 244-246).

(l) In the Synoptic Gospels the average amount of verbal agreement in parallel texts is only half as high as Old Testament parallel texts where there is a literary relationship,

m) The amount of identical wording in parallel Synoptic parallel pericopes is most heterogeneous and finds the closest parallel in the materials studied by Baum in the Avot of Rabbi Natan A par B.

(n) There is a higher rate of verbal agreement in poetic passages and that of the material studied rabbinic materials provided the best parallel with cognitive psychology research confirming poetic texts are better remembered than prose (C.III.3 pp. 202-209).

(o) The words of Jesus have a higher rate of verbal agreement than other common material. This is also reflected in Rabbinic materials and is due to the concern to preserve the teachings of the master (E.III.2.h pp. 350-351).

(p) Old Testament quotations have a degree of verbal agreement that is two times as high as the rest of the parallel material.

(q) Markan pericopes are substantially longer than Luke (two-thirds) and Matthew (three-quarters), and this is explained in terms psychological experiments where remembered texts tend to be shortened (C.VI.2.a pp. 247-251).

(r) The style of editing of Mark by Matthew and Luke is inconsistent, and this is argued to be because the materials are taken from an oral source, and because human memory works selectively producing heterogeneous results (C.VI. 2 pp. 247-252).

(s) The minor agreements against Mark are explainable as being characteristic of oral versions of the same text (F. I-II pp. 366-380).
provided, and one is left wondering about the particular relevance of the examples chosen, other than demonstrating similar patterns of agreement and disagreement within poetic materials from a wide range of times and cultures. The appropriateness and applicability of materials taken from other times and cultures to the biblical text will continue to be debated. It is the inherent danger run by any theory that seeks to explain a complex reality by means of a single solution, even when diverse examples are given. By his own admission, the pattern of variation and correspondence at times could be explained equally well by oral or literary factors. The same could be said to apply to the phenomenon of high content identity and low verbatim agreement encountered in the minor agreements. This too can be explained by oral or literary factors.

The need for memory based redactional activity in the composition of the Gospels is required for both incorporating oral traditions, as well as for working with multiple written sources, and there is no reason to suppose that memory based activity was not involved when drawing on both oral and literary sources. The anomaly identified in terms of contemporary compositional practice of high agreement in the sayings of Jesus is given a viable explanation in terms of Rabbinic parallels and their shared concern to preserve the sayings of the master. This too, however, could apply equally well to the formation of the Gospels in a literary form.

With regard to the minor agreements, Baum’s work has argued that the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels cannot be sufficiently explained in terms of literary dependence alone, and that both the oral tradition and memory play significant roles. The section devoted to the minor agreements examines the agreements in the light of the analogies provided by taking examples from the Palestinian Aramaic Targums (Gen 4,8 from Targum Pseudo Jonathan, Fragmentary Tractate, 110 Paris, and Targum Neophiti) that are compared to the pericope ‘On Fasting’ Mt 9,14-18//Mk 2,18-22//Lk 5,33-39. The second point of comparison has

130 BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, p. 406. See point i).
131 BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, See point k) p. 406.
132 BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, See point o) p. 409.
133 BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, p. 403.
materials from Tractate Aboth of Rabbi Nathan (A 14,17-21 and B 29,18-34) and m Aboth II 9, on the Good and Bad Way that are compared to the pericope ‘Picking Ears of Grain on the Sabbath’ Mt 12,1-8//Mk 2,23-28//Lk 6,1-5.

The result of these comparisons is that the agreements and differences of the Rabbinic texts are considered to be adequately explained on the basis of the oral tradition. This finding is then applied by Baum as an explanation for the same phenomenon in the minor agreements. Baum does well, however, to note that literary relationships between the Rabbinic texts existed as well as oral ones, and that they should not be excluded\textsuperscript{134}.

In the second part of the section devoted to the minor agreements Baum examines parallels taken from experimental psychology and oral poetry to see what light they can shed on the degree of variation found in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Building on the research of Parry and Lord, the Serbo-Croatian Heroic Song ‘The Singer from Bagdad’ is used as a point of comparison. This song was first dictated, and then performed on two other occasions, by the guslar Salih Ugljanin in 1934\textsuperscript{135}. This is then compared to the Healing of the Epileptic Boy in Mt 17,14-17//Mk 9,14-29//Lk 9, 37-43a;17,5-6. Once again, Baum finds confirmation that the oral tradition is capable of explaining both the convergences and disagreements in this pericope\textsuperscript{136}.

The last example used by Baum builds on the research of F.C. Bartlett, and later E. Hunt and T. Love who used the ‘War of the Ghosts’ as the text for studies in memory. In these studies the same text was required to be reproduced after different time intervals\textsuperscript{137}. Baum takes the results of this research comparing it to the Call of Levi in Mt 9,9-13//Mk 2,13-17//Lk 5,27-32. Baum maintains that the differences between the Synoptic parallels, and the studies in oral poetry and experimental psychology, stem from the number of people involved\textsuperscript{138}. There are other significant

\textsuperscript{134} BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, p. 373.
\textsuperscript{136} BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, p. 377.
\textsuperscript{138} BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, p. 380.
limitations at the methodological level since there is no assured way to create the
same conditions by which the processes for the formation of the Synoptic Gospels
could be tested. That caveat being stated, the research in oral poetry does suggest that
even the same person will not necessarily perform a well established piece in the
repertoire in exactly the same fashion.

Baum argues that the minor agreements are the result of dependence on oral
versions of the same tradition that Mark’s Gospel first put into writing. It is the oral
tradition then that is the key to understanding the presence of the minor agreements.
In this he builds on the work of P. Fiebig, A.B. Lord, B. Chilton and B. Reicke.139 He
confirms Markan priority, but highlights ways in which the oral tradition plays a
highly significant role in the formation of the minor agreements.

In his conclusions Baum examines five ways in which the oral tradition could
have contributed to the formation of the Gospels: (1) Cadbury proposed that Matthew
and Luke had a written copy of Mark from which a pericope would be read then
written down, relying on short-term memory; (2) Dunn dealt with the variation in the
traditions by suggesting the use of a written copy of Mark for the sections that are
closely reproduced, and that the pericopes that demonstrate a fair range of divergence
come from the oral tradition; (3) Hawkins suggested Matthew and Luke had a written
copy of Mark, but reproduced many pericopes in the triple tradition in the form they
had earlier memorized; (4) a further viable option could result from the combination
of the first three options, so that Matthew and Luke would have drawn upon part of
the triple tradition from an oral source, and the remaining common material coming
from reproducing from short-term memory the pericopes already read; and (5) his
own solution is that of drawing on Mark, and the same oral tradition that Mark had
already drawn on140.

For the first three proposals Baum identifies difficulties that discount their
viability as adequate explanations for the minor agreements. The difficulty with
Cadbury’s proposal is that of working out why one would need to write from short-

139 BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, pp. 409-410. For the work of B. Fiebig see pp. 60-63, B. Chilton pp.
67-68, and A.B. Lord pp. 74-76. See the graphic presentation of this hypothesis on p. 470.
140 BAUM, Der mündliche Faktor, pp. 411-413.
term memory if there was a text readily available for use\textsuperscript{141}. Baum also expresses concern about how to explain the degree of inconsistency in the use of Markan passages by Matthew and Luke given that some are very close, and others have been radically adapted. The fact that Old Testament quotations display the greatest degree of agreement, followed by the poetic words of Jesus, prose speeches and then narrative material, is considered a phenomenon not easily explained by the use of memory as Cadbury suggested.

Baum agrees with Dunn’s view of the influence of the oral tradition in those minor agreements where there is low verbal agreement. He suggests that this needs to be extended since it is not necessary to presume that only those materials with low verbal agreement would come from the oral tradition. Close verbal agreement can come from dependence on either oral or written sources. From the point of view of the minor agreements Dunn’s proposal is questioned for its inability to explain the origin of the minor agreements in common material with high verbal agreement\textsuperscript{142}.

The proposal of Hawkins fares better and Baum considers that it does explain the higher rate of agreement in Old Testament quotations, poetic sayings of Jesus, and the speech materials. The agreements in these materials are explained as due to both literary dependence on the Gospel of Mark, and on the oral version of Mark, with the variations in the agreements being partly explained resulting from the use of short-term memory.

Baum’s own proposed reconstruction of the process is that both Matthew and Luke drew not on the Gospel of Mark, but on the same oral tradition that Mark had used. This is claimed to provide an adequate solution not only for the minor agreements, but for “every single aspect” of the Synoptic Problem\textsuperscript{143}.

\textsuperscript{141} The studies in compositional practices contemporary to the formation of the Gospels have addressed this by highlighting the difficulty of working with scrolls, finding passages, and moving from one pericope to another if it involved a change of sequence.

\textsuperscript{142} The phenomenon of striking agreements in otherwise strongly Markan material is something that will be addressed later in this paper where it will be argued that it is precisely here that oral tradition can be seen to leave its traces, even if its contribution is in fact substantially more.

\textsuperscript{143} BAUM, \textit{Der mündliche Faktor}, p. 413. See p. 397 “Sämtliche Einzelaspekte des synoptischen Befunds lassen sich problemlos mit der Annahme vereinbaren, daß Matthäus und Lukas ihren gemeinsamen Markustoff aus derselben mündlichen Quelle geschöpft haben wie vor bereits der Evangelist Markus.”
A danger in Baum’s proposal, for all its efficiency, is that a global solution for the minor agreements is unlikely to address the complexity of the phenomena encountered, and which Baum’s own research brings clearly into relief. Another noteworthy weakness is that the oral tradition is perceived in some sort of unitary and almost static fashion. The reality would be much more variegated with various streams of oral tradition being preserved and transmitted by different communities that would have then been incorporated and modified in different ways by the evangelists.

b) Summary

The studies of Dunn, Mournet and Baum into the on-going role of the oral tradition agree in not only highlighting the role of the oral tradition, but also in stressing the role played by memory in the process of the transmission of the Gospel tradition. This can involve both long or short-term memory, of either oral or written sources. Some of the minor agreements can be understood as due to literary dependence, or dependence on the oral tradition, either of which can be incorporated into the written form of the tradition by the use of the faculty of short or long-term memory.

The results of these studies in the oral tradition would support what had already been brought into relief by the studies in compositional practices contemporary to the formation of the Gospels. This in no way excludes the contribution of the redactor in the formation of the minor agreements, but suggests that some agreements may have other explanations than simply relying on literary dependence understood in a simplistic fashion. Mattila noted that many historians in antiquity relied on “first-hand observation and oral report” and this is not dissimilar to Luke’s own claims in Lk 1,1-4 regarding the use of eye-witnesses in order to create an orderly account. Such an account no doubt required both editorial and redactional activity in order to draw the various materials together into a cohesive narrative with its own structural integrity and purpose.

Studies in the oral tradition have suggested that it can provide a partial answer, along with independent redaction, for the wide range of verbal agreement encountered

---

144 Mattila, A Question Neglected, p. 208.
in the minor agreements. It can also provide the means to explain some striking agreements in what are otherwise predominately triple tradition passages.

As Luz observed oral tradition is always possible but by its nature is never provable\textsuperscript{145}. There is an understandable reserve to call on oral tradition as a means to resolve whatever is difficult to explain by means of the major utilisation theories. It is something of an anomaly that there is recognition that the oral tradition continued to have an impact on the on-going transmission and development of the text, but at the same time an avoidance of giving it weight when making decisions about particular texts\textsuperscript{146}.

G. Strecker in his article \textit{Schriftlichkeit oder Mündlichkeit} judged that it is erroneous to look at the Gospels as being the result of discrete creative acts of an individual without taking due consideration of the continuity of the evangelist with the written, and above all, oral traditions of the community\textsuperscript{147}. This is all to the good, but the diversity of conversation partners in Baum’s research, ranging as it does from rabbinic literature, to experimental psychology, and oral poetry, serves to highlight that further research into appropriate methods to determine how orality functions in the formation of the Gospel is needed. At this stage a sufficiently solid methodological base is still lacking, and it will need to be developed if the predominantly literary paradigm is to be shifted.

\textsuperscript{145} See U. LUZ, \textit{Das Evangelium nach Matthäus} (EKKNT, 2/1-4), (Mt 8-17), Zürich, Benzinger; Neukirchenen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1990, p. 520, “Diese Hypothese ist bei Minor Agreements fast immer möglich und fast nie beweisbar.” DERRENBACKER, \textit{Ancient Compositional Practices}, p. 252, comes to the same conclusion. The validity of the solution provided by the oral tradition for some of the minor agreements is noted, as is the difficulty of demonstrating it convincingly when it comes to specific cases.

\textsuperscript{146} This is essentially Kirk’s critique of the work of Peabody, Cope and McNicol see KIRK, \textit{Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem}, p. 480.

\textsuperscript{147} G. STRECKER, \textit{Schriftlichkeit oder Mündlichkeit der synoptischen Tradition? Anmerkungen zur formgeschichtlichen Problematik}, in VAN SEGBOECK, \textit{The Four Gospels}, 159-172.
Section Three: critical reflection on the Source Critical Edition

Overview of the methodology

Appendix II of Neirynck’s *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis* contains a list of some 52 minor agreements that have been considered significant for synoptic studies by a number of scholars. Neirynck’s list comes from the research of S. McLoughlin who compiled a list based on the work of J.C. Hawkins, E.D. Burton, M.-J. Lagrange and B. de Solanges. This list was by no means exhaustive or definitive, but it provides a sufficiently focussed subset of the agreements against which the SCE and its identification of minor agreements can be tested.

Neirynck’s list will be compared here to the SCE to determine where they agree and disagree in the identification of agreements so as to identify more clearly and evaluate the criteria used in the preparation of the SCE. In the light of this comparison, the places where corrections are required in subsequent editions of the SCE will be noted. Appendix I of this paper compares Neirynck’s list to the SCE in its identification of agreements in precise detail.

In addition to the comparison between Neirynck’s list of significant minor agreements and the SCE, the phenomenon of variation within the minor agreements listed in *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis* is also examined with a view to the criteria used in the identification of agreements (see Appendix III of this paper).

Rather than simply compare Neirynck’s list to the SCE the decision was made to cast the net wider and examine how these minor agreements have been interpreted from a range of source critical perspectives. The works of Goulder and McNicol, Dungan and Peabody are used because they argue for Lukan dependence on Matthew

---

in order to explain the minor agreements, though Goulder would still accept Markan priority\textsuperscript{150}. Ennulat and Luz are supporters of a recension of Mark as a major cause of the agreements, though they would differ regarding the degree of redactional activity they would accept\textsuperscript{151}. Bovon’s commentary is noteworthy for its openness to the role played by the oral tradition\textsuperscript{152}. Streeter and Hawkins are also included as representative of two older and well-established perspectives\textsuperscript{153}. Fitzmyer and Nolland are included as two other representative commentaries of Luke and Matthew written from a Two-Source perspective\textsuperscript{154}. Schramm’s work is also included as a point of reference for its suggestions regarding Luke’s use of the Markan source\textsuperscript{155}. The opinions of these scholars for each of the significant minor agreements in Neirynck’s list have been compiled in a comparative and detailed table in Appendix II.

Neirynck’s list will then be used as the sample set by which the SCE is tested against Ennulat’s major work on the minor agreements, once again exploring the criteria used to identify the minor agreements. The last element of this section of the paper is devoted to the exploration of the possible role played in the formation of some of the minor agreements by the oral tradition, paying attention to the studies of Bovon, Soards, Brown, Luz and Stein.

\textbf{1) Comparing the SCE to Neirynck’s list of significant agreements}

\textit{a) Partial correction required to the SCE}

In four instances the Matthean text of the SCE needs partial correction. In three cases the errors were the result of simple oversight in the editing of the Matthean edition, since they were identified in the Luke edition as agreements:

\textsuperscript{152}F. Bovon, \textit{Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)} (EKKNT, 3/1), 4 vols., Zürich, Benzinger; Neukirchenen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1989-2009.
\textsuperscript{153}Streeter, \textit{The Four Gospels}; Hawkins, \textit{Horae Synopticae}.
§ 13.2:1 Mk 1,40       Mt 8,2 ἰδοὺ
§ 13.4:1 Mk 1,40       Mt 8,2 κύριε
§ 19.2:1 Mk 3,7-8      Mt (4,25) ὄχλοι
§ 25.1:1 Mk 4,10       Mt 13,10 μαθηταί.

Not identifying ἰδοὺ § 13.2.1 Mt 8,2 is a mistake and oversight in the editing of the volume of Matthew as it was indicated in the Lukan volume. The same explanation is required for not indicating § 19.2:1 Mt (4,25) ὄχλοι as an agreement. These agreements have been attributed to coincidental and independent redaction though other possibilities have also been suggested. Similar explanations for the agreement in Mt 8,2 and its use of κύριε § 13.4:1, and for the shared use of μαθηταί § 25.1:1 in Mt 13,10 have also been offered.

---

156 MONAGHAN, Luke, pp. 34-35. NEIRYNCK, The Minor Agreements, p. 273, notes the 7 occasions when Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in introducing ἰδοὺ into the narrative. STREEETER, The Four Gospels, p. 298, categorized these as “irrelevant agreements” and being due to coincidental improvement of Mark’s Greek and needing no special explanation. Be that as it may correction is also required for § 33.3:2 Mk 5,22 where it needs to be indicated as an agreement for Mt 9,18 and Lk 8,41. MONAGHAN, Luke, pp. 44-45.

157 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p.151, rates this particular element (III), indicating that it could be evidence for a recension, or for independent redaction, noting that it is generally understood as redactional. Emlulat’s rating system ranges from (I) to (IV) with the (I) and (II) indicates these elements are considered to argue strongly for a recension, and (III) suggesting that independent redaction is possible or (IV) where assimilation or textual assimilation may be provide the best explanation. See p. 33 for an overview of this ranking system. The passage Mk 5,21b-43 is one with a considerable number of agreements and Emlulat suggests that arguments for redaction are not conclusive, nor can they be discounted. See p. 157 where it is argued that a recension provides the best explanation for the passage as a whole. For this opinion see also LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), pp. 51-52; SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, pp. 126-127, notes that the use of ἰδοὺ gives rise to comment but does not consider it proof of another tradition; BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50) p. 442, sees no need for a parallel tradition, though the impact of the oral tradition should not be excluded. Even GOULDER, Luke (I), p. 424, notes the differences between Luke’s and Matthew’s editing of Mark and judges the influence of Matthew on Luke has been slight.

158 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 53, rates this agreement as (II), noting that most scholars see the use of κύριε to be the result of independent redaction. See p. 58, where it is argued that not all the agreements in the passage can be explained by redaction and that use of a recension is a better explanation, especially in the light of the structural correspondences. For independent redaction as the cause see FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 574; BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 237. On the other hand GOULDER, Luke (I), p. 330, judges Luke to be following Matthew in this passage, and sees the use of κύριε to be a Matthean intrusion. STREEETER, The Four Gospels, p. 309, judged this agreement to be due to textual assimilation.

159 See MONAGHAN, Luke, pp. 60-61, for the agreement noted in the Lukan text. ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p.124, rates this agreement (III), indicating it is open to debate as whether it is due to the use of a recension or independent redaction. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 301, notes the striking agreements in the passage and while this might lead to the judgement that other explanations are possible considers this as redactional. See n.1, p. 301. STREEETER, The Four Gospels, p. 302, sees this agreement to be the result of coincidental simplification of Mark’s text.
In one instance the Greek text of Luke SCE needs partial correction where the agreement was recognised in the English text, but not indicated as such in the Greek:

\[ \text{§ 53.10:1 Mk 9,19} \quad \text{Lk 9,41 διεστραμμένη}^{161}. \]

In six instances the text of the SCE for Matthew and Luke need correction:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{§ 19.6:1.2} & \quad \text{Mk 3,7-9} & \text{Mt (4,25) νόσοις} & \text{Lk 6,18 νόσων} \\
\text{§ 33.3:2} & \quad \text{Mk 5,22} & \text{Mt 9,18 ίδου} & \text{Lk 8,41 ίδου}^{162} \\
\text{§ 48.7} & \quad \text{Mk 8,29} & \text{Mt 16,16 τοῦ θεοῦ} & \text{Lk 9,20 τοῦ θεοῦ} \\
\text{§ 51.9:1} & \quad \text{Mk 9,7} & \text{Mt 17,5 οὕτου} & \text{Lk 9,34 οὗτου} \\
\text{§ 99.4:2} & \quad \text{Mk 14,62} & \text{Mt 26,64 ἄπ’ ἀρτί} & \text{Lk 22,69 ἄπο τοῦ νῦν} \\
\text{§ 106.9:1.2} & \quad \text{Mk 15,30} & \text{Mt 27,40 εἰ} & \text{Lk (23,37) εἰ.} \\
\end{align*} \]

The context for § 19,6:1.2 is that of the summaries of Jesus’ ministry in Mt 4.24-5,2 and Lk 6,17-20, that prepare for their respective Sermons on the Mount and on the Plain. Both Matthew and Luke agree in the mention of people suffering from diseases. There is an agreement in the use of νόσων that should have been noted. Ennulat addresses the shared use of this noun and suggests that both Mt 4,24 and Lk 6,18 could also be influenced by the summary of Jesus’ healing ministry in Mk 1,32-34. The suggestion is made that they could have already started to be combined in the pre-Lukan and pre-Matthean stages of the development of the tradition\(^{163}\). One would not want to overstate this agreement in the face of the significant variation in the two summaries. It is more likely that these summaries are examples of Matthew and Luke freely reworking Mk 3,7-13 for their own purposes\(^{164}\).


\(^{162}\) See the note for §13.2:1 Mk 1,40 above.

\(^{163}\) Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 96, rates this as (III/IV) suggesting that this agreement is open to conjecture as to its origin and explanation.

In Peter’s proclamation of Jesus’ identity in § 48.7 the agreement in the use of τοῦ θεοῦ in Mt 16,16 and Lk 9,20 should have been included, even though it is only a partial one, given that the explanatory genitive is applied differently in Matthew and Luke. Where the agreement is noted it is variously treated as indicating a post-Markan recension, a common source used by Matthew and Luke, or independent redaction.\(^{165}\)

In § 51.9:1 both Mt 17,5 and Lk 9,34 agree in including an introductory phrase that links Peter’s request to make booths with the appearance of the overshadowing cloud. At the level of verbal agreement both share the pronoun αὐτοῦ in the introductory phrase, though the rest of the phrases differ. Though there is only partial agreement, the shared use of the pronoun should have been noted as a minor agreement. The agreement in content and placement could indicate the on-going influence of the oral tradition, though it has been interpreted from other vantage points.\(^{166}\)

In § 99.4:2 there is agreement in content, but only partial verbal agreement provided by the use of ἀπό in Mt 26,64 and Lk 22,69, where Jesus proclaims that the Son of Man will be sitting at the right hand of God “from now on”. In such a case the partial agreement needs to be noted even though, once again, there is divergence in

\(^{165}\)ENNULAT, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, p.187, rates this highly (II) indicating the use of a recension marked by a higher Christological focus than the Markan original. See pp. 77, 202,203,422-427 for other examples of this increased focus in the proposed recension. The agreement can also be understood as the result of independent redaction see FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 774 who suggests the phrase “of God” is a Lukan addition to Mark; LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p.453, suggests that Matthew’s source is Mark and while this phrase is not noted as a striking agreement it is considered to be the result of independent redaction. STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 303, mentions the consistency in Lukian and Matthean usage in Mt 16,16 and 27,40 to Lk 9,20 and 23,35-37. On both occasions Matthew altered Mark to read “the Son of God” and Luke to read “the Christ of God.” An alternate view is provided by those who argue for Lukian dependence on Matthew. See GOULDER, *Luke,(I)* p. 438, who observes the consistency of Lukian usage here in the light of Lk 2,26; 23,35 and Acts 4,26 leading to the conclusion that Luke may have been influenced by Matthew here. This is an example of Goulder softening his usual line and arguing for a possibility rather claiming it as a certainty. See also McNICOL, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 137, who makes the observation that if Luke changed Matthew’s formulation it might seem odd, but that it is consistent with Lukian usage in Lk 2,26.

\(^{166}\)ENNULAT, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, p. 206, rates this as (II/III) and acknowledges the markedly different expressions. Nonetheless he argues that the change being made in the same place points towards a recension, and that it is Luke who has changed it though he uses the phrase elsewhere in Lk 8,49 and 22,47 where it is taken from Mark. For independent redaction as the explanation for the agreement see FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 801, who notes the agreement in substance but not wording; NIERYNCK, *The Two-Source Theory*, p. 34. BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, p. 489, has a more nuanced position where the agreement can be seen to be coincidental, adding that the oral tradition could have played a part here. STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 316, mentions that the only word in common is the pronoun and argues that it proves nothing, indicating common literary improvement.
the Matthean and Lukan phrases, and a considerable range of opinion as to how it is best explained.\(^{167}\)

In the last case § 106.9:1.2 the displacement of the parallel, and the layout of Aland, contributed to the agreement not being noted. Given that those who are mocking Jesus and the placement of the phrase differed (in Mt 27,40 it is those who pass by early in the scene, whereas in Lk 23,37, it is the soldiers who have the last word), this was not identified as an agreement. Once again, the agreement is there and should have been noted even if the explanation is that it is coincidental, or arises from possible use of another source\(^{168}\).

In the foregoing instances, other than the texts where errors were made in editing, these examples already highlight the difficulty associated with the identification of agreements when there is only partial verbal agreement, or where there is some degree of displacement that has influenced the decision as to whether these agreements were identified as such.

\(b)\) Examination of the agreements not included in the SCE but in Neirynck’s list of significant agreements

There are a number of minor agreements identified in Neirynck’s list, but not included in the SCE, that highlight several criteria that may be involved in the process of identification of agreements, namely: (a) the degree of verbal agreement required to indicate an agreement, (b) questions of proximity in the determination of

\(^{167}\)ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 367, judges this agreement as (II/III) and notes that the majority of scholars see this as the result of redaction of pre-Markan textual development. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28) (n. 8), p. 175, refers to it as a pseudo agreement resulting from independent redaction, with the added complication of Luke making use of another source than Mark; FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1467, argues for independent redaction, noting the Lukan use of the phrase in Lk 1,48 and 5,10; STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 321 sees it to be an independent insertion on the part of Luke and Matthew with the same respective phrases used in Mt 26,29 and Lk 22,18. GOULDER, Luke (II) p. 754, judges that Luke amended Matthew. McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, pp. 296-297, acknowledges the Lukan usage here, but highlights Luke’s general avoidance of Ærpt.

\(^{168}\)ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 396-397, rates this agreement as (I) indicating his assessment that this is another example of the recension of Mark used by Matthew and Luke that consistently heightens the Christological focus. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28) (n. 5), p. 324, would not be convinced by Ennulat’s suggestion here and suggests that Luke is following another tradition. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1500, is not sure whether Luke has introduced materials from a special source (L) into Markan material, or vice versa, and tends towards the latter option. HAWKINS, Horae Synopticae, p. 210, took this to be a sign that Matthew and Luke were using a non-Markan source here.
agreements, (c) the layout of synopses in terms of what texts are considered primary parallels, and (d) to what degree textual variants have been considered.

The aim of the SCE was to indicate what was unique and what was shared in terms of verbal agreement. For that reason when there was agreement in general content but not verbatim it was not included. Where there was variation of nouns for verbs this was not indicated as an agreement though in instances such as Lk 5,26 it was mentioned in the footnotes. As far as the list of significant minor agreements is concerned this has been generally effective, though it is clear that those instances when there is agreement in general content, but not verbal agreement, these were not indicated (this would apply to Mk 2,12, Mk 6,34, and Mk 14,62). In future editions this could be addressed in footnotes. The causes for such minor agreements could be coincidental redaction, direct literary dependence (either Luke or Matthew depending on the other, or a recension of Mark), or due to the influence of memory of oral or written materials.

i) Layout of Synopses and pericope division

The layout of synopses and the division of pericopes has had some influence on whether the SCE identified or indicated some agreements. The first example of this would be in Neirynck § 12.1 Mk 1,38-39 with its mention of Jesus preaching the gospel. Aland’s pericope division is § 39 Mk 1,35-38 //Lk 4,42-43 and § 40. Mk 1, 39//Mt 4,23//Lk 4,44. Huck-Greeven’s Synopse similarly divides the Markan pericope as Mk 1,35-38 and only points to Lk 4,42-43 as the relevant parallel passage. Neirynck indicates that the Matthean parallel is displaced from its Markan context by placing the displaced text within brackets, and this convention is followed throughout that volume and in this study. Matthew does not include the report of Jesus’ departure from Capernaum, nor Jesus’ announcement of his intention to go to other cities to preach that provides the context for the mention of the kingdom in Lk 4,43. Matthew reports Jesus’ preaching of the kingdom indirectly, and situates this

---

within a summary of Jesus’ ministry as a preparation for the Sermon on the Mount. All things considered, this was assessed as being less an agreement against Mark than a coincidence in redaction, though opinion would be divided\textsuperscript{173}. Further investigation has only served to strengthen that initial assessment.

Neirynck § 68.19 concerns Jesus’ entry into the city of Jerusalem and the requests for Jesus to control his disciples in Mt (21,16) and Lk 19,39. In this instance there is displacement that is recognised by Neirynck. This reflects the judgement of both Aland (§ 269 and § 271) and Huck-Greeven (§ 211 and § 212)\textsuperscript{174}. In these synopses these episodes are not judged to be primary parallels, though both direct the reader to the other pericope. The context for the request in Luke is the disciples’ descent from the Mount of Olives. In the Matthean narrative the context is after Jesus has entered the Temple precincts. Other notable disagreements here are: (a) that there is no verbal agreement in the content of the respective requests, and (b) that the subject of the verb differs. In Mt 21,16 the request comes from the chief priests and the scribes, and in Lk 19,39 it comes from the Pharisees. Should this be seen as an agreement or not\textsuperscript{175}? In the earlier volume of the SCE Matthew, pp. 126-127 it was not indicated as an agreement though in the SCE, Luke, pp. 148-149 it was. That it was indicated as an agreement in Luke was due to the layout of Aland § 269. An instance such as this reveals once again the complexity of the task in the determination of agreements. There is verbal agreement indicated in one volume, but

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7) (n. 3), p. 179, judges the phrase to be a Matthean construction. See also D.A. HAGNER, Matthew (Matthew 1-13) (WBC, 33A), Dallas, TX, Word Books, 1993, p. 79, who notes the similarity in Mt 9,35, suggesting if Matthew is not copying it the summary might have been contained in the oral tradition. BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 220, sees Lk 4,31-44 as dependent on Mark with any changes being due to Lukan redaction. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 555, and SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 89, agrees with this assessment. GOULDER, Luke (I), pp. 313-314, notes the typically Lukan language, but stresses the high number of agreements in the passage that point towards Lukan dependence on Matthew. MCNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 93, also notes the presence of characteristically Lukan language, but still argues for Luke conflating summary compositional language taken from Mt 4,17-25.}
\footnote{ALAND, Synopsis, pp. 236-237. HUCK-GREEVEN, Synopsis, pp. 194-195.}
\end{footnotes}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Whether this should be judged as a significant agreement remains to be seen. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25), pp. 179-180, makes no mention of any agreement between Matthew and Luke here though he recognizes the possibility of both Jn 12,17-19 and Mt 21,14-17 drawing on a pre-Matthean narrative tradition. BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), pp. 28-29, makes no mention of this as an agreement, and in (n. 17), p. 28, argues against the literary dependence of Luke on Matthew as argued by GOULDER, Luke (II), pp. 685-688. Bovon judges that any similarities are better explained as coincidental improvements of Mark, or that Luke possibly draws on an orally transmitted form of the tradition. He considers the possibility of a recension of Mark as unwarranted and unnecessarily complicated.}
\end{footnotes}
not in the other. The agreement should be noted in Matthew, even though the cause is liable to be the coincidental use of a common introductory phrase.

Neirynck’s list has indicated that § 69.2:1 with its mention of ἡλισθη in Mt 21,17 and ἡλίζετο in Lk (21,37) should be noted as an agreement, though there is recognition of displacement with Luke and Matthew using this rare verb in different contexts. Both Aland § 271 and Huck-Greeven § 212 agree in having Mk 11,11 paralleled by Mt 21,10-17, with no mention of Lk 21,37. Lk 21,37-38 is paralleled by Jn 8,1-2 in Aland § 301, and Huck-Greeven § 242 also indicates the same parallel. The SCE did not assess this as an agreement on the basis of the placement of the verb, but, on reflection, it would merit consideration as a possible indication of the influence of dependence on a shared tradition, be it oral or literary. The rarity of the word is seen to be compelling evidence for the Matthean and Lukan use of a recension by Ennulat, though Lukan dependence on Matthew, and coincidental redaction, are suggested as viable alternatives by others.

The context and layout of a Synopsis also had bearing on whether the agreement in § 109.4:1 Mk 16,2 was identified as such. This is an instance of a hapax legomenon used by both Matthew and Luke, but in different, though proximate, contexts. In Lk (23,54) the verb ἐφωσκεν is used to refer to the twilight in the evening that Jesus was buried, whereas in Mt 28,1 ἐφωσκούση is used to refer to the dawning of the first day of the week when the women come to the tomb. Neirynck clearly indicates the agreement, but acknowledges the displacement by placing the

---

177 ALAND, Synopsis, p. 271, and HUCK-GREEVEN, Synopse, p. 231. For an examination of the phenomenon of the minor agreements in the light of parallels in John’s Gospel see R.H. STEIN, The Matthew-Luke Agreements Against Mark: Insight from John CBQ 54 (1992), 482-502. In this article the parallels between John and Matthew and Luke are suggested to provide strong indications of the ways in which traditions continued to circulate in the early Christian community. See also STEIN, Studying the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 138-141 regarding the overlapping of the oral traditions.
178 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 252, is convinced that this agreement could hardly be by chance and is best explained by a recension rating it (I). LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25), p. 177, agrees that the number of agreements in this episode point to a post-Markan reworking of the episode. Despite that opinion in (n. 87) p. 189, he treats this verb, but does not see it as an agreement. See FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1357, where the verb is treated, but not as an agreement. GOULDER, Luke (II), p. 717, and MCNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse, pp. 270-271, judge this to indicate Lukan dependence on Matthew. STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 301, saw this to be a deceptive agreement since the verb is applied in different contexts, and in different places. The second of these objections is not nearly as strong as it may sound given the proximity of the Mount of Olives and Bethany.
Lukan text in brackets. The SCE did not indicate this to be an agreement, and there is sufficient justification for that judgement. On the other hand it does have legitimate claims to falling within that group of correspondences that could indicate some dependence on a shared tradition. Ennulat rates this correspondence as (III) indicating the lack of certainty regarding the primary cause of the agreement, though as would be expected given his thesis, a recension of Mark is deemed to provide the best explanation, and in this he would be partly supported by Luz. The literary dependence of Luke on Matthew is possible, and has received some support. On the other hand it may be that the oral tradition has had an impact here, as Luz suggests.

ii) Differing approaches to variation and the identification of agreements

Some elements identified as agreements in Neirynck’s list of significant agreements are certainly open to debate regarding the validity of the criteria used. In § 16.8:1 Jesus is questioned about fasting and attention is rightly paid to the Matthean and Lukan agreement in the use of ἐκχείται in Mt 9,17 and ἐκχυθήσεται in Lk 5,37. This concerns the wine being spilled, and this was indicated in the SCE. In the same verse the designation of ἀπόλλυνται in Mt 9,17 and ἀπολούνται in Lk 5,37 as an agreement is more problematic, and the SCE did not indicate it as such. The obvious difficulty with the designation of this as an agreement is that Mark 2,22 already has this verb. The agreement cannot be that the tense used by Matthew and Luke is the same, since they differ from Mark, and from each other. Matthew and Luke do agree against Mark in having a plural subject for the verb. While this is possibly an agreement against Mark, it would need to be noted that Mark uses the more periphrastic construction καὶ ὁ ὀἶνος ἀπόλλυνται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ, that

---

179 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 415-416, where he gives his conclusions for the passage as a whole. He does recognize on p. 409 that both Matthew and Luke agree in changing Mark in different ways. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), pp. 399-400, observes that there are a number of agreements in the passage as a whole that point to the possibility of a post-Markan recension having been used by Matthew and Luke.

180 GOULDERS, Luke (II), p. 773, not unexpectedly judges that Luke depends on Matthew (taking umbrage at being considered speculative by Tuckett) and MCNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse, pp. 308-309, draws on the work of Goulder and is convinced that there is a direct literary relationship between Matthew and Luke.

181 LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28) (n. 26), p. 400, is not convinced that such a rare word as this could have been due to independent redaction, and he suggests that this particular detail could be due to both Matthew and Luke drawing on an oral tradition.

already presumes a plural subject. This would support the suggestion that the agreement, such as it is, is the result of coincidental stylistic improvement.

Instances such as § 38.5:2 in the context of the Feeding of the 5000 also provide difficulties from the point of view of the criteria used for the determination of minor agreements. Neirynck indicates that the agreement is in the use of an aorist participle active nominative masculine plural, that is, ἀκούσαντες in Mt 14,13 and γνώντες in Lk 9,11. It is clear that different verbs are used by Matthew and Luke. They agree that there is a response on the part of the crowds, but Matthew uses a verb of hearing, and Luke a verb of knowing. This was not identified in the SCE as an agreement given that structural correspondences alone were not considered sufficient grounds to indicate an agreement. Ennulat’s study of the minor agreements would take a different stance, and the convergence of positive agreements and structural similarities is combined to argue for the Matthean and Lukan dependence on a recension 183.

Another interesting example in the same passage of the feeding of the multitude is the variation in § 38.9 with the shared report of Jesus healing in Mt 14,14 paralleled in Lk 9,11. The report of Jesus healing the sick is not found in Mark in this context 184. The difficulty here is not that Matthew and Luke include a report about Jesus healing, so much as that there is virtually no verbal agreement, with different verbs used for healing, and for describing the sick (Mt 14,14 καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν compared to Lk 9,11 καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο). It was not identified as an agreement in the SCE given the lack of verbal agreement, though it is another example of agreement in content that is worthy of attention, and the correspondence would justify being noted in the footnotes 185.

---

183 Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 170, uses this convergence to argue against independent redaction though he rates it (II/III) and admits that the episode of the feeding of the multitudes existed in multiple forms. On p. 179 he suggests the use of a recension. In his examination of the significant minor agreements he includes structural correspondences in his assessment on a number of occasions see e.g. pp. 144, 170, 212-212, 262-263, 377-378. For his conclusions regarding this line of argument see pp. 420-422.

184 Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 171, rates the agreement as (II) on this basis, but observes that it does not seem to trouble staunch Two-Source theorists.

185 Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 314, mentions the correspondence but notes that the choice of words is as “different as they well could be.” Goulder, Luke (I), p. 434, makes the surprising remark that it is no use objecting that the words are different. He may well be right in pointing to a shared idea as being the important point to consider, but one would have thought that those who stress verbal correspondence as indicating literary dependence, as he does, would be more even-handed in their
This is an episode which is particularly useful for the study of the complexity of the Synoptic relationships since the feeding of the multitudes is related by all the Gospels, and in multiple forms in Matthew and Mark.

Another instance of partial verbal agreement is found in § 53.21:2.3 Mk 9,27//Mt 17,18 and Lk 9,42. In Mk 9,27 Jesus takes the possessed boy and lifts him up. There an agreement with minor variation in the case used for ὁ παις in Mt 17,18 and τὸν παιδα in Lk 9,42. This is largely determined by the verbs being in the passive and active voice respectively. The SCE indicated both the similarity and variation in the use of the noun. The difficulty for the identification of an agreement is provided by the variation in the verb of healing, with Mt 17,18 using ἐθεραπεύοντη and Lk 9,42 ἱάσατο. There is no doubt that there is correspondence in content, but there is no explicit verbal agreement, and for this reason it was not indicated as an agreement. From a Two-Source perspective this would be attributed to independent individual redaction, but the question remains as to what degree this partial correspondence of meaning indicates some degree of dependence, be it literary or oral.

In the Gethsemane scene § 96.5:1 Neirynck draws attention to similarities between Jesus’ prayer in Mt (26,42) γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, and Lk 22,42 μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σῶν γινέσθω. This is an example of an agreement where there is some measure of displacement, convergence and variation. The SCE did not indicate this as an agreement given that the Lukan depiction of the scene has Jesus only praying that God’s will might be done once, and it was judged to be a

assessment when it does not support their argument. McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 135, takes the motif of healing as an indicator of Lukan dependence on Matthew but does acknowledge the presence of Lukan language. Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 396, suggests that a text such as this is one in which independent redaction, oral tradition, and a recension are all possible influences. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 467, attributes this agreement as probably due to the persisting impact of the oral tradition. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 763, indicates both the positive and negative agreements. Fitzmyer suggests that another tradition of the episode has had some influence. This view is supported by the different ways that the detail has been described in Matthew and Luke. McNaghan, Luke, pp. 78-79, and id., Matthew, pp. 104-105. Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 213, rates this as (I/III) and remarks that the agreement is “sachlich”- even though Luke and Matthew use their own preferred vocabulary. Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17) (n. 4), p. 520, suggests that both elements here are redactional; Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50) (n. 12), p. 507, lists a number of indications of Luke’s redaction in this passage; Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 810 recognizes that the Lukan verb for healing used here is not usually applied to an exorcism, but notes that in Acts 10,38 it is also used, as in Lk 9,42. It is instructive to see that Goulder, Luke (I), p. 447, lists this as one of the less probative agreements indicating Lukan dependence on Matthew, and even McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 146, only observes that Luke is similar to Matthew, and that Luke adds dramatic flourishes.
freely adapted version of the Mk 14,36 ἀλλάς οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω ἀλλὰς τί σὺ. Mark has Jesus praying in Mk 14,36 and then reports that Jesus prayed using the same words in Mk 14,39. There is no mention of the content of Jesus’ prayer when he leaves the disciples for the third time. In the Matthean portrayal and arrangement of the passage (Mt 26,29), Jesus’ first prayer mirrors Mk 14,36, and then the second prayer (Mt 26,42) echoes the Our Father (Mt 6,10), with the third report paralleling Mk 14,39. Now the reference has changed since the report becomes a repetition of the phrase from the ‘Lord’s Prayer’ that God’s will be done. In this way the Matthean Gethsemane scene becomes a tour de force of Jesus’ obedience to the will of the Father. An argument can be made for the convergence being the result of independent redaction though, as with other agreements treated in this study, other explanations have been offered suggesting Lukan dependence on Matthew, or other traditions.

On reflection this could be corrected to indicate the convergence in the use of τὸ θέλημα and the variation between γεννηθῶ and γινέσθω, though the displacement and the organisation of the scene by Matthew still argues against it.

A clear-cut example of the need for some restraint in the enumeration and identification of agreements is that of Jesus’ response to Judas in § 97.3 in Mt 26,50 and Lk 22,48. In this instance Matthew and Luke agree in having Jesus respond to Judas’ approach by saying something to him. The claim for this being a significant agreement is somewhat tenuous given that there is no verbal agreement, nor agreement in content between Mt 26,50 ἐπείρε, ἐφ’ ὅ πάρει, and Lk 22, 48 Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδω; Given the lack of

correspondence this was not deemed to provide sufficient grounds for it to be identified as an agreement in the SCE\textsuperscript{190}.

Within the context of the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin Neirynck § 99.3:2 has indicated that Mt 26,64 σὺ εἶπας and Lk (22,70) ἠμεῖς λέγετε are to be considered an agreement, though the displacement is recognised. There is no doubt that this is a partial agreement, and that Matthew and Luke both connect the statement to the question about Jesus’ identity as the Son of God. Despite these similarities, there are factors that argued against it being considered an agreement in the SCE. Mk 14,61 and Mt 26,63 situate the question about Jesus’ identity as the Christ and the Son of the Blessed/God before Jesus’ statement about the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power. In contrast Luke has two questions. The first in Lk 22,67 concerns Jesus’ identity as the Christ. The second comes after the statement about Jesus being seated at the right hand of God in Lk 22,69. After that statement Jesus faces a second question from the Council concerning his identity as the Son of God. The separation of the questions cannot be due to any dependence on Matthew over against Mark, neither can the plural subject of the verb in Lk 22,70\textsuperscript{191}. There is agreement in the use of the second person pronoun and a verb of saying in both Matthew and Luke, but they disagree in tense and number. What makes this a significant agreement for some commentators remains to be seen, given the variation between Matthew and Luke in this, and other, details of this scene. Some have suggested that this partial agreement indicates the possible use of a shared source\textsuperscript{192}. While this is possible there would

\textsuperscript{190} ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 355-356, rates this as (I/IV) indicating that there is a strong case for the introductory formula being due to the post-Markan recension. He still recognizes the difference in the wording of the response itself is open to a wide range of interpretative possibilities. On p. 361 he considers that Luke has probably reworked the material more than Matthew. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1448, considers this verse to come from Luke’s pen. GOULDER, Luke (II), p. 744, also suggests Lukan redaction. LÜZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 156, finds it difficult to judge to what degree the Matthean version is redactional, or whether Matthew committed to writing what was circulating in the oral tradition. Even McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 289, will only go so far as to say that Luke is following Matthew’s order, with any additions or omissions being due to Luke’s compositional agenda. STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 301, judged the disagreement to be so significant it outweighed many small agreements.

\textsuperscript{191} Even Griesbachians such as McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 296, have to recognize Luke’s considerable redactional activity in splitting Matthew’s single question into two. As a consequence Luke has to create a response from Jesus that is deemed to parallel Mt 26,64. While Goulder, Luke (II), p. 754, accepts Markan priority the Lukan form of the text is claimed to be a combination of Mark and Matthew in this section.

\textsuperscript{192} ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements” (n. 45), p. 367, mentions a number of scholars ranging from Streeter to Soards who make this suggestion. He provides the counter proposal that rather than an earlier tradition being used, the correspondence came from the other direction. He rates the agreement
have to be more correspondences than this to indicate a shared source as the explanation for what is at best a partial agreement, and quite adequately explained as being the result of independent redaction.\textsuperscript{193}

iii) Examples where the textual tradition plays a role

There are instances where the textual tradition has played a role in determining whether an agreement is identified as such. One example is that of § 63.5:(1) Mk 10,30 ἐκατονταπλασίονα//Mt 19,29 ἐκατονταπλασίονα// Lk 18,30 πολλαπλασίονα. Neirynck’s convention used to indicate an agreement is to underline the addition or substitution, but that is lacking in this instance.\textsuperscript{194} In the Appendix to a The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis mention is made of the agreement removed by the N-A\textsuperscript{26} text for Mt 19,29 where N-A\textsuperscript{25} had Matthew and Luke agreeing in reading “manifold” rather than “a hundredfold”.\textsuperscript{195} The SCE did not include this as an agreement and further investigation has served to justify that assessment.

Streeter also indicated the possible impact of the textual tradition on the hapax of § 109.4:1 Mk 16,2//Mt 28,1//Lk 23,54 already treated above as an example of a tradition being located in different settings in Matthew and Luke.\textsuperscript{196} The Western text D does not include this verse in Luke, and Streeter was led to surmise that if the omission was original to Luke then the phrase could be explained as being the result of assimilation to Matthew. Goulder judges that Luke is dependent on Matthew and that it is due to a misreading on Luke’s part of Mt 28,2.\textsuperscript{197}

\footnotesize{as (III/II) indicating his lack of certainty with regards to a post-Markan recension as the origin for the agreement.\textsuperscript{193} FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1458, argues for the Lukan use of a special source, though he considers that Luke has reworded it. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 174, claims Mark is Matthew’s only source here.\textsuperscript{194} NEIRYNCK, Horizontal-Line Synopsis, p. 5.\textsuperscript{195} B.M. METZGER, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (third edition), Stuttgart, United Bible Societies, 1975, p. 50, rated the “hundredfold” reading in Mt 19,29 as {B} and acknowledged the Western text of Luke (D Old Latin syr\textsuperscript{3}หก) of “sevenfold.” STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 318, opted for “sevenfold” being the original reading for Luke. ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 233, has a discussion of the text critical factors here and examines what might have led to there being an agreement against Mark. He observes that both Luke and Matthew tend to avoid πολλα generally so that it would make such a correspondence particularly noteworthy. For further discussion see also FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1205; BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15,1-19,27), p. 238.\textsuperscript{196} STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 324.\textsuperscript{197} GOULDER, Luke (II), p. 772.}
iv) Summary

The way that texts have been determined as the primary parallels by various Synopses has had an impact on the identification of agreements in the preparation of the SCE. The question of similarity of context and proximity has also had an impact on the identification of agreements. The question that naturally arises is that of where one draws the line, and on what basis. It can be conceded that there is a good case to be made for rare and very specific vocabulary indicating some degree of mutual dependence, even though there is a divergence in terms of the context in which the element is situated in the respective Gospels. The displacement of these agreements is capable of being explained as the result of dependence on either literary or oral sources that have been incorporated in different ways in the process of redaction.

2) Variation in the minor agreements identified in Neirynck’s list of agreements

The study of the variation in the minor agreements is an area of research worthy of further attention in its own right and is beyond the scope of this paper to address comprehensively. The following observations and examples will serve the purpose of drawing attention to the need for scholars to declare more clearly the criteria used in the determination of minor agreements. Boring’s recent call to define terms to assist “scholarly clarity and communication” is a pressing one. While Goulder’s work has come under fire for its use of the minor agreements to question the validity of Q as a hypothesis, there is wisdom in the methodology he adopted that clearly stated the criteria to be used in looking for a “rump of cases”. Identifying a number of significant and problematic agreements according to such criteria provides a much stronger foundation from which to argue a case, rather than simply multiplying the number of minor agreements.

198 See Appendix III outlining the variations in the minor agreements identified by Neirynck.
199 BORING, The “Minor Agreements”, p. 250.
200 GOLDSER, Putting Q to the Test, p. 219, where he identifies the criteria to be instances where “Luke agrees with Matthew against Mark in expressions which he, Luke, never uses elsewhere, or to which he shows a marked aversion; or which are unnatural; or in matters of order.” It is possible that Goulder’s explanation of Lukan dependence on Matthew can explain these cases, but atypical language is capable of being explained by other means.
The SCE used the criteria of verbal agreement, and while it is vulnerable to the charge of being overly restrictive it at least provides a solid base from which to begin. Examining more closely the range of variation encountered in the minor agreements in Neirynck’s *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis* provides support for the proposal that not all agreements are equal, and that the identification of agreements is often the opening gambit in a more detailed process of examination and evaluation.

Of the approximately 788 agreements listed in Neirynck’s list some degree of variation between Matthew and Luke is present in 175 cases. Appendix III of this study comprises a list of those instances where there is variation in the minor agreements indicated in Neirynck’s work. Variation is manifested in a number of ways: (a) no verbal agreement, (b) low verbal agreement but agreement in content, (c) partial verbal agreement, (d) variation in negative agreements, and (e) transpositions of order.

*a) No verbal agreement*

Of the 175 agreements where there is variation between Matthew and Luke in at least 48 instances there is no verbal agreement. This naturally leads to a questioning exploration of the criteria used for the identification and enumeration of these as minor agreements. In the SCE verbal agreement was used as the primary criterion in the identification of agreements and it still retains its usefulness, perhaps even more than ever, in the light of suggestions that structural agreements or vague similarity in content is sufficient to identify a minor agreement.

Some noteworthy examples of minor agreements in Neirynck’s list where there is no verbal agreement are:

§ 3.5 Mk 1,10 // Mt 3,16 [τοῦ] θεοῦ // Lk 3,22 τὸ ἅγιον

Both Matthew and Luke agree in modifying Mark’s mention of the Spirit with the addition “of God”, and “Holy.” There is correspondence in both further defining the
Spirit for the reader, but it is clearly done in different ways. While Luke refers frequently to the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts (on 41 occasions) the expression is only found in Mark 4 times and 5 times in Matthew.

**Conclusion:** Independent redaction. Not sufficient grounds to be identified as an agreement.

§ 26.3 Mk 4,14 // Mt 13,19 τῆς βασιλείας // Lk 8,11 τοῦ θεοῦ

Here Matthew and Luke agree in modifying Mark’s “the word” to the word of “the kingdom” or the word “of God” respectively. Is there sufficient justification in calling these additional clarifications an agreement?

**Conclusion:** Independent redaction. No agreement.

§ 27.3 Mk 4,21 // Mt(5,15) καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. // Lk 8,16 ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

and (11,33) ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν.

There may well be some Q overlap overall in this passage but this particular verse is problematic since there is no verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke. The application of the metaphor in Matthew and Luke varies significantly though they agree in having an additional phrase to Mark. The doublet in Lk 11,33 indicates this particular phrase is well established in the Lukan community.

**Conclusion:** Independent redaction. Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

§ 36.2 Mk 6,14 // Mt 14,1 τὴν ἄκοιν Ἰησοῦ // Lk 9,7 τὰ γινόμενα πάντα

In this reference to the report about Jesus’ ministry there is no verbal agreement but some general agreement in that both Matthew and Luke add some phrase about Jesus’ activity.

**Conclusion:** Coincidental and independent redaction – no verbal agreement.

§ 48.8 Mk 8,30 // Mt 16,20 διεστείλατο // Lk 9,21 παρῆγγειλεν

In this Luke follows the Markan verb for charging the disciples and strengthens it with the addition of παρῆγγειλεν. Matthew uses only one verb, and that agrees with neither Luke or Mark.
Conclusion: No agreement.

§ 58.2 Mk 9,50 // Mt 5,13 ἀλλισθῆσεται // Lk 14,34 ἀρτυθῆσεται
Here the only agreement between Luke and Matthew is the tense of the verb. Luke uses the same verb as Mark. Matthew uses another verb.
Conclusion: Independent redaction. No agreement.

§ 73.10 Mk 11,32 // Mt 21,26 φοβοῦμεθα // Lk 20,6 ἡμᾶς
The motif of fear is explicit in Mark and Matthew includes it. It is not stated in Luke.
The suggested agreement is that of the use of the first person plural
Conclusion: Independent redaction/possible dependence on a shared tradition.

§ 75.4 Mk 12,15 // Mt 22,18 γνοὺς...πονηρίαν // Lk 20,23 κατανοήσας πανουργίαν
The idea of knowing/perceiving is already present in Mark. The content of the knowledge varies. Mark describes the hypocrisy of Jesus’ opponents whereas Matthew mentions their malice, and Luke their craftiness.
Conclusion: Independent redaction. Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

§ 76.4 Mk 12,20 // Mt 22,25 γῆμας // Lk 20,31 λαβὼν
Luke has the same verb as Mark but varies in using the aorist participle. The only agreement between Matthew and Luke is that they both use an aorist participle but with different verbs.
Conclusion: Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

§ 81.4 Mk 13,2 // Mt 24,2 ἀμὴν λέγω ύμῖν // Lk 21,6 ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς
In this instance there is no agreement at all between Matthew’s introductory formula “Truly, I say to you” and Luke’s “the days will come”.
Conclusion: Not sufficient grounds to be identified as an agreement.

§ 86.3 Mk 13,26 // Mt 24,30 καὶ τὸτε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς //
Lk 21,26-27 ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἔπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.
There is no verbal agreement between these two statements in Matthew and Luke. Both have details not present in Mark in describing the responses of people to the return of the Son of Man. Matthew speaks of all humanity mourning whereas Luke has humanity fainting with foreboding at what is coming. 

*Conclusion:* Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

§ 97.3 Mk 14,45 // Mt 26,50 ἐπαίρε, ἐφ᾽ ὄ πάρει // Lk 22,48 Ἰουδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον παραδίδωσιν; 
The only possible agreement here is that Jesus speaks to Judas at his arrest. There is no agreement in content. 

*Conclusion:* Independent redaction. Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

§ 106.5 Mk 15,25 // Mt 27,36 ἐτήρουν // Lk 23,35 θεωρῶν 
In this instance Matthew describes the soldiers guarding Jesus whereas Luke describes the people who stand by watching. Different verbs are used for different subjects. 

*Conclusion:* Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

§ 109.12 Mk 16,6 // Mt 28,5 οἴδα γὰρ ὅτι // Lk 24,5 εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὰς 
In the first part of this phrase there is some agreement in changing Mark’s ἐκθαμβεῖσθε for μὴ φοβεῖσθε (Mt) and ἐμφώβοιν (Lk). In all three Gospels there is some introductory clause for the statement about not being afraid. Only Matthew has the phrase concerning the angel’s knowledge. 

*Conclusion:* Not sufficient justification to be identified as an agreement.

As these examples demonstrate so much depends on what the researcher chooses to focus on as an agreement. At times Neirynck’s list does indicate a number of possible correspondences, but each one needs to be carefully evaluated on its own merits.

*b) Low verbal agreement but agreement in content*
In 22 cases there is agreement in content but very low verbal agreement. While the SCE focussed on high degrees of verbal agreement, these particular 22 agreements are worthy of note because they indicate the limitation of only including high verbal agreement as a criterion when there is correspondence in content. Independent redaction is indicated by the lack of verbal agreement, and it may be that this provides an adequate explanation for the variation encountered in these examples. The agreement in content in these examples might indicate that there is an underlying dependence that could be oral or literary, and that these traditions have been changed and re-worked independently in the process of incorporating them into the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The use of long or short-term memory, the freedom to paraphrase, the tendency of Matthew and Luke to improve stylistically on received traditions all could play a role in contributing to the range of agreement and variation encountered in these agreements.

| § 4.7 Mk 1,13 | Mt 4,11 ἀφίησιν | Lk 4,13 ἔγετο |
| § 9.5 Mk 1,31 | Mt 8,15 ἡγέρθη | Lk 4,39 ἀναστάσας |
| § 12.1 Mk 1,38-39 | Mt (4,23) εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας | Lk 4,43 εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεὶ τὴν βασιλείαν |
| § 14.18 Mk 2,12 | Mt 9,7 ἐγερθεὶς | Lk 5,25 ἀναστάς |
| § 20.6 Mk 3,16 | Mt 10,2 ὁ λεγόμενος | Lk 6,14 ὁν καὶ ὠνόμασεν |
| § 31.1 Mk 4,35 | Mt 8,18 ὁ Τησοῦς | Lk 8,22 αὐτός |
| § 31.5 Mk 4,37 | Mt 8,24 ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ | Lk 8,23 εἰς τὴν λίμνην |
| § 34.5 Mk 6,3 | Mt 13,55 ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος | Lk 4,22 ἱωσήφ |
| § 35.7 Mk 6,7 | Mt 10,8 θεραπεύετε | Lk 9,2 ἱάσθαι |
| § 36.2 Mk 6,14 | Mt 14,1 τὴν ἀκοήν Τησοῦ | Lk 9,7 Lk 9,11 τὰ γινόμενα πάντα |
| § 38.9 Mk 6,34 | Mt 14,14 καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν | Lk 9,11 καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἐχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτω |
| § 53.4 Mk 9,17 | Mt 17,14-15 ἄνθρωπος | Lk 9,38 ἀνήρ |
| § 53.21 Mk 9,27 | Mt 17,18 καὶ ἔθεραπεύθη | Lk 9,42 καὶ ἱάσατο |
While these examples have not been indicated as agreements in the SCE, and will not be in the future, they will be acknowledged in footnotes in any future editions to aid readers to make their own decisions regarding these particular examples. That there is a high correspondence in content, not verbally, distinguishes these minor agreements from those instances where the level of verbal agreement and content is low. The variation may be easily explained as the result of redaction, but the high level of correspondence in content calls for explanation. I am inclined to see these instances as pointers to the possible impact of the ongoing oral tradition incorporated into the process of redaction by Matthew and Luke.

c) Partial verbal agreement

In 19 cases in Neirynck’s list there is a variation in the suggested agreement due to the use of simple or compound verbs on the part of either Luke or Matthew\(^{201}\). At best this is partial agreement, though it could well point to some form of dependence, either oral or literary. The stylistic preferences of Luke and Matthew and their respective redactional activity should not be excluded as major factors in these

---

201 See NEIRYNCK, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List*, pp. 252-254, for a helpful list of variations between simple and compound verbs.
variations. In the Lukan volume of the SCE on 28 occasions this form of variation was noted\textsuperscript{202}. In an attempt not to make the apparatus of the SCE too cumbersome the choice was made to indicate these variations in the footnotes for the Lukan volume rather than duplicate the notes in the Matthean volume.

Apart from the instances already mentioned, there are some 48 cases in Neirynck’s list in which Luke and Matthew agree in having the same verb but vary in terms of tense, mood, person or number. These variations are probably best explained as being due to the redactional activity of Matthew and Luke, and they indicate that even where there is the likelihood of dependence of some form or another that variation due to redactional activity or other causes will still occur. There are instances where the variation is that Luke or Matthew might use a noun rather than a verb or \textit{vice versa}. There would be some justification for saying that underlying such partial agreement is some dependence, whether oral or literary. In 35 instances dealing with nouns and adjectives there is some variation in terms of case, number or gender. These variations should most likely be attributed to redactional activity that arises from the desire to improve Mark both grammatically and stylistically, according to Matthew’s and Luke’s preferences\textsuperscript{203}.

\textit{d) Variations in omissions (negative agreements) identified by Neirynck}

The SCE did not address the area of the negative agreements and it is beyond the scope of this paper to resolve what is a complex area of study in its own right\textsuperscript{204}. For the purpose of this present study it is important to recognise that just as variation is encountered in the positive agreements indicated in the SCE, there is also a significant amount of variation in negative agreements. The degree of variation has an impact on whether they should be identified as agreements. Markan material not

\textsuperscript{202} There is no correlation between Neirynck’s list here and the SCE given that this phenomenon is not isolated to passages in which minor agreements are situated.

\textsuperscript{203} See NEIRYNCK, \textit{The Minor Agreements}, pp. 199-288, for an extensive study and classification of stylistic agreements dealing with: (a) conjunctions and sentence structure, (b) the use of verbs, and (c) word order, vocabulary and other matters. See LUZ, \textit{Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)}, pp. 35-55, for a list of Matthean preferred vocabulary.

\textsuperscript{204} A companion volume to the SCE is envisaged where the negative agreements will be addressed in an edition of Mark.
found in both Matthew and Luke is clearly indicated by Neirynck\textsuperscript{205}. There are other types of negative agreements where variation is encountered in Neirynck’s work: (i) where material is omitted by Matthew but present in Mark and Luke, (ii) where material is omitted by Luke but present in Mark and Matthew, (iii) where a Matthean doublet will include material that is omitted in the primary parallel, and (iv) where a Lukan doublet will include material that is omitted in the primary parallel.

\textbf{i) Material omitted by Matthew but found in Mark and Luke}

$\S$ 14.2 Mk 2,2 (Mt 9,1 omits); $\S$ 14.5 Mk 2,4 (Mt 9,2 omits); $\S$ 18a.8 Mk 3,5 (Mt 12,12 omits); $\S$ 19.7 Mk 3,11 (Mt 12,15 omits); $\S$ 23.18 Mk 3,32 (Mt 12,46 omits);

$\S$ 33.8 Mk 5,26 (Mt 9,20 omits); $\S$ 33.13 Mk 5,31 (Matthew omits); $\S$ 33.24 Mk 5,41 (Matthew omits); $\S$ 35.22 Mk 6,13 (Matthew omits); $\S$ 36.3 Mk 6,14-15 (Mt 14,2 omits); $\S$ 38.2 Mk 6,30 (Matthew omits); $\S$ 38.17 Mk 6,37 (Matthew omits); $\S$ 38.21 Mk 6,40 (Matthew omits); $\S$ 53.7 Mk 9,18 (Mt 17,15 omits); $\S$ 53.11 Mk 9,20 (Mt 17,17 omits); $\S$ 55.8 Mk 9,37 (Mt 18,5 omits); $\S$ 63.6 Mk 10,30 (Mt 19,29 omits); $\S$ 68.9 Mk 11,4 (Mt 21,6 omits); $\S$ 92.3 Mk 14,13 (Mt 26,18 omits).

\textsuperscript{205} These materials are indicated throughout \textit{NEIRYNCK, Horizontal-Line Synopsis}, and are compiled here for ease of reference. There are a number of instances where Neirynck provides no references to Matthean and Lukan passages: $\S$ 1.1 Mk 1,1; $\S$ 21.1 Mk 3,20-21; $\S$ 22.18 Mk 3,30; $\S$ 32.5 Mk 5,3; $\S$ 33.15 Mk 5,33; $\S$ 33.26 Mk 5,43; $\S$ 38.3 Mk 6,31; $\S$ 38.18 Mk 6,38; $\S$ 38.34 Mk 6,41; $\S$ 49.4 Mk 8,32; $\S$ 50.7 Mk 8,38; $\S$ 55.4 Mk 9,35; $\S$ 71 Mk 11,16; $\S$ 77.7 Mk 12,32-34; $\S$ 88.9 Mk 13,36-37; $\S$ 90.6 Mk 14,8; $\S$ 97.10 Mk 14,51-52. There are also passages where Neirynck provides more detailed reference to omissions of Markan material in Matthew and Luke: $\S$ 1.2 Mk 1,2 (both Mt 3,3 and Lk 3,4 omit); $\S$ 10.4 Mk 1,33 (both Mt 8,16 and Lk 4,40 omit); $\S$ 13.13 Mk 1,45 (both Mt 8 and Lk 5,15 omit); $\S$ 15.5 Mk 2,15 (both Mt 9,10 and Lk 5,29 omit); $\S$ 15.7 Mk 2,16 (both Mt 9,11 and Lk 5,30 omit); $\S$ 16.1 Mk 2,18 (both Mt 9,14 and Lk 5,33 omit); $\S$ 16.4 Mk 2,19 (both Mt 9,15 and Lk 5,34 omit); $\S$ 18a.7 Mk 3,4 (both Mt 12,12 and Lk 6,9 omit); $\S$ 19.4 Mk 3,9 (both Mt 12,15 and Lk 6,18 omit); $\S$ 22.15 Mk 3,28 (both Mt 12,31 and Lk 12,10 omit); $\S$ 27.5 Mk 4,23 (both Mt 13,23 and Lk 8,17 omit); $\S$ 27.6 Mk 4,24 (both Mt 13,23 and Lk 8,18 omit); $\S$ 33.2 Mk 5,21 (both Mt 9,1 and Lk 8,40 omit); $\S$ 33.9 Mk 5,27 (both Mt 9,20 and Lk 8,44 omit); $\S$ 33.11 Mk 5,29 (both Mt 9,22 and Lk 8,44 omit); $\S$ 45.1 Mk 8,14 (both Mt 16,5 and Lk 12,1 omit); $\S$ 51.15 Mk 9,10 (both Mt 17,9 and Lk 9,36 omit); $\S$ 53.3 Mk 9,15-16 (both Mt 17,14 and Lk 9,37 omit); $\S$ 53.12 Mk 9,21 (both Mt 17,17 and Lk 9,42 omit); $\S$ 53.14 Mk 9,23 (both Mt 17,17 and Lk 9,42 omit); $\S$ 53.15 Mk 9,24 (both Mt 17,17 and Lk 9,42 omit); $\S$ 53.17 Mk 9,25 (both Mt 17,18 and Lk 9,42 omit); $\S$ 53.19 Mk 9,26 (both Mt 17,18 and Lk 9,42 omit); $\S$ 53.20 Mk 9,27 (both Mt 17,18 and Lk 9,42 omit); $\S$ 54.2 Mk 9,30 (both Mt 17,20 and Lk 9,43 omit); $\S$ 68.10 Mk 11,6 (both Mt 21,6 and Lk 19,34 omit); $\S$ 68.18 Mk 11,10 (both Mt 21,9 and Lk 19,38 omit); $\S$ 74.19 Mk 12,12 (both Mt 21,46 and Lk 20,19 omit); $\S$ 108.2 Mk 15,42 (both Mt 27,57 and Lk 23,50 omit); $\S$ 109.6 Mk 16,3 (both Mt 28,2 and Lk 24,2 omit).
One of the distinguishing features about these instances listed by Neirynck is that in these passages the Markan material has a partial parallel in Luke that may or may not include some degree of verbal agreement. In the instances cited above Matthew omits this Markan material entirely. As an illustration of these types of negative agreements in § 14.5 Mk 2,4 there is mention of the removal of the roof so that the paralytic can be lowered on the pallet in front of Jesus. Mt 9,2 omits any mention of the roof and focuses on the faith of those who bring the man to Jesus. Lk 5,19 has very little verbal agreement with Mark, but some correspondence in the content. Neirynck identifies that both Matthew and Luke agree in omitting the Markan phrase ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες. Lk 5,19 has a partial parallel when it describes letting the man down through the tiles (διὰ τῶν κεράμων). Should this be identified as a negative agreement? At best it is only a partial one, and it is rightly characterised as such by Neirynck.

ii) Material omitted by Luke but found in Mark and Matthew

§ 12.3 Mk 1,39 (Lk 4,44 omits); § 25.7 Mk 4,12 (Lk 8,10 omits); § 32.6 Mk 5,4 (Lk 8,27 omits); § 38.12 Mk 6,35 (Lk 9,12 omits); § 45.6 Mk 8,13 (Luke omits); § 53.13 Mk 9,22 (Lk 9,42 omits); § 53.22 Mk 9,28 (Lk 9,43 omits); § 53.23 Mk 9,29 (Lk 9,43 omits); § 54.5 Mk 9,31 (Lk 9,44 omits); § 58.4 Mk 9,50 (Lk 14,35 omits)

§ 70.1 Mk 11,12-14 (Lk 19,44 omits); § 73 Mk 11,27 (Luke omits); § 77.6 Mk 12,31 (Lk 10,27 omits); § 88.4 Mk 13,34 (Lk 19,13 omits); § 103.2 Mk 15,8 (Lk 23,13 omits); § 106.12 Mk 15,32 (Lk 23,35 omits); § 107.6 Mk 15,40 (Lk 23,49 omits); § 108.6 Mk 14,44-45 (Luke omits).

In these passages the Markan material has a partial parallel in Matthew that may or may not include some degree of verbal agreement. In the instances cited above Luke omits this Markan material entirely. Once again, variation is found in what otherwise is indicated as a negative agreement. As an example in § 25.7 Mk 4,12 Jesus explains why he speaks in parables as μὴ ποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς. Lk 8,10 does not include the phrase. Mt 13,15 includes most of the Markan phrase but changes the motif of forgiveness to healing (καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ
Should this be indicated as a negative agreement? Both Luke and Matthew agree in not including the motif of forgiveness, and it can be identified as a negative agreement. However, the identification of the negative agreement is only a first step in the interpretative process and the agreement is best evaluated as a Matthean redactional modification of the Markan tradition.

iii) Where the Matthean doublet includes material the primary parallel omits

§ 13.9 Mk 1,43 (Mt 8,3 omits [Mt (9,30) includes] Lk 5,13 omits); § 13.12 Mk 1,45 (Mt 8,4 omits [Mt (9,31) includes]); § 31.2 Mk 4,36 (Mt 8,23 omits [Mt (13,36 includes)]; § 35.11 Mk 6,9 (Lk 9,3 omits but Lk 10,4 includes); § 35.13 Mk 6,10 (Lk 9,4 omits [Lk 10,7 includes]); § 35.15 Mk 6,10 (Lk 9,4 omits [Lk (10,6) includes]); § 45.1 Mk 8,11 (Mt 16,1 and Lk 11,16 omit [Mt (12,28) includes]; § 59.4 Mk 10,12 (Mt 19,9 omits [Mt 5,32 includes]); § 67.7 Mk 10,49-50 (Mt 20,32 omits [Mt (9,28) includes]); § 99.11 Mk 14,65 (Mt 26,68 omits [Mt (26,67) includes]).

iv) Where the Lukan doublet includes material the primary parallel omits

§ 32.7 Mk 5,5 (both Matthew and Lk 8,27 omit [Lk 8,29 includes]); § 63.7 Mk 10,31 (Lk 18,30 omits [Lk (13,30) includes]); § 64.1 Mk 10,32 (Lk 18,31 omits [Lk (19,28) includes]); § 65.1 Mk 10,38-39 (Luke omits [Lk (12,50) includes]); § 98.6 Mk 14,54 (Lk 22,55 omits [Lk (22,56) includes]); § 109.2 Mk 16,1 (Lk 24,1 omits [Lk (24,10) includes].

Neirynck’s *Horizontal-Line Synopsis* helpfully indicates where there is variation between doublets and what are judged to be the primary parallels. Within doublets there can be both positive and negative agreements, making the source critical task increasingly complex. The complexity provided by the negative agreements in the doublets serves as a reminder of the provisional nature of any source critical hypothesis, and the difficulties associated with the task of reconstructing the processes that accompany the formation of the Gospels. The SCE
partially addressed this complexity by indicating in the headings of passages what were considered to be the primary parallels and the doublets.

e) Transpositions of order

i) Simple inversions

In the minor agreements identified by Neirynck there are 27 instances where the word order of Matthew and Luke agree against the word order present in Mark. These simple inversions are indicated by the sign / placed between the two inverted words. While there is no doubt about the agreement in the inversion it is worthy of note that in 17 of these instances of simple inversion in word order there is also some other type of variation in the agreement, such as case, number, tense of verbs, subject of verbs, or additional detail. So in over 66% of these simple inversions there is variation of some kind. The presence of such variation does not of itself argue against dependence, but it suggests independent redactional activity on the part of Matthew and/or Luke. When the vocabulary is already present in Mark, correspondence in word order is often best explained as coincidental stylistic agreement.

§ 4.3; § 23.6; § 26.11; § 27.2; § 34.8; § 38.26; § 45.2.4; § 50.9; § 64.2; § 71.5; § 74.10; § 78.2; § 91.2; § 97.9; § 98.1; § 106.8.

ii) Complex inversions

Neirynck identifies some 43 more complex inversions among the minor agreements and uses the sign // to indicate them. Once again variation is encountered. In 31 instances there is some variation in the agreement ranging from case and number, to variation in the verbs used. There are also instances in which additional vocabulary and detail are incorporated in Matthew or Luke. In some 75 percent of these cases variation is encountered.

§ 2.3; § 4.1; § 9.5; § 10.6; § 16.8; § 17.5.10.12; § 18a.2; § 19:8; § 20.8; § 26.11; § 35.4; § 51.13; § 55.5.7; § 67.5; § 68.13; § 74.3; § 75.2.7; § 76.10.11.

---

206 See NEIRYNCK, The Minor Agreements, p. 5, for an explanation of the conventions used, i.e. / for an inversion involving two words, and // for more complex inversions.

207 NEIRYNCK, Horizontal-Line Synopsis, p. 5.
§ 77.8; § 78.5; § 94.5; § 95.3; § 97.1; § 98.3; § 99.5; § 100.13; § 103.4.13; § 109.14

What emerges from these examples of both simple and complex inversions is that while there is an agreement in an inversion this does not mean that there is a high level of verbal agreement in the inversions themselves. Once again one is confronted with the likelihood of independent redactional activity, even if the origin of the dependence is that of a shared oral or written tradition. Given the range of variation even in agreements the task of determining the degree, direction, and nature of dependence is difficult. This is not so much atomising the text with a view to eliminating agreements, but submitting the data to closer scrutiny as a safeguard against rushing too quickly to conclusions that are not soundly based.

The SCE did not indicate simple or complex inversions as agreements against Mark. If Matthew and Luke used the same words as Mark within one or two verses it was designated as triple tradition material. It has already been indicated that in many of the inversions there is a significantly high level of variation. This degree of variation suggests that the inversions are not sufficiently reliable indicators of dependence taken in isolation.

f) Summary

The reason for drawing attention to the phenomenon of variation in the agreements is that it provides a point of reference against which the claims for increasing the numbers of minor agreements can be tested. Admittedly the SCE is probably too restrictive in its identification of agreements only where there is high verbal agreement, but even Neirynck’s conservative list is open to serious challenge where there is such significant variation. The pattern of variation within the minor agreements needs to be seen within the context of the wider Synoptic debate, and the range of agreement and variation found in the Synoptic Gospels208. Any theory that

---

208 See STEIN, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 52-55, 127-129, highlights some basic parameters such as: of the 18,293 words in Matthew 7,392 have no parallel in Mark (40%), and of the 19,376 words in Luke 10,259 have no parallel in Mark (52.9%). Of 51 pericopes studied Mark is the longest 21 times, Matthew 11 times and Luke 10 times. The number of words found in Mark that are identical to Matthew are 4432 (40%), whereas the number of words in Mark identical in Luke are 2873 (26%). Matthew omits more than half of the Markan vocabulary and substitutes 6,469 for the words he omits (6,593). Luke omits three-fourths of the Markan vocabulary and substitutes 6,244 of his own words for the 8,083 words of Mark that are omitted. See J.S. KLOPPENBORG, *Variation in the Reproduction of*
argues for dependence must also deal with the high percentage of variation that also needs to be accounted for in order to describe adequately the relationships between Matthew, Mark and Luke.

3) Testing the SCE against the work of Ennulat

a) Summary of Ennulat’s research

One of the major contributions to the study of the minor agreements is the volume written by Andreas Ennulat in 1994, doctoral student of Ulrich Luz. This exhaustive study of the minor agreements argues that they are best understood as being due to Matthew and Luke drawing on a post-Markan recension\(^{209}\). It is a great tribute to the work that despite their different vantage points on the Synoptic Problem, both D. Dungan and C.M. Tuckett consider this research to be a point of reference for future investigations into the phenomenon of the agreements\(^ {210}\). Friedrichsen also acknowledges the comprehensive nature of this study of the minor agreements, but like Tuckett would have some serious methodological reservations regarding the identification and enumeration of agreements\(^ {211}\).

Ennulat begins his study with a quantitative analysis of the minor agreements that is undertaken independent of any explanatory hypothesis. In this analysis certain materials are not included and they are identified as being: (a) duplicate expressions, (b) Markan passages with direct or indirect Lukan and Matthean parallels, (c) and where Matthew and Luke disagree against Mark and each other. Ennulat makes some exceptions to this last category when there are correspondences that are otherwise difficult to explain as independent redaction. On the other hand he expands Neirynck’s cumulative list and also considers structural parallels as a factor in his

---


evaluation of agreements. Given that the agreements are evenly distributed throughout the triple tradition with positive and negative agreements in roughly equal proportions, his first conclusions are that: (a) the agreements are a literary phenomenon, and (b) a comprehensive solution is required. Proposals that explain the phenomenon of the agreements by calling on the influence of Q, the impact of the oral tradition, or through assimilation in the textual tradition are not considered by Ennulat to be sufficiently comprehensive. After examining the major proposals concerning the minor agreements he is of the view that there are only two viable possibilities: the independent and coincidental redaction on the part of Matthew and Luke, or the Matthean and Lukan use of a post-Markan recension, and this is the heart of his thesis.

In examining the agreements in the triple tradition Ennulat rates them on a scale of I-IV so as to adjudicate clearly between whether the agreements are the result of redaction or a recension:

I) The agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark are not able to be explained as independent redaction, or there are so many agreements in a particular context that they must be understood as the result of a post-Markan reworking of the Markan text.

II) Minor agreements that cannot be explained as the result of independent redaction, or that point in the direction of a recension.

III) Minor agreements in the grey zone that do not point in the direction of a recension, or point to another explanatory hypothesis. These agreements are generally understood as independent redaction, though they can be interpreted from a number of standpoints, and a post-Markan recension would still be among them.

---

212 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 3-4. FRIEDRICHSEN, New Dissertations of the Minor Agreements, p. 374, remarks that some of the “so-called” structural agreements could be disputed and might have been better left out.

213 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 18.

IV) Minor agreements that come through independent redaction of the Markan text by Matthew and Luke, oral tradition, Mark Q overlaps, or textual critical factors may be involved in the formation of the agreements\textsuperscript{215}.

As a result of his examination of the agreements Ennulat’s findings are that\textsuperscript{216}:

3\% cannot be explained as a post-Markan recension (IV)

6\% fall into the III/IV, IV/III zone

42\% fall into the grey zone III – these are open to evaluation as Lukan and Matthean redaction or a recension of Mark

19\% lie between III/II, II/III

20\% lie in II

6\% lie between I and II

4\% lie in category I.

Having analysed the evidence in this way Ennulat then outlines some of the characteristics and features of the recension that he proposes. In particular he argues for a consistently heightened Christological focus, and a different treatment of the motif of the messianic secret and of the Markan stress on the ignorance of the disciples. The stylistic and structural improvements to the text of Mark are also outlined\textsuperscript{217}. A consequence of this approach is that the current critical text of Mark is significantly different to the proposed text of Mark used by Matthew and Luke. Tuckett has criticised the profile of the recension suggested by Ennulat as being almost an anti-Mark, though he recognizes that Ennulat himself admits to the provisional and necessarily speculative nature of his suggestions\textsuperscript{218}. Another difficulty raised by Tuckett is the methodological difficulty of distinguishing between the secondary characteristics of the recension that Ennulat argues for on one hand, and the redaction of Matthew and Luke on the other\textsuperscript{219}.

\textsuperscript{215} Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, pp. 33. Friedrichsen, *New Dissertations on the Minor Agreements*, p. 375, considers it a curious thing that Ennulat does not express his rating of the agreements in the opposite direction, that is, rating as (I) the improbability of an agreement being independent redaction. Ennulat could counter that is what he has done, because for him there are only two viable options as comprehensive solutions.

\textsuperscript{216} Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, pp. 417-418.

\textsuperscript{217} Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*, pp. 419-428.

\textsuperscript{218} Tuckett, *The Current State*, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{219} Tuckett, *The Current State of the Synoptic Problem*, p. 35.
b) Evaluation of Ennulat’s thesis

One of the significant weaknesses in Ennulat’s conclusions is that while he argues for a recension as a global and comprehensive solution, on his own figures some 51% of his examples are capable of being interpreted as the result of independent redaction, or other causes. If one adds the further 19% of cases he rates as III/II or II/III it is possible to argue that, by his own admission, some 70% of the agreements identified are open to debate. One gets the sense that once committed to his thesis he will argue for it even when compelling evidence is not present in a passage, and this can be seen in the number of summaries for the pericopes that indicate that a recension is a possible solution, or where other factors other than independent redaction need to be considered. It is a consistent weakness in Ennulat’s thesis that he strongly argues that agreements are not the result of independent redaction without detailing the grounds for that judgement. In fairness to Ennulat he looks at the convergence of a number of factors, such as the accumulation of agreements in a particular passage, and uncharacteristic vocabulary or grammatical structures. Without wanting to split hairs there is a difference between outlining reasons why he considers an agreement to come from a recension on one hand, and saying why an agreement could not be the result of redaction on the other. This is another way of saying that he is better at outlining the contributing factors that guide his decision in the direction of a recension, than identifying the factors that identify why something cannot be redaction. As Friedrichsen observes it would be more helpful to demonstrate first why independent redaction would be improbable and then argue for a post-Markan recension. While Ennulat argues for a literary and comprehensive solution to the phenomenon of the minor agreements there is awareness of the provisional nature of the analysis he has undertaken, and of the

220 Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, See p. 122, 135, 167, 222, 227, 234, 237 for some examples of summaries where it is claimed that a recension is possible, or not to be excluded. This latter possibility indicates a reasonable and appropriate degree of caution on the part of Ennulat. It also suggests an awareness that the arguments for a recension are not nearly as compelling as he would hope.

221 Friedrichsen, New Dissertations on the Minor Agreements, p. 375.
chasm that opens up between suggesting that a hypothesis is possible, and demonstrating that it is the probable solution.\textsuperscript{222}

This is not to say that such a recension is impossible. It is a very attractive thesis and still maintains the Two-Source theory, though in a modified form. Ennulat’s low estimation of the amount of impact from the oral tradition would certainly be open to challenge and it would be fascinating to see how he would counter the suggestion of Baum who argues that the minor agreements are primarily due to the impact of the oral tradition. One is left to wonder how two scholars can look at the same evidence and come up with solutions so diametrically opposed. One virtually eliminates the oral tradition as a factor while the other considers it to be the best solution posed by the presence of the agreements in the triple tradition. The danger posed by comprehensive and unitary solutions is certainly clear to see.

One needs also some degree of caution in examining Ennulat’s work when determining the number of minor agreements. Much is made of structural convergences as an indication of a recension.\textsuperscript{223} Certainly this is a factor that is well worthy of consideration, but structural agreements can also be explained as being due to grammatical and stylistic improvements to Mark’s Gospel consistent with a certain level of education or usage that could easily be coincidental. The work of Abbott, Schmid, McLoughlin, and Neirynck have clearly outlined coincidences in the literary style of Matthew and Luke, and they provide necessary and helpful points of reference when making judgements about structural agreements.\textsuperscript{224} Ennulat may well be correct in drawing attention to this factor in the determination of agreements, but one is left with the sense that this is an area that requires a firmer foundation and clearer identification of what constitutes a structural agreement and how it should be evaluated.

\textsuperscript{222} \textsc{Friedrichsen}, \textit{New Dissertations on the Minor Agreements}, p. 381, suggests that the sheer scope of the work, that is an examination of all the minor agreements, is what makes it vulnerable to the charge of lack of depth in terms of argumentation on specific examples.

\textsuperscript{223} \textsc{Ennulat}, \textit{Die “Minor Agreements”}, some examples where this argument is used within the significant agreements listed by Neirynck are: p. 58 (Mk 1,40-45), p. 144 (Mk 4,41), p. 170 (Mk 6,33), pp. 211-212 (Mk 9,19), pp. 377-378 (Mk 14,72).

\textsuperscript{224} See note 27 above for indications of the scope of these studies. See also \textsc{Luz}, \textit{Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)}, pp. 35-56, on Matthean vocabulary; \textsc{Fitzmyer}, \textit{The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)}, pp. 107-127, on Lukan language and style.
One of the tensions evident in this study is that of arguing for a recension, but at the same time recognizing that independent redaction is always a factor to be considered. This is unavoidable given the range of convergence and divergence in the agreements. For all the agreements that are indicated there are still many disagreements in terms of verbal agreement and this reveals itself in a variety of ways such as vocabulary, in the use of simple for compound verbs or vice versa, the variation in terms of person and number, or the location of the agreement within a passage or phrase. All these need to be considered carefully since they indicate that if Matthew and Luke use the same reworked form of Mark they do so with considerable freedom. If Matthew and Luke have access to the same recension the variation in the agreements still needs to be explained, and this provides a strong argument for the redactional activity of Matthew and Luke whether one argues for a recension or for Lukan dependence on Matthew. Given that 40% of Matthew and 52% of Luke use different words to Mark, and that Matthew omits over half of the Markan vocabulary, and Luke omits 75% of the Markan vocabulary, it becomes clear that arguing for a recension has some obstacles to overcome if it is to be persuasive.

**c) Testing Ennulat’s research using Neirynck’s list of significant agreements**

i) Comparing Ennulat’s ratings as applied to Neirynck’s list, with his overall results

It is beyond the scope of this present paper to provide an in-depth study of Ennulat’s volume, but an examination of his arguments concerning the significant agreements listed by Neirynck provides a relevant selection of texts to examine his method and conclusions, and to test whether this group of texts is statistically consistent with the profile of the agreements already outlined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ennulat’s categories applied to Neirynck’s list of 52 significant agreements [my calculations]</th>
<th>Ennulat’s statistical profile for all the minor agreements (approx. 1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category I (9) 18% (much higher)</td>
<td>4% lie in category I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

What can be seen here is that, by Ennulat’s analysis of the significant agreements, there is a higher percentage of agreements in category (I) that argue for his recension than the general pattern he has identified. It would need to be stated that he does not use this as part of his own study since Neirynck’s list is not studied as a specific subset of the agreements he lists. It is clear that not all the agreements are addressed directly, and that a number are judged by Ennulat to be in passages where Mark-Q overlaps are identified. A consequence of this is that these passages are eliminated from his considerations regarding the recension. Given that the nature of a recension is that it is secondary there is no reason why the recension Ennulat argues for would not have included some overlap passages. While it is understandable that these passages were not treated it weakens the force of his argument.


d) Comparing Ennulat’s judgements to those of Luz

It is instructive to compare those texts that Ennulat considers strongly indicate Matthean and Lukan use of a recension with his mentor Luz’s commentary and its treatment of the same texts. It quickly emerges that Luz is much more open to the influence of independent redaction and the occasional influence of the oral tradition than is Ennulat. In § 12.1 Mk 1,38-39 Ennulat rates the similarity between Mt 4,23 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας and Lk 4,43 εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεί τὴν βασιλείαν as (I) and argues that it provides strong support for a recension rather

---

226 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 18,23,429.
than independent redaction, while Luz notes that the phrase is typically Matthean\(^{227}\). In § 13.4:1 Mk 1,40 the use of κύριε in Mt 8,2 and Lk 5,12 is rated as (II), on the basis of non-Lukian language, while Luz considers that it could be coincidental\(^{228}\). In § 14:4.1 Mk 2,3 the agreement in the use of ἰδοὺ in Mt 9,2 and Lk 5,18 is rated (II) and cited as evidence for a recension, while Luz considers that it could be independent redaction or a recension\(^{229}\). In § 14.20.1 Mk 2,12 the motif of fear in Mt 9,8 ἐφοβήθησαν and φόβου in Lk 5,26 is excluded by Ennulat as redactional and rated (II), while Luz notes that it is a motif found frequently in Matthew with regard to the disciples’ reaction to events in the ministry of Jesus. They are encouraged and urged to overcome their fear by Jesus himself\(^{230}\). There are occasions when Luz and Ennulat will clearly agree: § 16. 8.1 Mk 2,22 // Mt 9,17 // Lk 5,37 concerning the loss of the wineskins\(^{231}\); § 25.4.2.3 Mk 4,11 // Mt 13,11 // Lk 8,10 where Jesus makes the pronouncement concerning the disciples’ knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom\(^{232}\); or § 69.2.1 Mk 11,11 // Mt 21,17 // Lk 21,37 with the mention of Jesus lodging outside of Jerusalem. In these instances there is basic agreement regarding the proposed recension\(^{233}\).

On the other hand there are minor agreements where the difference in point of view could not be more marked, such as §17.10.3 Mk 2,26 // Mt 12,4 // Lk 6,4 where Luz argues that the use of the adverb μόνος is due to Matthean redaction, whereas Ennulat rates it as (I) indicating that is proof positive of a recension\(^{234}\). Ennulat argues that § 53.10.1 Mk 9,19 // Mt 17,17 // Lk 9,41 and the agreement in the use of

\(^{227}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 48-50. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7) (n. 3), p. 179.

\(^{228}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 53. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17) (n. 2), p. 8, when he mentions this as an agreement, but pays no particular attention to it.

\(^{229}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 61. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 36. See also (n. 7), where mentions that there are a striking number of agreements that are either redactional or point to a recension. The agreement concerning the use of ἐπί κλίνης is deemed to be a an improvement on the vulgar τῶν κρόμμων. It is not indicated as anything other than redaction.

\(^{230}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 68. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 37, where he highlights the following examples Mt 10,26-28; 14,27.30f; 17,6f.

\(^{231}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 7. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17) (n. 4), p. 46, where both agree against the likelihood of independent redaction.

\(^{232}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 125-126. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17) (n. 10), p. 301.

\(^{233}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 252. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25), p. 177, where he suggests a post-Markan reworking of the episode is possible, or that some of the changes in order are possibly be due to the pre-Markan form of the Passion narrative. For all that it is noteworthy that Luz makes no mention of ἔξωση as an agreement when he treats it on p. 189.

\(^{234}\) ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 82. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17) (n. 13), p. 229.
διεστραμμένη is evidence for a recension on the basis of the structural correspondences between Luke and Matthew. For his part Luz agrees that it is not the result of independent redaction but possibly due to the influence of the oral tradition. In the scene of Jesus’ trial Ennulat strongly argues for a recension § 99.10 Mk 14.65 // Mt 26.68 // Lk 22.64 with the coincidence in the use of the phrase τίς ἐστιν ὁ παῖσας σε; deemed to be inexplicable other than by a recension, whereas Luz is divided in his assessment between a recension and the impact of the oral tradition. In § 106.9.1.2 Mk 15,30 // Mt 27,40 // Lk 23,37 the shared use of εἶ as (I) calling on Jesus to declare his identity is judged not to be redactional. Luz expressly states that he is not convinced by Ennulat’s argument here.

What these examples chosen from the agreements rated (I) by Ennulat indicate is that even those who argue for a recension of Mark as the primary cause for minor agreements do not necessarily agree when it is applied to specific examples. Where Ennulat will argue consistently for a recension as a global solution, Luz is more prepared to consider the impact of both the oral tradition and independent redaction.

e) Comparing Ennulat’s list of significant agreements to the SCE

In Friedrichsen’s review of Ennulat’s dissertation he includes a list of 30 agreements rated (I), and also makes mention of 7 agreements that are rated slightly lower. While 9 of the agreements in this list are included in Neirynck’s list of significant agreements, approximately two-thirds of the agreements are not.

In the published volume Ennulat’s list of agreements is further refined, and the agreements rated in category (I) had been reduced to 24, indicating further reflection on Ennulat’s part. It is instructive to observe that of those agreements rated in category (I) only 6 are included in Neirynck’s list of significant agreements.

235 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 211-212. LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 519. NEIRYNCK, The Two-Source Theory, pp. 16-18 examines the suggestions of a range of scholars including Goulder, Luz and Bovon and concludes that “coincident direct contact with Deut 32,5 is a more probable solution” than Deutero-Markan theories, or oral tradition solutions.


239 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 469.

240 On the other hand it is worth noting that there are 31 agreements rated (I/II) or (II/I).
i) Negative agreements identified by Ennulat

Of the agreements in category (I) there are 5 negative agreements:

§ 18a.10 ἑυθύς in Mk 3,6 // Mt 12,14 // Lk 6,11\(^{241}\);

§ 20.3 the phrase ὁ γελατοντος concerning Jesus choosing the disciples that he wanted Mk 3,13 // Mt 10,1 // Lk 6,13\(^{242}\);

§ 26.2 οὐκ οἶδατε…. ἡος πάσας τὰς παραβολας γνώσεσθε; where Jesus rebukes the disciples for their lack of knowledge and understanding of the parables in Mk 4,13 // Mt 13,18 // Lk 8,11\(^{243}\);

§ 38.24 καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν regarding the division of the two fish Mk 6,41 // Mt 14,19 // Lk 9,16\(^{244}\);

§ 48.6 ὅ where the definite article is not used in reference to Peter. Mk 8,29 // Mt 16,16 // Lk 9,20\(^{245}\).

Given that these are negative agreements, they were not indicated in the SCE and neither are they part of Neirynck’s list of significant agreements. Ennulat is correct in the identification of these negative agreements but whether these negative agreements individually or collectively point to a recension remains to be seen. Ennulat’s contention would be that all of these agreements are inexplicable as coincidental and independent redaction and that they point strongly towards a recension. These negative agreements need to be examined within their respective contexts. One of Friedrichsen’s critiques of Ennulat’s methodology is that he tends to focus on isolated details “without sufficient attention to the context and/or nuance”\(^{246}\).

The weakness of the approach is that an isolated detail that might provide some difficulty to explain redactionally, something very dependent on the eyes of the individual exegete, is given too much prominence. As an example Mt 14,19 and Lk


\(^{243}\)ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 129.

\(^{244}\)ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 177.

\(^{245}\)ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 186-187.

\(^{246}\)FRIEDRICHSEN, New Dissertations on the Minor Agreements, p. 381.
9,16 do not include the division of the fish as a secondary action as related in Mark. Lk 9,16 is clear that when Jesus takes the loaves and fish he blesses and breaks them. The addition of αὐτούς makes it clear that both are blessed, broken and distributed thereby making the last part of Mk 6,41 redundant. Mt 14,19 is somewhat different in that while the bread and fish are blessed it is only the bread that is distributed. Given the similarity and the variation it is hard to see that this is a compelling argument for a recension. In addition it should not be forgotten that there are a number of differences on the part of Matthew and Luke in this passage. These also need to be considered and would indicate independent redaction needs to be factored into the equation. The Matthean mention of the women and children present in Mt 14,21, and the mention of crowds in Mt 14,19 rather than the crowd in Lk 9,16 are two evident examples of significant variation in the same passage.

In all these discussions the focus of exegete becomes a critical factor, and influences the evaluation of the evidence. In the negative agreement of §48.6 Mk 8,29//Mt 16,16//Lk 9,20 the lack of the definite article in referring to Peter is certainly noteworthy, but there are other elements and variations that cannot be ignored, suggesting independent redaction is a more significant factor to be considered. Matthew refers to Peter as Simon Peter, a detail that Luke does not include. In the same verse Peter will refer to Jesus as the Son of the Living God, whereas in Luke Peter identifies Jesus as the Christ of God. Jesus’ response to Peter in Mt 16,17-19 regarding his identity and function within the new community is unique to the Matthean depiction of this scene. In the face of these variations the lack of the definite article might point to a recension, but it needs to be explained in the face of all the evidence. In fairness to Ennulat he does provide a summary for each pericope in which the minor agreements, both positive and negative, are evaluated. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that certain elements are given much more prominence than they deserve, at least as far as indicating a recension is concerned.

ii) Where the SCE and Ennulat concur

SCE and Ennulat concur in the identification of seven agreements, namely:
Of these examples § 25.4:2.3, § 99.10 and § 109.17 form part of Neirynck’s list of significant agreements and the first two have been the subject of considerable discussion. The other four agreements were indicated in Neirynck’s cumulative list
but were not deemed to be particularly significant, or worthy of attention. The agreement in the use of ἄπαχγγέλλω in § 109.17 Ennulat considers to be the result of a pre-Matthean and Lukan change to the Markan text. While noting other possible explanations, namely, independent redaction, Lukan dependence on Matthew, pre-Markan or post-Markan traditions, they are weighed in the balance but found wanting by Ennulat.

The use of ὁτι in § 63.3 is clearly not normal usage for Matthew and Luke but Ennulat does not attend to Mt 5,22.28 where the same formula is found. In examining the wider context of this passage Mk 10,23-31 // Mt 19,23-30 // Lk 18,24-30 it should be recognized that while there are agreements there is also considerable variation between Matthew and Luke that should also be addressed before highlighting this particular element. In fairness to Ennulat consideration is made of the stylistic improvements of Matthew and Luke that would be considered coincidental. The summary for this particular passage is appropriately measured when he speaks of a recension as “nicht ausgeschlossen” rather than it being self evident and assured.

In § 77.1.3 there are a number of correspondences indicated in the SCE that Ennulat considers “derart massiv, daß kaum anders als von einer bereits veränderten Mk Vorlage zur Erklärung werden kann”. There is no dispute about there being considerable agreements but this particular pericope is one in which there is agreement with Mark, with one another, but also variation from Mark and each other. All of these elements need to be considered in providing an adequate and sustainable explanation.

---


255 Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 414-415. Ennulat does not consider this factor alone but also includes the elimination of the motif of flight, the silence of the women, and the modification of the reaction of fear. See also Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), pp. 399-400, for a list of the correspondences in this pericope, and for the suggestion of a recension as being a “denkbare Möglichkeit” and referring to Ennulat’s doctoral thesis.


257 Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 284.

258 Some of the variations in Matthew’s portrayal of this scene worthy of note are: i) the unique setting for the scene provided by Mt 22,34 and its focus on the silencing of the Sadducees; ii) the question now comes from the Pharisees; iii) Mt 22,38 and its addition of the mention of the first and great commandment; iv) the concluding comment in Mt 22,40 that the whole law depends on love of God and neighbour. Luke also presents the scene differently: i) Lk 10,25 phrases the lawyer’s question as being concerned with what is needed to inherit eternal life; ii) Lk 10,28 also concludes the scene with Jesus’ approval of the lawyer’s response and he calls him to now act according to his response to Jesus.
iii) Corrections to the SCE in the light of Ennulat’s research

Of the 19 agreements rated as (I) that remain there are three corrections required to the SCE in § 13.7 Mk 1,42 where Mt 8,3 and Lk 5,13 use εὐθέως rather than εὐθὺς 259. The second correction is that in § 61.7:1 Mt 19,20 and Lk 18,22 agree in the use of ἔττι 260. In both these instances the correspondence is an agreement and Ennulat is correct in noting them. There would be no argument about these being agreements but their significance as pointers to a post-Markan reworked text is questionable. Neither of these agreements are noted in Neirynck’s list, and they are likely to be the result of coincidental redaction, despite Ennulat’s claim to the contrary. § 106.9 has already been treated as a correction in the comparison between the SCE and Neirynck’s list of significant agreements where it was noted that the displacement of agreement and the layout of synopses contributed to it not being identified as an agreement 261.

iv) Where the SCE and Ennulat do not agree

Of the examples that remain there is clear divergence in the criteria used for the identification of agreements. Both § 12.1 Mk 1,39 // Mt 4,23 // Lk 4,43 concerning Jesus’ preaching activity and § 69.21:1 Mk 11,9-10 Mt 21,17 ηὐλίσθη Lk (21,37) ηὐλίζετο, where Jesus lodges outside of the city during his Jerusalem ministry, have already been treated 262. They were not included in the SCE on the grounds of partial verbal agreement for §12.1 Mk 1,39, and on the basis of the agreement being placed in different contexts for § 69.21:1. In both these texts Ennulat’s summation of their significance as agreements coincides with Neirynck’s own judgement, though their conclusions as to their interpretation would differ

259 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 56. See NEIRYNCK, The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, pp. 274-276, for the use of εὐθύς, εὐθέως, παραχρήμα in Luke and Matthew. The variation in their pattern of omission and the use of εὐθέως and παραχρήμα tends to support the argument for independent redaction and coincidental agreement on the basis of stylistic improvement to the Markan text.


261 See p. 52 above.

262 For §12.1 see above pp. 52-55 for the section relevant to the layout of synopses, and p. 80-82 where Ennulat’s judgement is compared to that of Luz. See ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 48-50. For § 69.21:1 see p. 51 and ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 252.
markedly. Neirynck’s own stance is clear in its focus on the role of independent redactional activity as the primary cause of the minor agreements263.

In § 67.11:1 the immediacy of the healing of Bartimaeus is described by a variety of adverbs in Mk10,52 εὐθὺς, Mt 20,34 εὐθέως, and παραχρήμα in Lk 18,43264. There is no verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke, though they coincide in their avoidance of εὐθὺς. The lack of verbal agreement was considered to provide sufficient justification for it not to be included as an agreement in the SCE.

§ 68.18 Mk 11,10 // Mt 21,9 // Lk 19,38 describes the crowd’s response to Jesus’ entry into the city of Jerusalem acclaiming Jesus in royal tones. In Mt 21,9 Jesus is spoken of as τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ where Lk 19,38 describes Jesus as ὁ βασιλεὺς. Once again this was also not included in the SCE on the basis of the lack of verbal agreement265.

Ennulat rates the structural correspondences in the dialogue between Jesus and the disciples in the feeding of the multitudes in Mk 6,35-39 // Mt 14,15-18 // Lk 9, 12-14 as the result of their reliance on a consistently reworked Markan text, though he does acknowledge that it could be explained on the basis of Matthean and Lukan redaction266. It was beyond the scope of the SCE to identify such correspondences as agreements, and Ennulat’s own admission that these correspondences could be redactional provides sufficient justification for caution in identifying them as agreements.

In examining the conclusion of the healing of Jairus’ daughter in Mk 5,43 Ennulat notes the verbal agreement between Mt 9,26 ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη and Lk 4,14b φήμη ἐξῆλθεν with the mention of the report of Jesus’ activity going out into the

263 NEIRYNCK, The Two-Source Theory, pp. 40-41, makes mention of the fact that while his focus is primarily redactional he has no objection to some agreements being due to the impact of the oral tradition or even some subsidiary dependence of Luke on Matthew, though this latter option is left unclear as to how this would be determined or demonstrated to be the case.
265 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 251.
266 ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 175.
surrounding areas\textsuperscript{267}. Explanations such as variant traditions, reminiscences of Q or Matthean and Lukan redaction are considered unconvincing and it is argued that this is a significant agreement against Mark and that it provides evidence of a recension of Mark as the most viable explanation. In this Ennulat agrees with the suggestions of Luz that Matthew’s concluding report is not freely composed but comes from either an adaptation of Mk 1,28 or a Deutero-Markan recension\textsuperscript{268}. Ennulat’s explanation for the correspondence is that Lk 4,14b was originally linked to Mk 6,1 where it would have served as a transitional verse between the miracles of Mk 4,35-5,43 and the rejection at Nazareth in Mk 6,1-6. An essential part of Ennulat’s argument is provided by the \textit{hapax} ἤ ϕήμη and the shared usage of ἐξέρχομαι rather than the Markan ἔρχομαι\textsuperscript{269}. While it might be true that Luke and Matthew will use this verb in their parallels to Mk 5,15; 6,11 and 14,72 this does not necessarily point to a recension\textsuperscript{270}. One weakness in the argument is that with such frequently occurring verbs of movement there is a wide range of both convergence and divergence in usage between Mark, Matthew and Luke and this should not be pressed too far as a supporting argument\textsuperscript{271}. With regard to ἤ ϕήμη the force of the \textit{hapax} needs to be recognised but the context in which it is used differs considerably in that Lk 4,14b describes Jesus’ return to Galilee after being tested rather than the conclusion to the episode of Jairus’ daughter. Given the difference in the context it is difficult to see how this could convincingly be used as a sign of a literary dependence or as a significant agreement. It was not identified as an agreement in the SCE, Neirynck’s list of significant agreements, or in the more general cumulative list.

v) Summary

Comparing the SCE to that of Ennulat it is clear that there is a significant number of differences with regard to the identification of agreements, and the respective criteria called upon to make those judgements. Given that the scope of the two works is significantly dissimilar that should not be unexpected. Ennulat’s study of

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{267}] \textsc{Ennulat}, \textit{Die \textquotedblleft Minor Agreements\textquotedblright}, pp. 156-157.
  \item[\textsuperscript{268}] \textsc{Luz}, \textit{Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)} (n. 6), p. 51.
  \item[\textsuperscript{269}] \textsc{Ennulat}, \textit{Die \textquotedblleft Minor Agreements\textquotedblright}, (n. 66), p. 156.
  \item[\textsuperscript{270}] Both ἐξέρχομαι and ἔρχομαι are frequently occurring verbs in the Synoptics (ἐξέρχομαι Mark 39 occasions, Matthew 43 times and Luke 44 times) and ἔρχομαι (Mark 85 times, Matthew 114 and Luke 101 times).
  \item[\textsuperscript{271}] \textsc{Neirynck}, \textit{The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark with a Cumulative List}, pp. 256-257, for examples of variation in the minor agreements.
\end{itemize}
the agreements argues for a proposed global solution to the minor agreements. Providing an explanation for the agreements was not the specific focus or purpose of the SCE, and the awareness of the agreements as an element to be considered and the complexity of the phenomenon gradually emerged as the work progressed. Factors such as the number of agreements in a given passage, or structural agreements, were not considered in the identification of agreements since verbal agreement in triple tradition passages was the primary criterion. The purpose of the SCE was not to explain the presence of the agreements but to identify them as a means of providing readers with a better appreciation of the complexity of the relationships of the Synoptic Gospels.

There is considerable attention paid to detail in Ennulat’s study but one has to wonder at the amount of weight certain positive and negative agreements are called upon to carry. There are occasions when Jesus’ warning about building houses on firm foundations rather than building on sand comes to mind! Does the omission of the definite article before Peter’s name at Caesarea Philippi really point to a recension? It hardly seems compelling. Boring’s observation about the agreements being an abstract set of relations in the mind of the researcher displays its acuity and its relevance here. What Ennulat interprets through the filter of the recension is capable of being interpreted from other perspectives that would interpret the same phenomena as being the result of independent redaction, the use of other sources, Mark-Q overlaps or even Lukan dependence on Matthew for Farrer theorists or Neo-Griesbachians.

One is left wondering about how some relatively minor agreements are deemed to be such strong indicators of a recension. On the other hand, a strength of Ennulat’s work is that considerable effort has been taken to take into account a number of factors such as structural correspondences, theological tendencies, verbal agreement, negative agreements, and the accumulation of all of the above. He is to be commended for attempting to deal with them in a cohesive fashion.

4) Significant minor agreements and the oral tradition
a) Research that has indicated the possible role of the oral tradition

The study of compositional practice contemporary to the formation of the Synoptic Gospels has called into question the dominant literary paradigm of the major utilisation theories. The role of both long-term and short-term memory has been identified as a factor that must be reckoned with in the process of transmission both oral and literary sources. Sufficient work has been done in this area to at least partly support Dunn’s call to reset the default paradigm and explore with less suspicion ways in which the oral tradition continued to influence the development of the Jesus tradition.

i) Bovon

Neirynck’s 1991 study on the minor agreements and the Two-Source theory drew attention to François Bovon’s first volume Lk 1,1-9,50 (1989) of his commentary on Luke and his identification of the role played by the oral tradition with particular regard to some of the most striking agreements\(^{272}\). Bovon’s own position is that of arguing for the Two-Source theory assuming Markan priority with Luke drawing occasionally upon the oral tradition\(^ {273}\).

From the point of view of the significant minor agreements identified in Neirynck’s list, Bovon would suggest that the oral tradition has had its role to play in the following:

\[
\text{§ 14.19:1 Mk 2,12 // Mt 9,7 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ // Lk 5,25 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ}^{274}
\]

\[
\text{§ 25.4:2.3 Mk 4,11 // Mt 13,11 γνώναι τὰ μυστήρια // Lk 8,10 γνώναι τὰ μυστήρια}^{275}
\]

\[
\text{§ 33.10:2 Mk 5,27 // Mt 9,20 τοῦ κρασπέδου // Lk 8,44 τοῦ κρασπέδου}^{276}
\]

\(^{272}\) NEIRYNCK, *The Two Source Theory*, p. 337.

\(^{273}\) BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, pp. 19-22.

\(^{274}\) BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, p. 245, he suggests the possibility of the influence of oral tradition in a guarded fashion here.

\(^{275}\) BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, p. 413, the use of the plural is deemed to be due to the oral tradition.
This is not to suggest that Bovon overplays the influence of the oral tradition since it is treated as one of a number of factors that gave rise to these agreements such as the impact of Q, independent redaction, composition, and possible parallel sources.

In the second volume Lk 9,51-14,35 (1996) and third volume Lk 15,1-19,27 (2001) there is no mention of the oral tradition as an explanation for the minor agreements. This could lead to the not unreasonable perception that Bovon’s source critical perspective has substantially changed over the passage of time. However, it needs to be recognised that 34 of the significant minor agreements in Neirynck’s list are located in the first nine chapters of Luke and other than the negative agreement in § 63.5(1) Lk 18,30 the rest are located in Lk 19-24. The final volume Lk 19, 28-24,53 (2009) does indeed examine these minor agreements and suggests the role played by the oral tradition in a number of the most striking and debated of them.

---

276 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 443, the priority of Mark is clear for Bovon and there is no other written tradition. While this detail is considered puzzling he is not convinced that it is secondary despite D it not including it. The oral tradition is considered the best explanation.


278 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 489.

279 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 489.

280 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 511.

281 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), Lk 3,16 (p. 177); Lk 9,1 (p. 454); Lk 9,2 (p. 454).

282 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), Lk 4,43 (p. 220); Lk 5,12 (p. 237); Lk 6,1 (p. 261); Lk 8, 25 (p. 421); Lk 9,7 (p.461); Lk 9,9 (p. 467); Lk 9,20 (p. 478).

283 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), Lk 5,12 (p. 237); Lk 6,17-18 (p. 285).

284 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), Lk 5,18 (p. 243).
As was seen in Bovon’s first volume the oral tradition is not argued as the only possible explanation for agreements and independent redaction. The use of Luke’s own source, and the textual tradition, are both examined as either alternative solutions, or are judged to have played their role in the formation of agreements, in conjunction with the oral tradition. Bovon’s approach is one in which the role of the oral tradition is not overemphasized, but given reasonable and due recognition.

Of the twelve significant agreements where oral tradition is argued to have some influence the majority display a very high level of verbal agreement, though there is some degree of minor variation. This high level of verbal agreement in certain

---

285 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), pp. 56-57, suggests that there were two stages of development in the oral tradition for this pericope in which Jesus’ authority to teach is challenged. The first stage included Jesus’ dialogue with the Jewish authorities. In the second stage this tradition was located in Jesus’ Jerusalem ministry. The specific detail of teaching is not identified as coming from the oral tradition and Bovon (n. 8), p. 54 mentions the Lukan use of the motif in Lk 19,47; 20,1; 20,21; 21,37; 23,5.

286 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p. 325. Here he argues for the shared use of an oral tradition that the Johannine Passion narrative also incorporates.

287 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p. 341. The difficulty in making a determination regarding the origin of this notable agreement is acknowledged, but it is argued that the present Lukan text is best explained by the use of Mark and the oral tradition.

288 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p. 344, suggests the possible solution for the agreement provided by the textual tradition is that it was was brought into Luke from Matthew. Bovon is unconvinced by GOULDER, Luke, p. 750, who argues that Luke depended on Matthew, and provides the counter proposal of the oral tradition.

289 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p.484 the agreement in the use of the verb for wrapping for burial is seen to be either coincidental stylistic improvement and/or due to the oral tradition.

290 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), Lk 22,67 (p. 365); Lk 22,53 (p. 484).

291 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), Lk 22,42 (p. 324); Lk 24,4 (p. 519), Lk 24,9 (p. 521).

292 BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), Lk 22,62 (p. 344); Lk 22,64 (p. 341).
elements or phrases in triple tradition passages can reasonably be explained as being due to the oral tradition. It can be argued that this is a more likely scenario than recourse to an exclusively literary paradigm that would then need to posit either Lukan or Matthean dependence, or another parallel source. Dependence on the oral tradition need not manifest itself in passages where there is a high level of verbal agreement as can be seen in the report of Jesus’ healing activity in § 38.9 Mk 6,34 // Mt 14,14 // Lk 9,11 and the interaction between Jesus and Judas in § 97.3 Mk 14,45 // Mt 26,50 // Lk 22,48. In both these instances the level of verbal agreement is low, and they were not indicated as agreements in the SCE given the criteria that were used. However, this does not preclude the influence of the oral tradition as a viable and reasonable explanation for these agreements. What it may well indicate is the variation within the developing tradition/s. Given that the literary paradigm has to take into account variation and redaction of the sources used, it would be unfair to expect that the oral transmission of traditions would occur without variation or modification in performance.

ii) Soards and Brown

Bovon’s suggestion regarding the influence of the oral tradition in the formation of minor agreements in the Jerusalem ministry and Passion and Resurrection narrative finds support in the works of Marion Soards on Luke 22, and Raymond Brown’s magisterial The Death of the Messiah. Soards argues for Mark as Luke’s basic source but suggests that the oral tradition has been blended into Lk 22 and combined with the Markan materials by means of Lukan redaction and composition. The agreements of § 97.3 Mk 14,45 // Mt 26,50 // Lk 22,48 where Jesus and Judas interact, § 100.15:1 Mk 14,72 // Mt 26,75 // Lk 22,62 Peter weeping bitterly, and § 99.10 Mk 14,65 // Mt 26,68 // Lk (22,64) where Jesus is challenged to identify who is striking him, are all argued as due to the influence of the oral tradition that has been incorporated into Markan materials. The oral tradition is also suggested to have played its role in Jesus’ rebuke of the disciples about the sword in

---


294 SOARDS, The Passion, pp. 118-119.

295 SOARDS, The Passion, pp. 105-106.
Lk 22,5a-c and in the agreement in Jesus’ reply to his accusers in Lk 22,67 that is judged to be a redacted form of Mark based on oral tradition\textsuperscript{296}.

Raymond Brown recognises the role played by the oral tradition in the formation of the Gospel materials but acknowledges the speculative nature and limits involved in identifying it with any certainty\textsuperscript{297}. At the same time he notes the provisional nature of any working hypothesis regarding the formation and interrelation of the Synoptic Gospels, and the likelihood that the process of their composition is more complicated than even the most complex theories that have been proposed\textsuperscript{298}. With regard to the minor agreements in the Passion narratives he considers agreements such as the wrapping of Jesus body for burial § 108.7:1 Mk 15,46 // Mt 27,59 ἐντύλιξεν αὐτό // Lk 23,53 ἐντύλιξεν αὐτό as coincidental, though he sees coincidence having “limited appeal” as an explanation for the agreements\textsuperscript{299}. Brown argues that it was necessary to modify the working hypothesis of Markan priority by the addition of the influence of the oral tradition, and that provides a better solution than the \textit{ad hoc} postulation of other written sources. Both Neirynck and Senior are criticised for their lack of preparedness to accept the role that is played by the oral tradition in the formation of these agreements in the Passion narrative\textsuperscript{300}. With regard to the agreement of § 99.10 Mk 14,65 // Mt 26,68 // Lk (22,64) the question “who is it that struck you” he suggests that it has come into the oral tradition from the version of blind man’s buff well known in the Hellenistic period\textsuperscript{301}. In neither the episode of Peter weeping bitterly, or in Jesus being asked to prophesy, is Brown convinced by text critical solutions\textsuperscript{302}. He would go so far as to characterise Senior’s text critical solution as a “desperate” one that does not make sufficient allowance for the oral tradition.

iii) Luz

\textsuperscript{296} \textsc{Soards}, \textit{The Passion}, pp. 105-106. Neither of these agreements form part of Neirynck’s list of significant agreements. 
\textsuperscript{297} \textsc{Brown}, \textit{The Death of the Messiah}, p. 42. In pp. 40-46, he briefly addresses questions of the interdependence of the Gospels, oral tradition and the minor agreements in the Passion narrative. 
\textsuperscript{298} \textsc{Brown}, \textit{The Death of the Messiah}, p. 42. 
\textsuperscript{299} \textsc{Brown}, \textit{The Death of the Messiah}, p. 44. 
\textsuperscript{300} \textsc{Brown}, \textit{The Death of the Messiah}, p. 45. 
\textsuperscript{301} \textsc{Brown}, \textit{The Death of the Messiah}, p. 45. For a more detailed treatment of this agreement see p. 579. 
\textsuperscript{302} \textsc{Brown}, \textit{The Death of the Messiah}, pp. 579, 609.
Luz is known for his consideration of the Matthean and Lukan use of a recension of Mark as a partial solution for the problem posed by the minor agreements. It is this hypothesis that his student Ennulat develops in his research specifically devoted to the minor agreements. Luz himself sees no pressing reason to abandon the Two-Source theory and considers that independent redaction, and a recension of Mark addresses the phenomenon of the agreements sufficiently well.

The contribution played by the oral tradition in the formation of the minor agreements is not ignored by Luz, and he suggests it is a possible explanation for the following significant agreements in Neirynek’s list:

§ 53.10:1 Mk 9,19 // Mt 17,17 διεστραμμένη // Lk 9,41 διεστραμμένη

§ 97.3 Mk 14,45 om // Mt 26,50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἔταϊρε, ἔφι ὁ πάρει. // Lk 22,48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἰούδα, φιλῆματι τὸν ὑίον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδος.

§ 99.10 Mk 14,65 // Mt 26,68 τίς ἐστίν ὁ παίσας σε; // Lk (22,64) τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε.

§ 100.15:1 Mk 14,72 // Mt 26,75 ἐξελθὼν ἐξῳ ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς. // Lk 22,62 ἐξελθὼν ἐξῳ ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

§ 109.4:1 Mk 16,2 // Mt 28,1 ἐπιφωσκούσῃ // Lk (23,54) ἐπέφωσκεν.

§ 109.9:1 Mk 16,5 // Mt 28,3 ἀστραπῇ // Lk 24,4 ἀστραπτούσῃ.

While the possibility of the oral tradition is considered in these agreements it can be seen that Luz is guarded in his evaluation. The alternative possible explanation of a

---

303 See the section above where the passages that Ennulat rates as (I) that argue strongly for a recension, are compared to the judgements of Luz who displays a far greater openness to the role played by independent redaction.

304 Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7), p. 30.

305 Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), See pp. 519-520, where he considers the possibility of independent redaction, the use of another source possibly oral, or a Deutero-Markan recension. Luz judges that it may not be possible, or ultimately all that important, to judge between the second and third possibilities.

306 Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), See p. 156, where the suggestion is made as to how difficult it is to judge between redaction or Matthew putting into writing what was circulating in the oral tradition.

307 Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 204, considers a Deutero-Markan recension, or the use of an oral tradition.

308 Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28) (n. 26), p. 400. The possibility of the impact of the oral tradition is noted, as is that of a recension.

309 Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28) (n. 3), p. 400. The possibility of the impact of the oral tradition is noted, as is that of a recension.
Deutero-Markan recension as the source for these significant agreements is also noted. Luz’s caution is representative of how deeply entrenched the literary paradigm has become as a means of explaining Synoptic relationships. Despite that caution it can be seen that there is a convergence in the work of Bovon, Soards, Brown and Luz in terms of the possible role played by the oral tradition in the formation of minor agreements, particularly in the Passion narrative.

iv) Stein

Robert Stein addresses the problem posed by the minor agreements in 1992 by examining the overlapping of traditions in the Synoptics and John. Countering Dungan’s suspicion of the “blessed overlap” that Two-Source theorists are charged with as a means of dealing with difficult cases, Stein takes the position that it would be highly unlikely that there would not be overlaps in the development and incorporation of the traditions. The article explores the possibility that the agreements between the Gospel of John and any, or a number, of the Synoptics indicates that the overlapping of traditions did occur and this points to the on-going influence of the oral tradition and other parallel traditions. In particular there are eight minor agreements that find a parallel in John that are taken to indicate the influence of the oral tradition.

i) Mk 1,8 // Mt 3,11 // Lk 3.16 // Jn 1,26-27. Matthew, Luke and John agree in using the present rather than the aorist ēβαστισα.

ii) Mk 1,10 // Mt 3,16 // Lk 3,22 // Jn 1,32 where the Spirit comes “upon” Jesus rather “into” him.

iii) Mk 6,33,41,43 // Mt 14,13,19,20 // Lk 9,11,16,17 // Jn 6,2,12,13 regarding agreements between Matthew, Luke and John in the details of the Feeding of the 5000, namely, the mention of the crowds following Jesus, and the pieces left over.


312 Stein, The Matthew-Luke Agreements Against Mark, pp. 494-500. See also Id., Studying the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 138-141 where he returned to this theme and makes mention of five of these examples.

v) Mk 14,30,72 // Mt 26,34,74 // Lk 22,34,60 // Jn 13,38; 18,27 where all agree against Mark in having the cock crow only once.

vi) Mk 14,47 // Mt 26,52 // Lk 22,51 // Jn 18,11 where Matthew, Luke and John all agree against Mark in having Jesus rebuke Peter for striking the High Priest’s servant with the sword.

vii) Mk 15,11-12 // Mt 27,21 // Lk 23,18 // Jn 18:40. Matthew, Luke and John agree in the detail of the people calling out the name of Barabbas.

viii) Mk 15,46 // Mt 27 // 60 // Lk 23 // 53 // Jn 19,41 where Matthew, Luke and John agree, though using different wording, in the detail that the tomb used for the burial of Jesus had never been used.

The amount of agreement either verbally or in content suggests to Stein that other forms of the tradition influenced the Gospel writers who drew on them independently. That these traditions were drawn on independently is supported by the pattern of variation where John may agree with one or other of the Synoptics, with all of them, or with a combination of any two of them. This changing pattern of convergence and divergence does support the argument of the on-going development of the tradition where literary and oral traditions continued to interact with, and be incorporated into, the formation of the Gospels in their final form. From the point of view of the developing tradition, the distinction between oral and written tradition is not as significant as the likelihood that both contributed to the formation of the Gospels. One of the strengths of the article is that it addresses the range of correspondences that might occur between John and the Synoptics, either individually or in various combinations. Stein also makes a suggestion worthy of consideration regarding the types of Gospel traditions in which such agreements might be located. These agreements are more likely to occur in traditions that are important and frequently used in the life of the church — such as the accounts of the baptism of

315 Stein, The Matthew-Luke Agreements Against Mark, pp. 488-494. Stein lists: a) common material found in all the Gospels, b) material common to Matthew, Mark and John, c) material common to Matthew and John, d) material common to Mark, Luke and John, e) material common to Mark and John, f) material common to Luke and John.
Jesus, the Passion and resurrection narratives, and some of the more well-known miracles (e.g. the feeding of the 5000 or Jesus walking on the water)\textsuperscript{316}.

\textit{b) Oral tradition, minor agreements and the SCE}

In the preparation of the SCE the phenomenon of the minor agreements emerged as an area of study deserving of further investigation. A number of questions started to emerge regarding not only the identification and enumeration of agreements, but how they were to be explained in terms of their formation. The work of Boring has helped to bring more sharply into focus the question of the criteria used to identify agreements in the SCE. As has been already stated earlier in this paper, the criterion of verbal agreement was the primary category used, combined with the judgement that the agreements were located in parallel passages, a judgement that was largely guided by the arrangement of the passages in Aland’s Synopsis.

These criteria still provide the initial point of reference though the criteria for the identification of agreements needs to be augmented to include those instances where there is \textit{displacement of an otherwise rare detail} such as Jesus lodging in Bethany (§ 69.21:1 Mk 11,9-10 // Mt 21,17 \(\eta\upnu\lambda\iota\iota\sigma\theta\eta\) // Lk (21,37) \(\eta\upnu\lambda\iota\iota\zeta\varepsilon\tau\o\) or the mention of the twilight/dawn (§ 109.4:1 Mk 16,2 // Mt 28,1 \(\epsilon\pi\varphi\omega\sigma\kappa\o\upsilon\sigma\eta\) // Lk (23,54) \(\epsilon\pi\varphi\omega\sigma\kappa\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\)). In the SCE agreements were identified in parallel passages, and while this can be argued to be appropriate on most occasions, the displacement of these traditions can obscure the possibility that they reflect the same tradition. The work of Neirynck’s Cumulative List clearly identified this as a factor worthy of recognition by indicating the displacement of the agreement. These agreements would be best indicated and treated by the addition of footnotes providing the reader with sufficient information to make their own judgement.

Another way in which the SCE’s criteria would be expanded would be in those agreements where there is \textit{high agreement in content but not verbal agreement}. Examples of this among the significant agreements in Neirynck’s list would be:

\begin{verbatim}
§ 51.9:1 Mk 9,7 // Mt 17,5 \(\epsilon\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\o\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\zeta\) // Lk 9,34 \(\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \delta\varepsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\ \lambda\down\gamma\o\upsilon\tau\o\upsilon\zeta\) while he was still speaking
\end{verbatim}

§ 38.9 Mk 6,34 // Mt 14,14 καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀφρώστους αὐτῶν. // Lk 9,11 καὶ τοὺς χρῄζουσαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰάτο ṣ reference to Jesus’ healing activity

§ 97.3 Mk 14,45 om // Mt 26,50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐταῖρε. ἔφ’ ὁ πάρει. // Lk 22,48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰουδα, φιλήματι τὸν κύριον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδωμι; = Jesus and Judas interact at his arrest

§ 109.9:1 Mk 16,5 // Mt 28,3 ἀστραπή // Lk 24,4 ἀστραπτούση = lighting /shining apparel.

The argument can be made that these partial agreements are due to independent redaction, and the redactional activity of Matthew and Luke is not disputed here. The editorial activity of the evangelists is acknowledged, but this does preclude the possibility of dependence on a source, oral or written. There are two elements to be addressed here. The first concerns the recognition that a tradition has been transmitted and incorporated into a Gospel, while the second is what the redactor does with a received tradition. There is no need to drive a wedge between these elements, and redaction criticism has been concerned with addressing how traditions have been incorporated and/or modified in the process. These instances would suggest either variation in the oral tradition, which is always possible since it is unlikely that it developed in some mechanical and strictly controlled fashion, or the influence of the redactor in the manner in which the tradition is incorporated. The variation in the written Gospels and the compositional practices of the time have already highlighted the role of memory, dictation, and paraphrase as parts of the process of the transmission of the Jesus tradition, and all of these factors would provide possible explanations for the variation encountered in these agreements.

The oral tradition has been identified as being the possible source of a number of agreements where Matthew and Luke agree in having a striking detail or phrase in an otherwise Markan passage:

§ 14.4 Mk 2,3//Mt 9,2 ἐπὶ κλίνης // Lk 5,18 ἐπὶ κλίνης = on his bed
§ 25.4:2.3 Mk 4,11 // Mt 13,11 γνώναι τὰ μυστήρια // Lk 8,10 γνώναι τὰ μυστήρια\footnote{BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 413, judges the use of the plural to be due to the impact of the oral tradition.} = knowing the mysteries

§ 33.10:1 Mk 5,27 // Mt 9,20 τοῦ κρασπέδου // Lk 8,44 τοῦ κρασπέδου = hem of the garment

§ 36.1:2 Mk 6,14 // Mt 14,1 ὁ τετραάρχης // Lk 9,7 ὁ τετραάρχης = the tetrarch

§ 53.10:1 Mk 9,19 // Mt 17,17 διεστραμμένη // Lk 9,41 διεστραμμένη = perverse generation

§ 73.2:1 Mk 11,27 // Mt 21,23 διδάσκοντι // Lk 20,1 διδάσκοντος = motif of teaching

§ 99.10 Mk 14,65 // Mt 26,68 τίς ἐστιν ὁ παισάς σε; // Lk (22,64) τίς ἐστιν ὁ παισάς σε. = Who is the one striking you?

§ 100.15:1 Mk 14,72 // Mt 26,75 ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσέν πικρῶς. // Lk 22,62 ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσέν πικρῶς - He wept bitterly

§ 108.7:1 Mk 15,46 // Mt 27,59 ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ // Lk 23,53 ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ - wrapped in linen

§ 109.17 Mk 16,8 // Mt 28,8 ἀπαγγέλλα // Lk 24,9 ἀπήγγειλαν - the women at the tomb proclaim the Good News.

For Neo-Griesbachians and proponents of the Farrer theory this does not need to be explained by recourse to the oral tradition since it is argued that Luke depends on Matthew, which provides an alternative solution. For Two-Source theorists the oral tradition provides a viable means of explaining these agreements, rather than always turning to independent redaction to resolve every difficulty. Coincidental independent redaction can be pushed only so far, and while it is capable of explaining the difference between Matthew and Luke in the interaction between Jesus and Judas when Jesus is arrested Mt 26,50 // Lk 22,48, its limitations are revealed in terms of Peter weeping bitterly Mt 26,75 // Lk 22,62, or the call for Jesus to identify the one striking him Mt 26,68 // Lk 22,64. The verbal correspondence is so high that something other than independent redaction is needed to explain these agreements. In the last two examples text critical solutions that argue for some form of assimilation in the process of transmission are possible, but the influence of the oral tradition is an alternative solution more than worthy of consideration.
There are some agreements that occur in the same pericope such as in the healing of the paralytic, the transfiguration and the feeding of the 5000.

Healing of the Paralytic

§ 14.4 Mk 2,3 // Mt 9,2 ἐπὶ κλίνης // Lk 5,18 ἐπὶ κλίνης – on his bed
§ 14.3 Mk 2,3 // Mt 9,2 ἰδοὺ // Lk 5,18 ἰδοὺ – behold
§ 14.19:1 Mk 2,12 // Mt 9,7 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οίκον αὐτοῦ // Lk 5,25 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οίκον αὐτοῦ – he went to his house

Transfiguration

§ 51.9:1 Mk 9,7 // Mt 17,5 ἐτί αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος // Lk 9,34 ταύτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος – while he was speaking
§ 51.3 Mk 9,2 // Mt 17,2 τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ // Lk 9,27 τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ – his face

Feeding of the multitudes

§ 38.4:1 Mk 6,32 // Mt 14,13 ἄνεξώρησεν // Lk 9,10 ὑπεχώρησεν – Jesus withdrawing
§ 38.5:2 Mk 6,33 // Mt 14,13 ἡκολουθήσαν αὐτῷ // Lk 9,11 ἡκολουθήσαν αὐτῶν – the crowds following Jesus
§ 38.9 Mk 6,34 // Mt 14,14 καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρόστους αὐτῶν. // Lk 9,11 καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἐχοντας θεραπείας ἴατο – he healed them
§ 38.25 Mk 6,43 // Mt 14,20 τὸ περισσεύον // Lk 9,17 τὸ περισσεύσαν – pieces left over

These examples of an accumulation of agreements in a given passage are open to interpretation from different perspectives. One of the criteria used to discount the possibility of the impact of the oral tradition in favour of a literary model of dependence is that of the accumulation of agreements in a given passage. But why should it be that the oral tradition would only function in terms of single elements or phrases in a passage? The converse is just as likely to be the case, i.e. that familiarity with the performance of a well-known scene in the life and ministry of Jesus would influence the transmission of the passage in written form. This, in fact, is Stein’s suggestion to explain not only some of the minor agreements, but to highlight the points of contact with the developing Johannine tradition.
There are some passages where matters are more complex again, where the possibility of overlap with Q has to be considered. The Mark-Q overlaps themselves support the suggestion that the traditions were transmitted in more than one form. They also suggest that there was a considerable degree of interaction, and crossover, in the development of the traditions. The correspondences that are present in the final form of the text could be the result of independent redaction, but the oral tradition is worthy of consideration. The possibility that the oral tradition underlies these agreements should not be rejected. While the criteria used in the SCE did not identify these instances as agreements, this reflection provides the opportunity to examine them from that point of view as indicators of the influence of the oral tradition.

It is possible to argue that, where there are a number of agreements in a given passage, a recension is possible, or that a parallel source was drawn upon by Matthew and Luke. This argument certainly must be considered, and has its merits. On the other hand it is vulnerable to the criticism that if a recension or written source is the origin of these agreements why is there so much variation? There is no \textit{a priori} argument that would suggest that only written sources could explain a concentration of agreements in a given passage, though this is an argument used by Ennulat to argue for a recension, and by those who suggest that Luke depends on Matthew. Oral traditions could be interwoven in the process of composition at any time. Luz is justified in taking a cautious approach towards the oral tradition as a means of addressing the challenge of the minor agreements, but some degree of wariness is also required when arguing for a recension that is not supported by the manuscript evidence. After all, even with the full manuscript evidence of Matthew and Luke there are some who still cannot see them, in some senses, as recensions of the Markan tradition.

The oral tradition is capable of having an influence on passages in the process of being written at any time. The oral performance of a pericope can partly determine the way that a passage is later transmitted. In the process of composition, memory has been clearly identified as playing a significant role. Given that the task of writing was not a solitary activity involving a writer and a couple of scrolls, a more dynamic process needs to be envisaged in which memory and dictation play their part, and this may go further in explaining the range of variation that is encountered in the agreements and in the wider tradition.
Conclusion

In the preparation of the SCE the phenomenon of the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark was one of a number of elements in the wider context of the Synoptic debate that called for closer attention. The invitation to prepare a critical reflection on that work has provided the opportunity to engage more closely not only with the criteria used to identify and enumerate the minor agreements but also to examine the SCE in the light of further studies in the minor agreements.

Using the significant agreements identified in Neirynck’s cumulative list as the sample set, the work of SCE and a number of other researchers in this area have been reviewed. As a result of this review a number of significant minor agreements have been identified as being in need of modification in subsequent additions of SCE, and others have been noted as worthy of being indicated in footnotes, particularly for some of the important minor agreements where there has been some measure of displacement, or where there is high agreement in content but low verbal agreement.

The phenomenon of a wide degree of variation and convergence in these agreements is explicable on the basis of both independent redaction and the use of the oral tradition, or of memory of written or oral sources (both long and short-term). Compositional practice in antiquity contemporary to the formation of the Gospels would support the above conclusion and put what is found in the Gospels within a credible world.

The formation of the Gospels is indeed a complex process, but there has been an unmerited explosion in the identification and enumeration of agreements. While the primary stance of high verbal agreement has been confirmed as the principal criterion for the identification of agreements, this study suggests that this has to be expanded to include examples of where there is displacement of a rare element, or a high level of agreement in content but low verbal agreement.

Correspondence can be explained as being due to a number of causes. The arguments raised by Ennulat regarding the structural agreements have been evaluated as less a sign of dependence on a recension as much as due to Matthew and Luke converging in their grammatical structures, and in their improvements to the Greek of
Mark that could be due more to a shared level of education and language usage rather than a recension. From a text critical perspective a recension is possible, but is it probable? Where the suggested recension falters as an explanation is that while there is some measure of agreement there is also nearly always some measure of variation. What one interpreter sees as proof of a recension another sees as coincidental but independent redaction!

The opportunity to compare SCE to the works of others who have conducted research in this area has confirmed that the Two-Source theory is still viable as a working hypothesis, but it needs some modification as Dunn and Mournet have suggested. This study of the significant minor agreements has indicated that a more complete and compositional model will allow for the on-going influence of the oral tradition as well as for redaction, and that these two factors are not mutually exclusive. That a particular and distinctive element has been introduced into a Markan passage can be explained as due to redactional activity, but this does not preclude the possibility that the oral tradition is the means by which Matthew and Luke received the particular detail that is identified as an agreement. Neville has suggested that this is like having one’s cake and saving it for later. That may well be true but it is perhaps more a sign that the complexity of the compositional process is one in which oral tradition, written traditions, and independent redaction are all involved. Occam’s razor can be shown to be a blunt instrument after all!

Some questions are difficult to resolve given the speculative nature of Synoptic studies. Those who argue for a recension or for Lukan dependence on Matthew see the accumulation of agreements in a given passage to be compelling evidence that a literary solution is required. This might be the case but it presumes that the influence of the oral tradition can only manifest itself in single and not multiple agreements in a given pericope. This premise probably reflects more the predominately literary experience of the modern interpreter than the reality of the first century environment in which the Gospels were written.

No study will do more than shed some light on what are well recognised as highly complex processes. As far as the minor agreements are concerned they are not so much the Achilles’ heel of the Two-Source theory, as much as an invitation to
reassess the predominance of the literary paradigm, and to recognise the complexity of the processes involved in the formation of the Synoptic Gospels.
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Appendix I

In this appendix Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis* and the SCE are compared regarding the significant minor agreements. The purpose of this appendix is to identify where the SCE and Neirynck agree and disagree, and to indicate where corrections need to be made to subsequent editions of the SCE.

Page Number HLS = Refers to the page number in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*.

HLS Reference = Reference to the particular minor agreement in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*.

Mark = Gospel of Mark.

Matthew = Neirynck’s suggested agreement is provided in the Greek text.

SCE Matthew = This column notes whether the SCE volume of Matthew included this particular agreement. It also includes any possible corrections or modifications to be made to subsequent additions.

Luke= Neirynck’s suggested agreement is provided in the Greek text

SCE Luke = This column notes whether the SCE volume of Luke included this particular agreement. It also includes any possible corrections or modifications to be made to subsequent additions.

Variation = Any variation between the Matthean or Lukan forms of the agreement listed by Neirynck is noted.

Comment = This column includes reference to any corrections that may be necessary for subsequent editions of the SCE, or where the judgements of Neirynck are explored or questioned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>Mt</th>
<th>Lk</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17   | §12.1   | Mk 1,38-39 | Mt (4,23) | Lk 4,43 | No | Variation-a) in word order  
b) Matthew uses noun, Luke uses the Inf |
<p>|      |         |  |  |  |  | Layout of ALAND, Synopsis, p. 37, has Mk 1,35-38 as parallel for Lk 4,42-43 as does HUCK-GREEVEN, Synopsis, p. 27. This is an instance where the layout of the synopsis used does affect whether the minor agreement was identified. |
| 17   | §13.2:1 | Mk 1,40 | Mt 8,2 | Lk 5,12 | No - correction needed | Yes | Correction needed in Matthew text (Greek and English). |
| 18   | §13.4:1 | Mk 1,40 | Mt 8,2 | Lk 5,12 | No - correction needed | Yes | Correction needed in Matthew text (Greek and English). |
| 20   | §14.20.1 | Mk 2,12 | Mt 9,8 | Lk 5,26 | No - noted | Variation in motif of fear - Matthew uses the verb where Luke's uses the noun. |
|      |         |  |  |  |  | While in the same semantic field this text was not identified as an agreement given the variation. MONAGHAN, Luke, (n.74), p. 36, draws attention to the shared motif. |
| 22   | §16.8:1 | Mk 2,22 | Mt 9,17 | Lk 5,37 | No | Agreement in placement of verb the verb is shared with Mark. |
|      |         |  |  |  |  | This was not indicated as an agreement given that Matthew and Luke make use of the same verb as Mark. They agree in changing the placement of the verb, and the verb for spilling (indicated in the SCE). This gives rise to the question of to what degree grammatical constructions are to |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Correction Needed</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>§ 19.2:1</td>
<td>Mk 3,7-8</td>
<td>Mt (4,25 ) 12,15 ὄχλοι</td>
<td>Lk 6,17-18 ὄχλος</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in number</td>
<td>Correction of Matthew needed (Greek and English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>§ 19.6:1.2</td>
<td>Mk 3,10</td>
<td>Mt (4,24) νοσοὶ καὶ</td>
<td>Lk 6,18 νοσεὶν αὐτῶν καὶ</td>
<td>No-correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in case</td>
<td>Correction needed for Matthew and Luke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>§ 25.1:1</td>
<td>Mk 4,10</td>
<td>Mt 13,10 Μαθηταί</td>
<td>Lk 8,9 Μαθηταί</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in order and placement</td>
<td>Luke has material between these two elements. Correction needed in Matthew text (Greek and English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>§ 33.3:2</td>
<td>Mk 5,22</td>
<td>Mt 9,18 ἰδοὺ</td>
<td>Lk 8,41 ἰδοὺ</td>
<td>No-correction needed</td>
<td>No verbal agreement</td>
<td>There is no verbal agreement here. It provides an interesting point of discussion about to what degree agreements have to agree to be counted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>§ 38.5:2</td>
<td>Mk 6,33</td>
<td>Mt 14,13 ἀκούσαντες</td>
<td>Lk 9,11 γνῶντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in verbs (hearing/knowing)</td>
<td>No verbal agreement – agreement in content. In this instance the motif of healing is shared the language is significantly different. This should have been noted as in §14.20.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>§ 38.9</td>
<td>Mk 6,34 (omit)</td>
<td>Mt 14,14 καὶ ἐθεράπευσαν τοὺς ἀφίλοντος αὐτῶν</td>
<td>Lk 9,11 καὶ τῶν χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπεῖας ἔτο.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement – agreement in content.</td>
<td>Significant variation in the application. Correction needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>§ 48.7</td>
<td>Mk 8,29</td>
<td>Mt 16,16 τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ξάνθου</td>
<td>Lk 9,20 τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>No-correction needed</td>
<td>No verbal agreement needed</td>
<td>No verbal agreement – agreement in content. In this instance the motif of healing is shared the language is significantly different. This should have been noted as in §14.20.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>§ 51.9:1</td>
<td>Mk 9,7</td>
<td>Mt 17,5 ἐτὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος</td>
<td>Lk 9,34 ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος</td>
<td>No-correction of pronoun needed</td>
<td>Variation in verb of speaking. Low verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Partial correction needed regarding the pronoun. Only partial agreement in there being a verb of speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>§ 53.10:1</td>
<td>Mk 9,19</td>
<td>Mt 17,17 διεστραμμένη</td>
<td>Lk 9,41 διεστραμμένη</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes – [correct Luke's]</td>
<td>Minor correction needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 53.21:2.3</td>
<td>Mk 9,27</td>
<td>Mt 17,18 καὶ θεραπευθῆ ὁ παις</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,42 καὶ ἤσαστο τὸν παιδὸ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Significant variation — different verbs of healing, variation in case of the noun.</td>
<td>Different verb of healing used. Another example where the motif is shared there is variation. In this instance the same word for child is used and this strengthens the case for an agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 63.5:[1]</td>
<td>Mk 10,30</td>
<td>Mt 19,29 ἐκατονταπλασίωνα</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 18,30 πολλαπλασίωνα</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The possible agreement here is in the textual tradition for Mt 19,29 where B L have Matthew agreeing with Luke. See Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis, p.93, where Nestle-Aland 26 removed the agreement (it has been continued in Nestle-Aland 27).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 68.19</td>
<td>Mk 11,10 om</td>
<td>Mt (21,16) εἶπαν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>No – correction?</td>
<td>Lk 19,39 εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Addition of preposition in Luke.</td>
<td>Aland, Synopsis does not have this as a direct parallel pp. 236-237. Huck-Greever, Synopses, p. 195, does not indicate Lk 19,39 as the parallel. Given it is a frequent phrase it is hardly an agreement that one would call significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 69.2:1</td>
<td>Mk 11,11</td>
<td>Mt 21,17 ἡμιλίσθη</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (21,37) ἡμιλίζετο</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in tense of verb — setting is different in Matthew and Luke</td>
<td>This is a rare vocabulary element it is used in different settings. There may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>§ 96.5:1</td>
<td>Mk 14,36</td>
<td>Mt 26,39</td>
<td>Lk 22,42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in placement and personal pronouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πλὴν (26,42) γεννηθέω τὸ θέλημά σου.</td>
<td>μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἄλλα τὸ σὸν γινέσθαι.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The majority of this material looks more to be a redactional adaptation on the Markan tradition given the amount of variation in Matthew and Luke.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.3</td>
<td>Mk 14,45 om</td>
<td>Mt 26,50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐταίρε, ἐφ᾽ ὦ πάρει</td>
<td>Lk 22,48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Τούδε, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδας;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Agreement in introduction, content of the saying is totally different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>§ 99.3:2</td>
<td>Mk 14,62</td>
<td>Mt 26,64 σὺ εἶπας</td>
<td>Lk 22,70 ὑμεῖς λέγετε</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in number of pronoun and verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Given the variation in the tense and number this was not indicated as an agreement. However there is convergence in the use of 2nd person and the verb of saying. In Matthew it is the High Priest, in Luke it is the assembled Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>§ 99.4:2</td>
<td>Mk 14,62</td>
<td>Mt 26,64 ἀπὸ ὀρτί</td>
<td>Lk 22,69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation - similar content low verbal agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No - correction of preposition needed</td>
<td>Minor correction regarding preposition. Here the motif is the same the verbal correspondence is limited. It is another example of a shared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ 106.9:1.2</td>
<td>Mk 15,30</td>
<td>Mt 27,40</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk (23,37) ei</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in placement and content of the question, and the subject of the verb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is an interesting example. In Matthew the question is “If you are the Son of God” asked by those who passed by. In Luke it is later in the episode and the question is “If you the King of the Jews” asked by the soldiers. They agree in there being a question addressed to Jesus, not the content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>§ 109.4:1</td>
<td>Mk 16,2</td>
<td>Mt 28,1 ἐπιφωσκοῦση</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (23,54) ἐπεφώσκεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Different context, variation in use of participle by Matthew and verb by Luke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Here Matthew and Luke agree in using a rare word, the context is different. For Luke it is referring to the Sabbath beginning and in Matthew it refers to the beginning of the first day of the week. The layout of neither ALAND, Synopsis, p. 324, 325, or HUCK-GREEVEN, Synopsis, p. 273 or 275, address this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II

The aim of this Appendix is compare the judgements of Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis* and the SCE to the judgements of a range of scholars. To this end the section underneath each of the significant agreements contains the opinions of a range of scholars representing various points of view with regard to the Synoptic Problem generally, and with regard to the minor agreements in particular. This Appendix provides a means of examining not only whether the agreements were identified, also different perspectives as to how they are to be explained.

Page Number HLS = Refers to the page number in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*.

HLS Reference = Reference to the particular minor agreement in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*.

Mark = Gospel of Mark.

Matthew = Neirynck’s suggested agreement is provided in the Greek text.

SCE Matthew = This column notes whether the SCE volume of Matthew included this particular agreement. It also includes any possible corrections or modifications to be made to subsequent additions.

Luke = Neirynck’s suggested agreement is provided in the Greek text.

SCE Luke = This column notes whether the SCE volume of Luke included this particular agreement. It also includes any possible corrections or modifications to be made to subsequent additions.

Comment = This column includes reference to any corrections that may be necessary for subsequent editions of the SCE, or where the judgements of Neirynck are explored or questioned.
ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 36, does not treat this agreement specifically due to the possible Mk-Q overlap. A recension is argued to be possible.

FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 452, judges Lk 3,1-3a as Lukian composition. The possibility of Luke and Matthew using Q is not to be excluded, the agreements can be explained by other means and the matter is not easily decided.

SCHRAMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, pp. 34-35, considers the possibility of some dependence on Q as well as Mark. The material has been stylised as a prophetic call narrative.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, pp. 134, sees all of Mt 3,1-6 to be found in Mark, sees a trace of a second source evident in Mt 3,5. In (n. 1), p. 134, it is suggested that the source may have been substantially the same as Mark.

MCNICOL, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, pp. 71-72, makes the assessment that this appears to be taken from Mt 3,5. It is noted that περίχωρος is a preferred term of Luke used in Lk 4,14.


STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 305, judges this agreement to be due to the influence of Q.

---

Table: Agreement between Mk 1,5 and Mt 3,5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 1.9</th>
<th>Mk 1,5</th>
<th>Mt 3,5</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk(3.3)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Minor variation – case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 2.6:3</th>
<th>Mk 1,8</th>
<th>Mt 3,11</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 3,16</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not mentioned specifically by Ennulat.

FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 464, sees 7b-9, 16b-17 as Q material and 15-16a as Lukian composition. The addition of 'with fire' in Lk 3,16 is judged to be an earlier tradition from Q (see p. 473).

SCHRAMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, pp. 35-36, sees a combination of sources here and that the baptism with fire and the Spirit is from Q.

LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)*, p. 148, notes the influence of Q on Matthew. In (n. 28), p. 148, he observes that Matthew only took "with the Holy Spirit" from Mark and one can only postulate not prove that "with fire" was part of Q.

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, p. 177, judges this as coming from Q though he mentions that Luke has in view the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2,3-4.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 135, in Mt 3,11-12 Matthew is judged to follow the non-Markan source closely, with no certain influence from the material that parallels Mk 1,7-8.

MCNICOL, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 74, regarding Lk 3,15-17 the Matthean linguistic characteristics in Luke are signs of Luke copying from Matthew and not Q.

GOULDER, *Luke (I)*, p. 276, argues that Luke re-joins Matthew's redaction for this phrase. With regard to the possibility of the phrase coming from Q he argues on p. 279 that we don't need multiple lost sources.
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em> (pp. 48-50)</td>
<td>States that the frequent use of the phrase &quot;καί ἴδιον&quot; in Mark and Luke is likely to be coincidental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em> (pp. 51-52)</td>
<td>Notes that on 6/7 occasions Matthew and Luke will correspond in using &quot;καί ἴδιον&quot; against the Markan text (Mk 2.3; 3.1; 5.22; 9.4 (14,43) 16.5). See (n. 13), p. 51. He also makes mention that Luke uses the construction 16 times in special Lukian material. See (n. 20), p. 52. See Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements</em>, pp. 273-274, for more detail regarding this construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em> (pp. 570)</td>
<td>Mentions how scholars such as Schramm argue on the basis of the minor agreements in the episode of the cleansing of the leper that Luke is dependent on another form of the story. He is of the opinion that other means to explain some of the minor agreements. With regard to the frequent Lukian use of &quot;καί ἴδιον&quot; see p. 574.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Streeter's, <em>The Four Gospels</em>, p. 309</td>
<td>Observation regarding the frequent use of &quot;ἔδωκα&quot; in Matthew and Luke, and that it is likely to be coincidental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Streeter's, <em>The Four Gospels</em>, p. 309</td>
<td>Observation regarding the frequent use of &quot;ἔδωκα&quot; in Matthew and Luke, and that it is likely to be coincidental.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em> (pp. 51-52)</td>
<td>States that the frequent use of the phrase &quot;καί ἴδιον&quot; in Mark and Luke is likely to be coincidental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em> (pp. 51-52)</td>
<td>Notes that on 6/7 occasions Matthew and Luke will correspond in using &quot;καί ἴδιον&quot; against the Markan text (Mk 2.3; 3.1; 5.22; 9.4 (14,43) 16.5). See (n. 13), p. 51. He also makes mention that Luke uses the construction 16 times in special Lukian material. See (n. 20), p. 52. See Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements</em>, pp. 273-274, for more detail regarding this construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em> (pp. 570)</td>
<td>Mentions how scholars such as Schramm argue on the basis of the minor agreements in the episode of the cleansing of the leper that Luke is dependent on another form of the story. He is of the opinion that other means to explain some of the minor agreements. With regard to the frequent Lukian use of &quot;καί ἴδιον&quot; see p. 574.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Streeter's, <em>The Four Gospels</em>, p. 309</td>
<td>Observation regarding the frequent use of &quot;ἔδωκα&quot; in Matthew and Luke, and that it is likely to be coincidental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Streeter's, <em>The Four Gospels</em>, p. 309</td>
<td>Observation regarding the frequent use of &quot;ἔδωκα&quot; in Matthew and Luke, and that it is likely to be coincidental.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, a closer look at the usage in Acts, and the occasions when Luke introduces it into Markan material, leaves the suggestion of the influence of another tradition as worthy of consideration.

Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), (n. 2), p. 8, mentions the agreements and includes ἰδοὺ
Luz pp. 8-9 sees most of the agreements in the healing of the leper due to independent redaction, consistent with Matthean and Lukan usage and as improvements of the Markan text. The omission of Mk 1,40 σπάσανθείσας leads him to raise the question of different Markan recensions.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 237, sees κατί ἰδοὺ as a favoured Lukan construction.


McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 95, Lk 5,12-14 is judged to be very similar to Mt with differences being due to heightening the dramatic tone.

Gould, Luke (I), pp. 329-330. The story is deemed to follow Mark and the Matthean variants of Mark closely. He argues that κατί ἰδοὺ can be found in half of Luke’s healing stories and may be due to Mt 8,2.

Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 298, mentions ἰδοὺ as an example of an “irrelevant agreement.” In other words, as coincidental. See also p. 309 where he notes that the 33 uses by Matthew and 16 uses by Luke are due to independent redaction that sometimes coincides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 13.4:1</th>
<th>Mk 1,40</th>
<th>Mt 8,2 κύριε</th>
<th>No - correction needed</th>
<th>Lk 5,12 κύριε</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 53, catalogues the wide range of interpretations for this agreement noting that the majority of scholars see this as the result of independent redaction. He admits that the use of κύριε fits into the normal pattern of Matthean usage, finds Luke’s use harder to explain. He sees Matthew to be clearly influenced by the Q and Markan use of the term, while Luke sometimes eliminates it. The argument Ennulat adopts here is that since Luke sometimes eliminates the term it is a stronger argument for the use of a recension. For Mk 1,40-45 he notes that many of the agreements in this passage can be explained as redactional, not all (p. 58). Structural correspondences argue for a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark. He argues also against the use of another source other than Mark e.g. Q Rating: (II)
(Mk 1,40–45 has 11 negative agreements and 10 positive minor agreements - IV – 2, III/JV – 1, III-12, II/III- 1, II- 2, I/II-1, I-1).


Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 92, argues that κύριε is not so much Lukian redaction as a preferred address for Jesus in the Lukian Sondergut e.g. Lk 5,12.

Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), (n. 2), p. 8, mentions the agreements and includes κύριε. Since it receives no special attention it would presumably fit in the category of coincidental agreements.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 237, sees this to be a Lukan addition.

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 95, Lk 5,12-14 is judged to be very similar to Mt with differences being due to heightening the dramatic tone.

Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 309, judges this to be due to textual assimilation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>§ 14.3:1</th>
<th>Mk 2,3</th>
<th>Mt 9,2</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 5,18</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, pp. 99-103. For the passage Lk 5,17-26 Schramm argues that Luke uses Mark and another source. The agreements with Matthew are listed on p. 99. He is convinced that these correspondences did not happen by chance.

Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Mt 8-17), p. 36, notes the striking number of minor agreements in the pericope of the healing of the lame man Mk 2,1-12 (Mt 9,1-8, Lk 5,17-26). While many of them are the result of independent redaction the use by Matthew and Luke a recension is worth considering. This use of ἵδοι is judged to be redactional. See (n. 7), p. 36, for discussion of the agreements in the passage.

Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Lk 1,1-9,50), (n. 5), p. 243, mentions that ἵδοι and ἐπὶ κλίνης are minor agreements. He also mentions the suggestion of Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p. 99f, that sees this as a pointer towards a parallel source to Mark.

Rolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 379, argues that other than Mt 9,1 Matthew draws on Mk 2,1-12 for this episode Mt 9,1-8. He notes the surprising number of minor agreements.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>§ 14.4:1</th>
<th>Mk 2,3</th>
<th>Mt 9,2</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 5,18</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 61, given the usage by Matthew and Luke he finds it highly unlikely that the agreement is due to independent redaction. The overall passage Mk 2,1-12 is deemed to have many agreements that could be explained as independent redaction he prefers the pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark as a better theory (p. 68). Rating: (II).


Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p. 99, sees this agreement is a pointer to the Lukan use of another source than Mark in this passage.

Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Mt 8-17), (n. 7), p. 36, suggests that the vulgar and popular Markan τὸν κρύβοτα τοὺς replaced by the more generic κλίνης. Luz does not indicate clearly whether this is deemed to be independent redaction, or due to the use of a recension.

Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Lk 1,1-9,50), (n. 5), p. 243, mentions that ἵδοι and ἐπὶ κλίνης are minor agreements. He refers to Schramm’s suggestion that sees this as a pointer towards a parallel source to Mark.
OLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 379, (as above). This detail not specifically treated.

GOULDER, Luke (I), p. 331, makes the observation that the word refers to a proper bed on posts, and that this is the way Luke uses it in Lk 8:16 (so you can light a lamp under it), and Lk 17:34 where a couple are sleeping in it. He sees Luke following Matthew against his own normal usage. It is interesting that Goulder, notes that the term will be retained Lk 5.24,25 whereas Mt 9.7 does not mention it. On p. 332 he notes T’s assessment of his argument as being overstated. See C.M. TUCKETT, On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke, in NTS 30 (1984) 130-142, p. 132 ff.

GOLDER, Luke (I), p. 332, notes how Luke ends the story with the same five words as Matthew with the addition of the mention of glorifying God. With regard to the passage as a whole he argues against Schmidt and accuses him of atomising the evidence and ignoring the cumulative effect of such agreements. Rating: (II)

SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas (n. 1), p. 100, considers Streeter’s opinion that this phrase came from Matthew and Luke both wanting to emphasise the direct and immediate consequences of Jesus’ command. That they did so exactly the same way is problematic as an explanation.

LÜTZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), (n. 7), p. 36, judges that Matthean redaction could explain the phrase. He also notes the striking number of agreements in the pericope.

BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1:1-950), p. 245, considers that outside of the possibility of another written source the small agreements can be best be explained by use of the same oral tradition. He is not convinced of the Luke knowing or making use of Matthew. In (n. 20) Bovon makes mention of this as a surprising minor agreement and wonders whether it can be explained by the influence of the oral tradition.

MCNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 97, for Lk 5:22-26 Luke is judged to follow the Matthean account closely. The only changes being minor additions to make the account more dramatic. This detail not treated specifically.

GOULDER, Luke (I), p. 332, notes how Luke ends the story with the same five words as Matthew with the addition of the mention of glorifying God. With regard to the passage as a whole he argues against Schmidt and accuses him of atomising the evidence and ignoring the cumulative effect of such agreements.

STREETER, The Four Gospels, pp. 299-300, judges this to be a deceptive agreement and stresses that Matthew and Luke are at pains to bring out clearly that the man did exactly what Jesus had commanded. The phrase εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ is basically an echo of Jesus’ command in Mk 2:11 where the man is told to go εἰς τὸν οἶκον σου. The agreement in the change of verb is seen to be is inevitable if the emphasis is placed on the destination.

HAWKINS, Horae Synopticae, p. 209, judges this to be an obvious amplification naturally introduced by a writer.
EHNULAT, p. 68, judges that independent redaction could explain the minor agreements, he excludes it here.
RATING (III).
(Mk 2.1-12 has 16 negative agreements and 13 positive minor agreements – IV/II -2, III-10, II/II -1, I/III – 1, II -8, I/II- 1).


SCHRAMLDER MARKUS-STOFF BEI LUKAS, p. 100, mentions this as one of the considerable number of agreements in the passage, noting the difference. In (n. 2), he mentions the suggestion of B.S. EASTON, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 68 that the motif of fear may have come from Q.

LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 37, notes the motif of fear as also frequent motif in Matthew as a response of the disciples as well (See Mt 10, 26-28; 14, 27, 30ff; 17, 6f).

NOYIAND, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 383, recognizes the shared motif fear and the difference and comments that it is the appropriate natural reaction.

MRCNICAL, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 97, Luke is judged to follow the Matthean account closely for Lk 5,22-26. The only changes being minor additions to make the account more dramatic. This detail not treated specifically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 16.6</th>
<th>Mk 2.21</th>
<th>Mt 9.16 ἐπιβάλλει</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 5.36 ἐπιβάλλει</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EHNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 76-77, notes the opinion of FITZMYER and others of the choice of the cognate verb by Matthew and Luke. See (n. 29), p. 76 for the opinions of a range of scholars on this minor agreement.

For the passage Mk 2.18-22 he is convinced that the agreements cannot go back to a pre-Markan stage of the development of the text. The agreements are post-Markan. He is convinced that some of the correspondences are so great that there has to be a direct literary relationship. He doesn't exclude the idea of Lukan and Matthean redaction. He argues against a "nebenmk Quelle" and suggests a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark.

RATING (III).

FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 595, notes this agreement and explains it as simply the cognate verb of patch that Matthew and Luke naturally and independently prefer. He also makes mention of the agreement "otherwise" and the shared omission of Mk 2,19c due to its repetitive and unnecessary nature. He is unconvinced that Luke makes use of another source other than Lk 5,39 which is seen to come from L.

SCHRAMLDER MARKUS-STOFF BEI LUKAS, pp. 105-111, sees Lk 5,33-39 to be a passage where Luke and Matthew have used a parallel tradition to Mark.

LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 46, judges that most of the agreements in this passage are due to independent redaction the use of ἐπιβάλλει is not one of them and is unlikely to be the result of independent redaction.

BOYON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 255, makes the observation that ἐπιβάλλει, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐκχυθήσεται are not, in his judgement, sufficient cause to posit a parallel source to Mark available to Matthew and Luke.

NOYIAND, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 389, considers that while there are minor agreements a source beyond Mark is unlikely.

GOULDER, Luke (I), p. 335, makes the observation that a fair account can be made of the Lukan redaction of Mark in Lk 5,27-39. He also acknowledges that the agreements are not as striking as the previous
two pericopes, that they still exist. That might be true the question needs to be addressed as to what they are and how they are to be interpreted. Goulder argues that Luke agrees with Matthew here. Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 310, mentions this as an instance where the Markan noun “almost shouts to an editor to alter the verb” to the form found in Matthew and Luke. Textual assimilation is the culprit.

STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 310, mentions this as an instance where the Markan noun “almost shouts to an editor to alter the verb” to the form found in Matthew and Luke. Textual assimilation is the culprit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 16.8:1</th>
<th>Mk 2,22</th>
<th>Mt 9,17</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 5,37</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variations in tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ἐκχειται... ἀπολύνται”</td>
<td>“ἐκχειται... ἀπολύνται”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Agreement in placement of verb the verb is shared with Mark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 77, sees this agreement as arguing strongly for a recension. In (n. 37), p. 77 he mentions that HAWKINS, Horae Synopticae, p. 210 also reckoned with a recension of Mark. For his part Argyle judged this to be a sign of Luke’s dependence on Matthew. Rating: (I)

SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, pp. 105-111, judges the agreement to indicate Matthew and Luke are using another source even though there is divergence in their formulation. p. 105.

LITZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17). (n. 4), p. 46, judges ἐχειται to be unlikely as the result of independent redaction.

BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 255, makes the observation that ἐπιβάλλει, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἐχειται are not, in his judgement, sufficient cause to posit a parallel source to Mark available to Matthew and Luke.

NOLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 392, sees the differences between Matthew and Mark are due to Matthean redactional activity.


STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 311, suggests that the agreement ἐχειται is the result of textual assimilation from Luke into the Matthean text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 17.3</th>
<th>Mk 2,23</th>
<th>Mt 12,1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 6,1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Note different context – variation in tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐσθίειν</td>
<td>ἐσθίειν</td>
<td>ἐσθίειν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ἐσθίειν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Note different context – variation in tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 77-78, notes how with regard to Mk 2,23-28 many possibilities have been raised and examined i.e. Lukan and Matthean redaction as well as development of the text pre, during and post-Mark. On p. 79 he judges the motif of eating falls within the grey zone and notes that the motif is already in Mk 2,26b and could be due to independent redactional activity. What Ennulat doesn’t mention is that a different verb for eating is used in 1 Sam 21:5 LXX, and that it is the same verb used in the citation of the verb in Mark, Matthew and Luke. The motif is shared, as is the use of the normal verb for eating. Rating: (III).

SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 112, sees this indicating the influence of another tradition.

LITZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17). (n. 4), p. 228, notes how difficult it is to determine the relationship of the synoptic texts here given the uncommonly high number of agreements between Matthew and Luke.

BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 267, mentions the striking convergence with regard the fact that Matthew and Luke make it clear that the disciples were eating. He notes, however, that
this is presumed in the Markan text, though it is not made explicit.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 481, notes how Matthew and Luke make the eating of grain explicit, and both delete the awkward mention of making a path. He does not suggest another source.

STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 312, suggests that Matthew and Luke would have shared the same difficulty with the Markan text as later scribes did and rewrote the sentence. The verb "to eat" would come naturally to mind in the context.

HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 209, sees this as an obvious amplification introduced naturally by a writer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 17.10:3</th>
<th>Mk 2,26</th>
<th>Mt 12,4 μετ' αὐτοῦ μόνον</th>
<th>Lk 6,4 μετ' αὐτοῦ μόνον</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 82, notes the Matthean and Lukan usage of this adverb and how it is found in Q materials, materials unique to them, and added to Markan material. See (n. 59) The question is posed as to whether the use of the adverb provides the occasion/justification for the additional saying in Mt 12,5-6 about the sabbath, mercy, and sacrifice judged to be a pre-Matthean addition.

What he leaves unresolved is why Luke does not have the saying about sacrifice.

Rating (I)
(Mk 2,23-28 has 10 negative agreements and 11 positive agreements – IV/III- 2, III/II- 3, II/II- 1, II- 5, II/1- 1, I/II- 1, I- 1).


SCHRAMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p. 111, suggests the agreement regarding “those with him” comes from the influence of Mk 2,25.

LUZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, (n. 13), p. 229, sees this as Matthean redaction.

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, (n. 18), p. 268, provides an overview of suggestions regarding the pre-history of the text.

GOULDER, *Luke (II)*, pp. 336-338, notes eight agreements between Luke and Matthew in Lk 6,1-5. He notes this particular agreement and judges it to be gratuitous on the part of Luke who seems to be explaining an already present mention of eating with the addition of the mention of the disciples rubbing the grain in their hands.

STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 312, suggests that the usage here is due to a later interpolation in the textual tradition.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 18a.1-{1}</th>
<th>Mk 3,1</th>
<th>Mt 12,10 ξηπαθέω</th>
<th>Lk 6,6 ξηπαθή</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 88, suggests that the possibility of independent redaction on the part of Matthew and Luke is not excluded. There is a saying in Q dealing with the same theme it is judged to have no influence here. For the majority of the agreements Lukan and Matthean redaction is possible. The accumulation agreements, and their combinations here, lead to consideration of a recension.
Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-X)*, p. 610, notes Luke's consistency in using the adjective in the introduction and in the healing itself. The adjective is already present in Mk 3.3. This is an important observation and pushes the argument towards independent redaction.

Lütz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p. 237, recognizes the redactional activity of Matthew to rework the Markan text structurally, stylistically, and with a view to greater clarity and focus. Jesus will address the man with the withered hand later in the episode. See (n. 7), p. 237.

Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, p. 272, sees this agreement as both minor and insignificant.

Goulder, *Luke (I)*, p. 339, notes the agreement is often mentioned, considers little can be made of it since Mk 3,3 also has ξηράντα and that Luke changes Mark's ξηράντειν on several occasions.

Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 301, mentions that this is an agreement hardly worthy of mentioning. He would judge the agreement to be due to it being the natural word to use in the context. The difference corresponds in English to "dry" and "dried."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating: (III/II)</th>
<th>Mk 3,1-6 has 7 negative agreements and 13 positive agreements - IV -I, III/IV – I, III-6, III/II- 5, II-1, I-1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-X)</em>, p. 610, notes Luke's consistency in using the adjective in the introduction and in the healing itself. The adjective is already present in Mk 3.3. This is an important observation and pushes the argument towards independent redaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lütz, <em>Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)</em>, p. 237, recognizes the redactional activity of Matthew to rework the Markan text structurally, stylistically, and with a view to greater clarity and focus. Jesus will address the man with the withered hand later in the episode. See (n. 7), p. 237.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovon, <em>Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)</em>, p. 272, sees this agreement as both minor and insignificant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulder, <em>Luke (I)</em>, p. 339, notes the agreement is often mentioned, considers little can be made of it since Mk 3,3 also has ξηράντα and that Luke changes Mark's ξηράντειν on several occasions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streeter, <em>The Four Gospels</em>, p. 301, mentions that this is an agreement hardly worthy of mentioning. He would judge the agreement to be due to it being the natural word to use in the context. The difference corresponds in English to &quot;dry&quot; and &quot;dried.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>§ 19.2:1</th>
<th>Mk 3,7-8</th>
<th>Mt (4,25) 12,15 ὄξλοι</th>
<th>No-correction needed</th>
<th>Lk 6,17-18 ὄξλος</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, p. 95, sees that the judgement of respective shaping of the Markan text by Matthew and Luke is justified. Rating: (III).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lütz, <em>Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)</em>, p. 243, sees Mt 12,15 to be dependent on the summary of Mk 3,7-12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHRAMM, <em>Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas</em>, p. 113, notes how both Luke and Matthew agree in using the same Markan frame for their respective Sermons, and this is not by chance. He suggests the influence of a variant tradition that also combined the summary of Jesus' ministry and the call of the Twelve. The final form of the text reflects the use of the available traditions and redaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovon, <em>Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)</em>, p. 285, asks the question as to whether Luke had Q as well as Mk 3,7-12 at hand. He suggests that both Luke and Matthew freely compose the summaries such as this. The primary source for Lk 6,17-19 is deemed to be Mark.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNicol, <em>Beyond the Q Impasse</em>, pp. 100-103, would argue that Lk 6,11-20 is the result of combining Mt 12,15a with Mt 4,23-5,1 and Mt 12,14-15 that also echoes Mt 9,35-10.2. As proposed it looks a complicated process of Luke drawing on Matthew.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulder, I, p. 344 suggests that the phrase comes as a surprise, and that it may be influenced by Mt 4,25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26</th>
<th>§ 19.6:12</th>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>Mt (4,24) νόσοις καὶ</th>
<th>No-</th>
<th>Lk 6,18 νόσων αὐτῶν καὶ</th>
<th>No-</th>
<th>Variation in case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|...
The agreements are judged as being due to post-Markan development of the text (p. 98), though independent redaction by Matthew and Luke not excluded. He suggests some of the agreements need to be understood in relation to one another and he notes the tendency to highlight Jesus as wonder worker (part of the pre-Mt/Lk reworking of Mark he suggests).

(For Mk 3,7-12 there are 13 negative agreements and 5 positive agreements - III/IV – 2, II- 7, III/II-5, II/III-1, II-2).

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (1-IX), p. 624, suggests that Luke has added the mention of cures to the Markan source drawing attention to the Lukan use of ἰόμαι in Lk 6,18,19; 7,7; 8,47; 9,2,11,42; 14,4; 17,15; 22,5 Acts 9,34; 10,38; 28,8,27.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 285, asks the question as to whether Luke had Q as well as Mk 3,7-12 at hand. He suggests that both Luke and Matthew freely compose the summaries such as this. The primary source for Lk 6,17-19 is deemed to be Mark.

| 27 | § 20.8:1 | Mk 3,16-18 | Mt 10,2 ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ | Yes | Lk 6,14 τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ | Yes | Variation in case and article |

Ehnulat, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 105-106, judges the agreements being due to Matthew and Luke both depending on a modified Markan text. He acknowledges that the negative agreements are due to independent redaction. The positive agreements are better explained by a pre-Matthean and Lukian reworking of Mark.

RATING: (II)
(Mk 3,13-19 has 9 negative agreements and 5 positive agreements - IV -1, IV/111-1, III/IV-2, III-4, III/IV-1, II-2,1-1)

Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 83, notes the agreement with Luke in changing Andrews' place in the order and the additional mention of Andrew's relationship to Peter. He asks the question whether Luke has independently supplemented the mention of Andrew in this context given that Lk 5,1-11 has no mention of Andrew unlike Mk 1,16 and Mt 4,18.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (1-IX), p. 618, does not treat this agreement and notes that Andrew is mentioned only here and in Acts 1,13.

Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, pp. 113-114, notes the correspondence with Mt 10,2.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 278, mentions the agreement with Matthew regarding Andrew, and the omission of being the son of Zebedee. On p. 283 mention is made of Acts 1,13, the only other time when Andrew is mentioned in Luke-Acts.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 411, observes that is not clear to him Matthew has used anything other than his Markan source. In (n. 15), p. 411, he suggests that while the mention is shared it may be for different reasons. In Luke's case it is to retain the mention of Andrew in Mk 1,16 that was otherwise lost. By this he presumably means in Luke's recasting of the call of Peter in Lk 5,1-11.

Gould, Luke (I), pp. 341-342, considers that there are enough signs to indicate that Luke is casting his eyes over Mt 10 and Mk 3,16-19. He notes that Matthew makes five changes to Mark and Luke follows him in four of them, some of them are against Luke's normal tendencies. The conclusion being that he is following his source Matthew. Gould, p. 343 notes the divided opinion about the list of the twelve.

| 32 | § 25.1:1 | Mk 4,10 | Mt 13,10 Μαθηταί | No – correction | Lk 8,9 Μαθηταί | Yes |
ENNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 124, suggests this detail could well be seen to be the result of independent redaction. A post-Markan reworking of the text could have eliminated the motif of the Markan lack of understanding on the part of the disciples. (See Mk 4,34). Rating: (III/1).


SCHRÄMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 123, suggests that for Lk 8,4-9 and 9f Luke is influenced by another tradition.

LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 301, sees Mk 13,1-13 is based on Mk 4,10-12. The striking agreements in the passage are clearly noted. They not only simplify the narrative and make stylistic improvements also avoid the Markan motif of the lack of understanding of the disciples. In (n. 7), p. 301 Luz judges the coming of the disciples to Jesus as redactional.

BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 404, mentions this agreement among others. He argues that Mark is the only written source used by Luke here for both the parable and its interpretation. The differences can be traced to the impact of the oral tradition.

NOLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 532, is of the opinion that for Mt 13,10-17 Matthew has knitted together materials from various sources. He notes how in Lk 8,9-10 the same materials are combined in different ways.

McNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 124, judges that Lk 8,9-10 follows Mt 13,3-9 closely. This detail, however, is not treated.

STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 302, sees the Markan phrase to be cumbersome and the usage of "disciples" to be an obvious simplification that would have been made independently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32</th>
<th>§ 25.4.23</th>
<th>Mk 4,11</th>
<th>Mt 13,11</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 8,10</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ENNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 125-126, judges that the agreements in Mk 4,11 have to be taken together and need to be interpreted in light of each other. The agreements are judged to be definitely post-Markan and the alignment of the reworking of specific Markan theological tendencies (e.g. the disciples lack of understanding, the motif of the messianic secret) shows that Matthew and Luke both used the same re-worked text of Mark. See p. 128. Rating: (I).

(Mk 4,1-12 has 5 negative agreements and 6 positive agreements - III/IV -2, III -1, III/II - 1, II/II - 1, II/II - 1, III).


SCHRÄMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, pp. 115-116, mentions this correspondence as evidence for the proposal of a Nebentradition. In (n. 2) pp. 115-116, he agrees with the judgement of Kümmel, Einleitung, p. 31, that this cannot be explained as coincidental.

LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 301, notes how the tendency in the post-Markan redaction is to portray the disciples positively with regard to their understanding of Jesus and his message. In (n. 10) Luz makes it clear that this is a tendency in the recension and that it is not explainable as Lukan redaction.
Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1.1-9.50)*, p. 413, judges that the use of the plural for τὰ μυστήρια comes from the oral tradition.

Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 532, suggests that for Mt 13,10-17 Matthew has knitted together materials from various sources. He notes how in Lk 8,9-10 the same materials are combined in different ways. This detail is not treated specifically as an agreement.


McNicol, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 124, makes the judgment that Lk 8,9-10 follows Mt 13,3-9 closely. This detail is not treated.

Goulder, *Luke (I)*, p. 415, notes how Luke agrees with Matthew. Luke is suggested to lack the intellectualisation found in Matthew is deemed to follow Matthew nonetheless. On p. 417 Goulder draws attention to the accumulation of agreements in this pericope and considers that there is more than enough to embarrass defenders of the Two-Source theory. Goulder agrees with Two-Source theorists that Luke has another source than Mark. That other source is not Q.

Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 313, suggests that this verb would be a natural one for two independent interpreters to supply.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36</th>
<th>§ 31.13:23</th>
<th>Mk 4,41</th>
<th>Mt 8,27 εθαύμασαι λέγοντες</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 8,25 εθαύμασαι λέγοντες</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p.144, addresses the fact that the motif of fear in Mark 4,41 ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν has been considerably reduced by Matthew and Luke. He recognises that independent redaction is possible sees it to be questionable. The agreements are judged to be a textual development of Mark and explained as Lukian and Matthean redaction of Mark. Ennulat argues that there are too many structural and verbal similarities to be judged as being anything other than indicating a literary relationship of dependence on a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark. Rating (III) Mk 4,35-41 has 12 negative and 13 positive agreements - IV-1, IV/III-1, IV/II-1, III-7, III/11 – 3, II-6, I/III-1.


Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p. 124, sees in this detail the combination of the influence of Mk 4,41 and another tradition that corresponds to Matthew's usage here.

Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p. 22, judges Mt 8,23-27 to be a redactional reworking of Mk 4,36-41. Most of the agreements are consistent with the language of Matthew and Luke not all. See (n. 9) p. 22 where he suggests that the use of εθαύμασαι λέγοντες could be redactional.

Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1.1-9.50)*, p. 421, notes the Lukan redaction in this pericope such as the removal of Semitisms and the agreements with Matthew that are judged to be insignificant. Note 3 p. 421 mentions this detail adds that the motif of wonder at the end of the pericope is hardly surprising and that it could well be the result of independent redaction.

Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 370, argues that Matthew is likely to be solely dependent on Mark he admits the possibility that the opening words of Mt 8,27 might come from a second source.


| 39 | § 33.3:2 | Mk | Mt 9,18 ἵδοι | No – | Lk 8,41 ἵδοι | Variation – Luke has material between these two |
The agreement between Matthew and Luke in the use of ἄρχων provides Ennulat with the opportunity for considerable discussion (p. 152). For the passage overall he notes that the arguments for or against independent redaction are not conclusive.

Rating: (III).

In this instance the SCE did not pick up on the use of ἰδοὺ given the intermediate material that Luke includes about the ruler (a man named Jairus). This was a mistake on my part, it highlights the question of proximity in the identification of agreements. Matthew has "behold a ruler" in comparison to Luke's "behold a man by name of Jairus who was a ruler". This is a good example of how there is an agreement significant redactional difference as well.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 745, notes the agreement in the use of ἄρχων and wonders why it is changed here when τοῦ ἄρχοντος αὐτοῦ is used in Lk 8:49.

Schrämm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, pp. 126-127, considers that the use of another tradition is not likely. The correspondences with Matthew are noted are not conclusive proof of the use of another tradition. The use of ἰδοὺ and κρασπέδου give rise to the comment that they are not coincidental, the explanation for the correspondence is not explored.

Boëon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1:1-9:50), p. 442, argues that the priority of Mark in this episode is unequivocal and that there is no need for recourse to some other parallel tradition. In (n. 1) p. 442 the agreements are listed as v.41 ἰδοὺ... ἄρχων. v.42 θυγάτηρ, v.44 κρασπέδους. ὡς οὖν ἦματο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, v.51 εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν. On p. 443 he does acknowledge that the similarities between Lk 8:44 and Mt 9:20 are puzzling and questions whether they might have both independently had recourse to Mk 6:56b. His conclusion is to reckon with the ongoing impact of the oral tradition.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 394, mentions the agreements in passing there is not sufficient cause for an appeal to a second source.

Mcnicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 130, picks up on Goulder, Luke (I), pp.424-425, identifying the use of ἄρχον which is unusual phraseology from Matthew echoed by Luke.

Goulder, Luke (I), p. 424, notes Luke is shorter than Mark, he is much more gentle in abbreviating Mark than Matthew. As a result the influence of Matthew on Luke has been relatively slight. For all that ἄρχων is highlighted as having been introduced under Matthean influence. Matthew never uses ἄρχοντος αὐτοῦ. Luke does in Lk 8:49 and Lk 13:14 and in Acts 13:5; 18:8,19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.22</th>
<th>ἄρχων</th>
<th>correction needed</th>
<th>elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No correction needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 154, notes the wide range of ways in which this detail is interpreted. For some it is an element introduced from Mk 6:56, or explained text critically, or as pre-Markan or
post-Markan traditional material. He sees both a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark or the impact of Mk 6,56 as both possible. The agreements are judged to be post-Markan reworking p. 157. Lukan and Matthean redaction can’t be conclusively proven or disproven, the combination of agreements in shorter sentences and phrases leads to the supposition of the use of a pre-worked text.

Rating: (III).

(Mk 5:21b-43 has 12 negative agreements and 10 positive agreements - IV/III – 1, III-10, III/II – 5, II/III – 1, II- 1, II/I – 1, I/II - 1, I-1)

Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), (n. 7), p. 51, judges this detail as one of the clear proofs for a recension of Mark.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 746, notes the agreement and also draws attention to the varied textual tradition concerning it. It was omitted in D present in P75, Sinaïticus and Vaticanus.

Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, (n. 4), p. 126, mentions that in the textual tradition in D it Marcius the word is omitted.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 442 (See above).

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 396, makes mention of the agreement judges that the influence comes from Mk 6,56 where the same phrase is used referring to minimal contact.

Neirynck, Two-Source Theory, pp. 12-14, deals with the suggestions of Goulder, Luke (I), pp. 424-425, and Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), (n. 7), p. 51. He suggests that the explanation is obvious and it is redactional based on Mk 6,56. As far as Luz’s suggestion of a recension is concerned Neirynck is unconvinced. See his conclusion on p. 15.

Mcnicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 131, picks up on Goulder, Luke (I), pp. 424-425, where he identifies the use of τοῦ κρασπεδοῦ τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ as unusual phraseology from Matthew echoed by Luke. This distinctively Jewish term appears three times in Matthew. McNicol, Dungan and Peabody believe this to be “one-way” evidence of the literary dependence of Luke (and Mark) on Matthew. They maintain that the phrase only exists in Luke and Mark in passages parallel to the order of Matthew.

Goulder, Luke (I), pp. 424-425, remarks that this is a notorious agreement and one of the twenty listed by Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 210. There are eight words in common. On p. 425 he looks at the suggested options: i) Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 313 looked at the omission in Luke D lat, or ii) Luke and Matthew have added the phrase under influence of Mk 6,56 or Num 15,38 LXX. Goulder claims Luke is following Mark from memory, there are echoes of the shorter Matthew version of the episode.

Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 313, notes this as a “Western non-interpolation.”

Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 210, see this as proof of a common source for Matthew and Luke.

| 42 | § 35.5:2 | Mk 6,7 | Mt 10,1 και θεραπεύειν πάσαν νόσον | Yes | Lk 9,1 και νόσους θεραπεύειν | Yes | Variation in word order, case, number |

Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 162-163, judges this passage to be a Mark-Q overlap, and assesses it to be difficult to evaluate in terms of agreements. In (n. 60), p. 162, mention is made of some 31 agreements between Matthew and Luke.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 751, sees the episode as derived from Mk 6,6b-13 and notes the doublet in Lk 10,1-12 that is assessed as coming from Q. Some of that material may have shaped the redaction of the Markan material in this pericope. The mention of curing diseases is deemed to be Lukan redaction. (See p. 753 where he notes it as a Lukan redactional addition).

Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 83, sees Mk 10,1 to be redactional, and goes on further to say that the agreements with Lk 9,1 donot argue against it.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 454, suggests that even in Lk 9 Luke already has the material for Lk 10 before his eyes. This is not surprising given that Q already thought in terms of a

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 132, takes this phrase, and the mention of preaching the kingdom that follows, as proof that Luke has fragmentarily preserved pieces of distinctively Matthean redactional passages. The use of the mention of diseases is deemed to come from the Matthean use of Isa 53,4 in Mt 8,17.

Goulder, Luke (I), p. 420, judges Luke’s way of proceeding to be that he stays with the Markan scroll in front of him and allows the parallel Matthean account to influence him from memory. He notes that Matthew is longer than Mark and so there are correspondingly more agreements. With regard to this phrase Goulder sees that Luke coinciding with Matthew clearly indicates the influence of Matthew. He uses Fitzmyer’s observation that the syntax doesn’t fit the rest of the sentence well to clinch his argument for Lukan dependence on Matthew. He makes a great deal of the fact that in the NT people are healed rather than illnesses and this is a Matthean usage followed by Luke.

Goulder examines the arguments for the Q Mission discourse having influence on this passage (p. 430). He claims no consideration is given to the concentration of agreements and the unlikelihood of Luke agreeing every time with Matthew. A counter argument would be that if another source is used then it is not Matthew that Luke is agreeing with, the common source. He notes that Tuckett, On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke, pp. 135ff, claims this phrase comes from a common source, though he allows that Luke has used it in redacting Mark at Lk 4,23; 9,35 and 10,1. Tuckett notes the Matthean usage of healing people rather than diseases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 35.6</th>
<th>Mk 6,7 om</th>
<th>Mt 10,7 κηρύσσετε ... η βασιλεία τῶν συμφαιήνων.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 9,2 κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in mood and article and description of the kingdom (of heaven/of God)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Ennulat’s view see Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 162-163.


Liu, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 88, notes how Mt 10,5b-15 is the result of Matthew combining Mk 6,8-11 and Q=Lk 10,4-12. With regard to Mt 10,7 this is judged to be the result of a loose combining of Lk 10,9 and Mk 3,15; 6,13.

Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 454, mentions that the commissioning of the disciples was related in similar fashion in Mark and Q. On p. 456 the expression is judged to be redactional (cf Acts 26,31). See (n. 16), p. 170 for the Lukan use of the verb.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 414, Matthew is judged to have used Mk 6,7 and to introduce material from a separate mission charge (cf Lk 10,1-16).

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 132, argues that this phrase is proof that Luke has preserved fragments of distinctively Matthean redactional passages.

Goulder, Luke (I), p. 429, suggests that Luke follows Matthew in specifying that the commission is to preach the kingdom of God. He maintains that in Lk 9,1-2 Luke has agreed in whole or in part at every point where there was an opportunity and in no instance here does he agree with Mark against Matthew.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 35.9:1</th>
<th>Mk 6,8</th>
<th>Mt 10,9-10 μὴ δέ</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 9,3 μὴ</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Different negative particles See Ennulat pp. 162-163 and his judgement of a Mark-Q overlap.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Different negative particles
See Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, pp. 162-163, and his judgement of a Mark-Q overlap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44</th>
<th>§ 36.1.2</th>
<th>Mk 6,14</th>
<th>Mt 14,1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 9,7</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὄ τετράρχης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 164, sees the agreements to be post-Markan. He finds that either Matthean or Lukan redaction is difficult to sustain. Rating: (III).

(In Mk 6,14-16 there are 4 negative agreements and 5 positive agreements - IV/III -2, III -4, III/II-2).

FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 757, notes the agreement here, also indicates that Lk 3,1 has already used the title.

LÜS, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p. 389, claims Mk 6,14-29 to be the only source used by Matthew and the Matthean particularities in the passage are in the main redactional.

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, p. 461, notes how the agreements in the passage should not be overrated. He judges the use of the correct title for Herod to be an example of independent redaction.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 579, judges that despite the agreements with Lk 9,7-9 there is little likelihood of Matthew using a source other than Mark.

GOULDER, *Luke (I)*, p. 432, is of the opinion that Luke follows Mark in Lk 9,7ff. While the wording is close to that of Mark Luke agrees with Matthew in his use of this term for Herod.

STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 299, judges this to be an inevitable correction that Matthew and Luke would have made independently.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45</th>
<th>§ 38.5:2</th>
<th>Mk 6,33</th>
<th>Mt 14,13</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lk 9,11</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀκούοντες</td>
<td></td>
<td>γνώνες</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>οἱ ὑπὲρ ηκολούθησαν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation in verbs (hearing/knowing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 170, notes that the feeding of the multitudes is a tradition that existed in multiple forms. Mark is the first one to bring them together binding them with theological reflection. Given the very high number of positive agreements both structurally, and in the light of the Last Supper, he argues against both independent redaction, or that Matthew and Luke used an existing tradition other than Mark. A post-Markan recension is suggested despite the complexity of the tradition history of this episode p. 179. On the basis of Lukian usage Ennulat argues against the idea of the crowd following Jesus being Lukian redaction since it is almost exclusively comes from his sources. Rating: (II/III).

(Mk 6,30-44 has 8 negative agreements and 23 positive agreements - IV/III -1, II/II -3, III/II -2, III/II-2, II -2, II/II-1)

SCHRÄMM, *Der Markus-Text bei Lukas*, pp. 129-130, considers that the correspondences in Lk 9,10-17 are too numerous to be considered to have come about by chance and point to the use of variant tradition.

LÜS, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p. 396, notes the striking number agreements in the passage, particularly the material that is omitted. He notes the points of contact with the feeding of the multitude in Jn 6,2 where the multitudes follow Jesus. This argues for the impact of variations in the oral tradition of this pericope. This is a text where independent redaction, oral tradition and a
He mentions this as a possibility. The verb "to follow" would be the only natural one to employ. Contexts that the agreement with Matthew must indicate dependence.

On given the presence of Matthean linguistic characteristics, with the addition of Lukan, defenders of a pure deuteromarkan recension are all possible. Given the agreement here also indicates that Matthew and Luke would have naturally added the mention of the crowds. The verb "to follow" would be the only natural one to employ.

46 § 38.9 Mk 6,34 Mt 14,14 και εὐθανάσεως τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. No Lk 9,11 καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἐχόντας θεραπείας ἱπτό. No Great variation – idea of healing shared

Ekkurat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 171, notes that both Matthew and Luke have the mention of Jesus’ healing not present in Mark (cf. p. 171). He notes how this agreement doesn’t seem to trouble defenders of a pure Two-Source theory. Either healing is taken as one of the skills of shepherds or there was a normal connection of the motifs of teaching and healing eg. Mt 4,23; 9,35; Lk 9,2.6. He suggests that it is not so much a combination of motifs one superseding the other. The Matthean addition in Mt 19,2 to Mk 10,1 is given as an example. Rating: (II).

See Neirynck, Two-Source Theory, p. 30, mentions that Bozon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 467, sees this as due to the ongoing impact of the oral tradition. He also mentions Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), p. 396, where Luz admits that in the feeding story there is the influence of independent redaction, deuero-Markan recension, and the oral tradition.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (1-LX), p. 757, mentions the agreement here also indicates that Lk 3,1 has already identified Herod using the title τετρασωροφόντος. On p. 761 Fitzmyer observes that the feeding of the multitude is the only miracle in the Galilean ministry related in all the Gospels, and that its analysis is further complicated by the two traditions of the feeding of the 4000 and the 5000 in Matthew and Mark. Fitzmyer takes Mk 6,30-44 as the primary source for Luke. The agreements, both positive and negative, are noted on p. 763. While it might be possible that there was a Q form of the story Fitzmyer suggests that Mark is the primary source, and that Luke was also influenced by another tradition (not Mk 8,1-10), and Luke’s own redaction has to be considered. With regard to the specific detail here Fitzmyer, p. 766 sees this as redactional. Given Matthew and Luke agree in content rather than wording it may indicate what the other tradition included. He mentions this as a possibility.

Schrömm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 129, simply refers to this as healing summary.
Luke, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Mt 8-17), p. 396, addresses the question of the agreements in the feeding story and notes the number of them. While many are judged as not easily explained as redaction he does note that the addition of the healing activity of Jesus is the result of independent redaction.

Boyan, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Lk 1.1-9.50), p. 467, notes the surprising mention by Matthew and Luke of Jesus healing people as being due to the persisting impact of the oral tradition.

Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, pp. 589-590, mentions that in Mt 4.23 and 9.35 Jesus teaches and heals as in Lk 9.11, here there begins a number of references that focus on Jesus’ healing. See (n. 62), p. 590, commenting on the use of ἐρωτάσοντας. This is judged to be influenced by Mk 6.5 or 6.13.

McNicol, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 135, takes the motif of healing as being one of the examples in this passage that would support the argument that Luke depends on Matthew and not Q given the presence of Matthean linguistic characteristics, with the addition of Lukan language in the same context.

Gould, *Luke (I)*, p. 434, makes the interesting claim that it is no use objecting that the words are different in Matthew and Luke. I would wonder about the wisdom of such a remark. It is. After all, only the reverse of indicating dependence because words are the same! In this instance Luke is deemed to follow Matthew and just use his preferred verb for healing.

Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 314, noted the striking coincidence of Matthew and Luke mentioning Jesus’ healing activity that the difference in choice of words as “as different as they well could be.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 48.7</th>
<th>Mk 8,29</th>
<th>Mt 16,16 ὑπὸ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος</th>
<th>No-correction needed</th>
<th>Lk 9,20 ὑπὸ θεοῦ</th>
<th>No-correction needed</th>
<th>Significant variation in the application: The Christ the son of the Living God (Mt) // the Christ of God (Lk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, (n. 41), p. 187, observes that this agreement is just about always judged to be the result of independent redaction, and seen in the light of Matthew’s and Luke’s respective Christologies. What Ennulat adds to the discussion is that there is a consistency in the changes made in the parallels to Mk 14.61 and 15.32. This suggests to him that a reworking of Mark is the cause. In this passage he assesses the agreements as “sprachlich” and as post-Markan changes. He notes how both Matthew and Luke eliminate the Markan mention of Jesus being on the way. He sees it to be consistent with other Christologically based changes made to Mark in a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark.

Rating: (II)
(Mk 8,27-30 has 8 negative agreements and 8 positive agreements - IV/III-1, III-6, III/I-1, II/III-1, II-4, I-1)

Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-X)*, on p. 774 he suggests that the genitive phrase “of God” is a Lukan addition to Mark and is unrelated to Matthew’s more complex phrase which combines two Petrine confessions from Mark and a pre-Matthean post-resurrection tradition.

Luke, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Mt 8-17), p. 453, suggests Mt 16.13-16.20 has Mark as its source. See (n. 10), p. 453 where he mentions this phrase “of God” as the most striking agreement. He judges it to be independent and quite different redaction by Matthew and Luke.

Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 658, notes that for Mt 16.13-16, 20 nothing more than the Markan source can be confidently identified. With regard to Mt 16.17-19 he suggests that it determining the boundaries of the Matthean contribution and redaction is an uncertain task.

McNicol, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 137, claims that if Luke changed Matthew’s formulation the phrasing is odd it is paralleled in Lk 2.26 ὑπὸ θεοῦ κύριον.

Gould, *Luke (I)*, p. 438, notes that in this passage Luke follows Mark very closely, and this is deemed to be unusual and this makes the agreements with Matthew even more apparent. The use of the explanatory genitive i.e. the Christ “of God”, is found in Lk 2.26; Acts 4.26 and Lk 23.35. In the light of this he suggests that Luke may have been influenced by Matthew.

Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 303, examines the usage of both Mt 16.16 and 27.40 comparing the usage to Lk 9.20 and 23.35-37. He notes that Matthew in both cases alters Mark to “the Son of God” and Luke to “the Christ of God.” In other words each prefers a different title. It would be easy to consider that the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ is coincidental an examination of the wider context reveals a consistency
in their independent alteration of Mark.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>§</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>§ 51.3</td>
<td>Mk 9,2</td>
<td>Lk 9,29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation Luke uses gen case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENNULAT**, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, pp. 202-203, notes this as being one of the most significant of the agreements and he explores the various explanations provided e.g. development of the textual tradition, or the influence of Ex 34,29 LXX. He wonders whether this reference is appropriately to be judged as Lukan and Matthean redaction. Ennulat sees the focus on Jesus’ face rather than his garments as part of the Christologically focussed changes made to Mark and therefore likely to be part of a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark.

**FITZMYER**, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 792, examines the agreements in the passage and judges the description of Jesus’ experience during prayer to be redactional. Rather than argue for a separate tradition Fitzmyer suggests independent changes made to the shared Markan source. Fitzmyer, p. 799 is not so sure that Ex 34,29-35 is an influence here.

**SCHRAMM**, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p. 137, considers the best explanation for the differences between Luke and Mark is the use of an additional source.

LÜZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p. 505, recognises Mk 9,2-13 as the source notes the many possibilities in terms of a possible recension of Mark, independent redaction, or special traditions. See (nn. 8-11), p. 596.

**BÖVON**, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, pp. 488-489, mentions Mk 9,23-27 as the primary source however he is well aware of the possibility of the use of a special tradition or a reworked Markan text as Ennulat would suggest. This agreement is seen to be coincidental and he notes both Matthew and Luke have a shared interest in the face of Jesus. Like the agreement in vs 34 ἵνα δείξητε ὑμῖν ἵνα δείξητε ἵνα δείξητε they observe that in neither case is the phrase identical, nor do they have the same function. He concludes observing that this would have been an episode that was naturally part of the oral tradition and performance.


NOLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 698, notes the striking number of minor agreements with Lk 9,28-36 is of the opinion that all can be explained as due to redaction.

**STREETER**, *The Four Gospels*, pp. 315-316, suggests that the word is the most natural one to have used in the circumstance and that the question should not be so much why Matthew and Luke have used it, rather, why Mark did not use it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>§</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>§ 51.8:1</td>
<td>Mk 9,6</td>
<td>Lk 9,34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation Luke uses gen case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENNULAT**, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 205, notes the different reasons for the fear of the disciples in Matthew and Luke i.e. the voice from the cloud, or the cloud.

SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 137, notes the correspondences and judges that they could not be independent or by coincidence.

LÜZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17), (n. 8), p. 506, mentions that this could be redactional.

GOULDER, Luke (I), pp. 443-444, he observes that the motif has been added by both Luke and Matthew later in the story than Mark. Matthew after the overshadowing and the cloud and in Luke at the overshadowing. He suggests that the presence of this phrase opposite Lk 9,33 has been combined with the memory of Matthew’s use of the fear motif later in the story, and this has resulted in the compromise of Lk 9, 34b.

ENNIULAT, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 206, is convinced that despite the difference between Matthew and Luke the coincidence in making this change in the same spot argues for some literary dependence. The agreements are argued to be post-Markan. He notes the difference between Matthew and Luke ascribes this to Luke changing a shared source. He notes that in Mk 5,35; 14,43 Luke uses the same phrase as Matthew has here.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 801, indicates that this seems to be an agreement in terms of substance that the wording is not the same. He notes that the phrase is also found in Lk 11,53; 13,17 (p. 802).

SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 137, notes the correspondences and judges that they could not be independent or by coincidence.

BOVON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50), p. 489, sees this agreement to be coincidental since the phrase is not identical in Matthew or Luke, nor do they have the same function. He concludes that this would have been an episode that was naturally part of the oral tradition and performance.

NEIRYCK, Two-Source Theory, p. 34, assesses this as independent redaction on the part of Matthew and Luke. See (n. 168).

NOLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew, (n. 62), p. 703, mentions that the most striking agreement is in Mt 17,5 and the phrase “while he was yet speaking,” though he notes that, strictly speaking, only one word is shared.

GOULDER, Luke (I), p. 442, highlights this as a significant agreement. He suggests that the cumulative evidence points to direct Matthean influence on Luke (p. 443).

STREETER, The Four Gospels, p. 316, observes that the only word Matthew and Luke have in common is the pronoun that is judged to prove nothing other than literary improvement. It could be due to the original phrase having dropped out of Mark.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52</th>
<th>§ 51.9:1</th>
<th>Mk 9,7</th>
<th>Mt 17,5 ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος</th>
<th>No – correction of pronoun needed</th>
<th>Lk 9,34 ταύτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος</th>
<th>No-correction of pronoun needed</th>
<th>Variation in verb of speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 53 | § 53.10:1 | Mk 9,19 | Mt 17,17 διεστραμμένη | Yes | Lk 9,41 διεστραμμένη | Yes – correction of Luke’s |
ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, pp. 211-212. With regard to the scholars who see the use of Deut 32,5.20 to explain this agreement see (n. 41), p. 212. On p. 212 he suggests that the structural correspondences make a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworked Markan text likely (p. 213). Rating: (I).

(Mk 9,14-29 has 7 negative agreements and 15 positive agreements - III-3,III/II-3, III/I-1, II-3, II/I-1, I/III-1, I-1).

FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*, p. 806, notes this agreement and judges it to be coincidence. While the agreements could lead to the conclusion that Matthew and Luke have substituted a shorter Q form of the passage he is not convinced. On p. 809 he judges the agreement to have been added independently being influenced by Deut 32,5.

SCHRAMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p. 139, makes note of this as one of a number of positive agreements. Mention is also made of the orientation of the phrase towards Deut 32,5 and Isa 59,8.

LÜZ, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, p. 519, argues that this is one of the agreements in this episode that cannot be understood as independent redaction. He asks the question as to whether both of them could have independently made the addition in the light of Deut 32,5 LXX (n. 5), p. 519. It's a good question other possibilities such as the impact of oral tradition could explain this. On p. 520 he makes the observation that the oral tradition could have an impact and that it is always possible, never provable.

For the passage as a whole he claims that while the argument for a reworked Mark can be based on other texts in Matthew the episode of the epileptic boy is not one that can be used to argue for a post-Markan recension (p. 520).

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, pp. 507-508, makes the point regarding this episode and its complex pre-history that we cannot assume that he oral tradition simply ceased when Mark put the tradition into written form for the first time. Matthew and Luke are influenced by another form of the tradition though the Markan order is respected. Bovon, p. 511, sees it as independent redaction or the influence of oral tradition.

See NEIRYNCK, *Two-Source Theory*, pp. 16-23, notes how almost all scholars who accept the shorter form of Mk 9,19 see this a reminiscence of Deut 32,5 LXX (p. 16).

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 710, claims that the shared features in Mt 17,14-18 and Lk 9,37-43 suggest that Matthew also has access to a second simpler source. He notes this addition is shared with Luke and that it confirms the link with Deut 32,5.

MCCULLAS, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 146, observes that Lk 9,39-42 is similar to Mt 17,15-18 with Luke adding some dramatic flourishes. This detail not treated.

GOULDER, *Luke (I)*, pp. 446-447, argues for this as a significant agreement with Luke agreeing with Matthew for eleven consecutive words, only five of which are in Mark. He notes that J. Schmid, *Matthäus und Lukas*, p. 124, refers to the influence of Deut 32,5. Goulder observes "We can certainly understand Matthew as developing Mark out of this text; the question is, as so often is, What is the likelihood of Luke also developing Mark independently out of the same text on the strength of a single word γενεκα?" (See p. 447).

STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 317, considers this an insertion in the textual tradition.

---

| 55 | § 53.21:2.3 | Mk 9,27 | Mt 17,18 καὶ ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παιδί | No | Lk 9,42 καὶ ἱάσατο τὸν παιδί | No | Significant variation – different verbs of healing, case for παιδί | Yes |

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 213, regarding the use of καὶ ἐθεραπεύθη/ καὶ ἱάσατο he recognises that the agreement here is "sachlich"[essential] Matthew and Luke use their own preferred vocabulary. What he notes is that it is unusual that they both use their word vocabulary for healing in the context of an exorcism.
Regarding the use of παῖζ / παιδα, Ennulat recognises that Lukan uses this noun in Lk 8,51.54, and that it can be seen as redactional. He claims the same surety is not there for Matthew (p. 213). Rating: (III).


LUX, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*, (n. 14), p. 520, argues that both ἰδρυματικόν and παιδα are redactional.

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 1,1-9,50)*, (n. 12), p. 507, mentions a number of indications of Luke's redactional hand. The use of παῖζα is one of them.


McNICOL, *Beyond the Q Impasse*, p. 146, observes that Lk 9,39-42 is similar to Mt 17,15-18 with Luke adding some dramatic flourishes. This detail not treated.

Gould, *Luke (I)*, p. 447, lists this as one of the less probative agreements indicating Lukan dependence on Matthew.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60</th>
<th>§ 63.5:(1)</th>
<th>Mk 10,30</th>
<th>Mt 19,29 ἐκατονταπλασίωνα</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lk 18,30 πολλαπλασίωνα</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements",* p. 233, looks at the textual critical matters associated with this particular word. In Mt 19,19 the word is a hundredfold, or many times. In Luke it can be variations of many times or seven times.

On p. 234 the agreements are seen to be essentially stylistic improvements bringing the key saying and the promise of eternal life into greater prominence. He argues that the changes cannot be attributed totally to independent redaction on the part of Matthew or Luke. With a view to Lk 22,24-30 he would not exclude the possibility of the influence of a pre-Matthian/Lukan text.

Rating: (III).

(Mk 10,30-32 has 3 negative agreements and 5 positive agreements - III-4, II-3, II/1 - 1, I-1)

LUX, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25)*, p. 120, judges that most of the agreements in the passage Mt 19,16-30 are due to independent redaction, the sheer number is difficult to explain. In (n. 13), p. 120 Luz counts 40 agreements in the passage.

FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*, p. 1202, agrees with SCHRÄMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p.142 that there is no other source in this passage than Mark. On p. 1205 he notes the varied textual tradition with some mss reading seven or a hundredfold (See Mk 10,30).

SCHRÄMM, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, p.142, sees Lk 18,18-30 to be dependent on Mk 10,17-31 though he recognises agreements between Matthew and Luke.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, p. 797, suggests that Matthew follows Mk 10,28-30 introduces it material paralleled in Lk 22,28-30. He suggests the mention of a hundredfold in Matthew may be under the influence of the hundredfold blessing found in the Old Testament (Gen 26,12; 2 Sam 24,3; 1 Chron 21,3)


BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 15,1-19,27)*, p. 238, notes how the Lukan version is somewhat bland in comparison to a hundredfold. For the variants see (n. 54).

GOULDER, *Luke (II)*, p. 671, sees Lk 18,18-30 to be a text Luke follows without reference to Matthew. While he identifies some agreements the judgement is that it is hard to show them to be significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 68.19</th>
<th>Mk 11,10</th>
<th>Mt (21,16) εἶπαν κατó</th>
<th>No – possible correction</th>
<th>Lk 19,39 εἶπαν πρὸς κατóν</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Addition of preposition in Lk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ENNILAT, Die "Minor Agreements",** p. 251, considers this to be possibly Matthean redaction, hardly Lukan. (In Mk 11,1-11 there are 9 negative agreements and 21 positive agreements). Rating: (III/II).

**Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25),** pp. 179-80, does not mention this agreement though he points to the correspondence with Jn 12,17-19 and the possibility of a pre-Matthean variant of the narrative tradition in Mt 21,1-17.

**Bovon, (Lk 19,28-24,53),** pp. 28-29, argues against Goulder, *Luke (II)*, pp. 685-688, and sees no other source than Mark. This agreement is not treated specifically and he suggests redactional improvement on the part of Matthew and Luke, and the possible impact of oral tradition. A recension is seen to be much too complicated and unnecessary hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 69.2:1</th>
<th>Mk 11,11</th>
<th>Mt 21,17 ἔλεισθη</th>
<th>No – possible correction needed</th>
<th>Lk (21,37) ἔλειζε</th>
<th>No – possible correction needed</th>
<th>Variation in tense of verb – setting is different in Matthew and Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ENNILAT, Die "Minor Agreements",** p. 252, considers that this agreement could hardly be by change, given the rarity of the word. See (n. 84) for the varying opinions of Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, p. 210; Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 301, and Schmid, *Matthäus und Lukas*, p. 137. He believes the correspondences at some points are so great in this passage that one can/must reckon with a pre-Matthean and Lukan reworked Markan text (p. 252).

Rating: (I).

**IV/III-1, III-8, III/II-6, III/I-1, II-2, I/II-1, I-2**

**Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XIV),** p. 1357, ponders whether Lk 21,37-38 could be from a Lukan source judges them to be due to Lukan composition. He mentions Mt 21,17 does not mention it as an agreement.

**Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas,** p. 182, judges Lk 21,5-38 as the end result of combining Markan and pre-Markan materials. Lk 21,37f is judged to be Lukan redaction.

**Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25),** p. 177, suggests a number of the minor agreements could go back to a deuteromarkan reworking of the episode. He notes the complexity in tracing the text source critically given the significant additions in the Matthean version of the episode. In (n. 87), p. 189, he treats this verb, not as an agreement. Both FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XIV)*, p. 1358, and Luz address the fact that the verb means to spend the night /lodge rather than stay outside for the night.

**Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53),** (n. 156), p. 198, makes mention of Mt 21,17 using the same verb develops the idea no further.

**Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew,** p. 846, comments on Mt 21,14-17 and suggests that for other than Mt 21,17 these verses have no parallels in Mark and Luke and Matthew made use of tradition fragments
for them. He mentions on p. 848 that Luke makes use of the same verb in Lk 21,37, provides no comment regarding dependence or relationship.

Mcnicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, pp. 270-271, notes that Lk 21,37-38 was composed by Luke, mentions the echoes found in Mt 21,17.


Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 301, judges this to be a deceptive for two reasons. The first being that Matthew and Luke use the phrase in two different contexts, and the second is that they apply it to different places i.e. Matthew to Bethany and Luke to the Mount of Olives. He judges this as pointing to independent editing.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>65</th>
<th>§ 73.2.1</th>
<th>Mk 11,27</th>
<th>Mt 21,23 διδάσκοντι</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 20,1 διδάσκοντος</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in case of participle of teaching and placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 259, notes that generally the mention of teaching is seen as Matthean or Lukan redaction it is conditioned extensively by the tradition. On pp. 262-263 Ennulat considers that the Markan text was structurally modified, and he doesn’t see the types of changes would be consistent with redaction as a sufficient explanation. As expected he opts for the pre-Matthean and Lukan reworking of Mark as the best explanation.

Rating (II/I).

(Mk 11,27-33 has 9 negative agreements and 12 positive agreements).

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1271, sees Lk 20,1 to be a characteristic introductory clause substituted by Luke that repeats the context of teaching in the Temple. On p. 1272 he notes the motif of teaching as an agreement, considers that it has to be judged as coincidental.

Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, p. 149, sees Luke from Lk 20,1b following Mark with stylistic improvements. He suggests that the only possible evidence for a variant tradition might be Lk 20,1a. Even Schramm is less than convinced of this possibility.

Lutz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25), p. 206, judges Mt 23-27 to be a reworking of Mk 11,27-33 without any major changes. He notes the striking number of agreements in the passage assigns them to be the result of independent redaction. The motif of teaching is judged to be one of these. See (n. 16), p. 206.

Boston, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), pp. 54-57, provides a detailed examination of the development of this tradition. He argues that in the oral phase this pericope went through two stages of development. In the first phase the focus was on the hopeless dialogue between Jesus and the authorities. In the second phase the incident was bound to the last period of Jesus’ ministry. Besides this Matthew and Luke have inherited Mark.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 856, remarks that Matthew changes Mark's mention of Jesus walking in the Temple to that of his teaching in the Temple. In (n. 38), p. 856 he observes Lk 20,1 has a similar change.

Mcnicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 251, judges Lk 20,1 to be Lukan composition, and the motif of teaching to be generally a sign of Lukan composition. However, the verb is also found in Mt 21,23.


Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 318-319, judges this agreement to be the result of textual assimilation since the Old Lat, and Old Syr. Texts did not include it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 84.4:2</th>
<th>§ 96.5:1</th>
<th><strong>Mk</strong></th>
<th>Mt 24,21, Lk 21,23</th>
<th><strong>Mk</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th><strong>Application of the adjective varies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENNLAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</strong> p. 313, judges the use of μεγάλη by Luke as redactional, and to be consistent with Luke’s omission of the following half verse. As far as Ennlat is concerned the same cannot be said for Matthew usage here. On p. 314 Lk 21,20-24 is seen as rigorous abbreviating of the passage, making it virtually impossible to make a judgement. He mentions Lk 17,20ff as worth comparing though he notes there is Mark-Q overlap. The agreements are deemed to post-Markan and make the passage read more smoothly. Rating: (III) <em>(Mk 13,14-23 has 3 negative and 4 positive agreements).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)</em>, p. 1342, judges Lk 21,2-24 to be a radically reworked form of Mark and that there is considerable Lukan redaction and composition. On p. 1346 he judges that this part of Lk 21,23 substitutes for Mark 13,19 and is probably due to Lukan composition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25),</strong> p. 408, sees the source for Mt 24,3-31 as Mark though there is some influence from Q 17,20-37 in Mt 24, 15-28. The use of the adjective is judged to be characteristically Matthean see (n. 14), p. 408.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew,</strong> p. 975, mentions a number of Matthean redactional changes, including μεγάλη, noting that the application distinguishes the oppression mentioned in Mt 24,9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse,</strong> p. 264, in the chart provided this is indicated as proof that Luke used Mt 24,21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOULDER, Luke (II),</strong> pp. 710-712, looks at Lk 21,20-24 and notes how this section on the siege of Jerusalem being one that has attracted plenty of attention from those who would argue that Luke makes use of a second source (See SCHRAMM, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas, pp. 178-180).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>79</th>
<th>§ 96.5:1</th>
<th><strong>Mk</strong></th>
<th>Mt 26,39, Lk 22,42</th>
<th><strong>Mk</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th><strong>Variation in use of verb to be and my vs yours</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENNLAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</strong> p. 350, notes that generally Matthew’s form of the prayer is judged to be influenced by Mt 6,10, and that Luke is also influenced by a traditional formula here (see Acts 21,14). He makes mention of the fact that it is unusual for Matthew to elongate a Markan text. This leads to the supposition that Mt 24,22-44 were already connected in the Markan text. On p. 352 he recognises that Luke has drastically abbreviated the Markan text with the repetition of the prayers and replacing it by one prayer. He still argues that the correspondences indicate a post-Markan level of textual development. Rating: (III/II) <em>(In the overall section Mk 14,26-53 he notes 20 negative and 24 positive agreements - III/II- 5, III/II- 1, II-2)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p.1438, argues that apart from the textual problem posed by Lk 22,43-44 the rest of the scene can be explained as Lukan redaction of Mark or composition. Fitzmyer judges that Luke has formulated in an abstract manner what Mk 24,36 stated concretely (p. 1442). The saying is deemed to echo a wish in the Our Father, it is not a part of the Lukan form of it.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), See (n. 6),</strong> p. 131 where a possible hypothesis is that the agreements in this passage are the result of independent redaction. He makes no mention of this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the scene of the arrest he sees the Markan framework to be clear, with new material that has echoes of Matthew, with the introductory phrase in particular. He sees Luke to be using a tradition that is partly independent from Mark.

BovON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p. 324, sees Luke using Mark as the source in Lk 22,1-14, and then using his own source in Lk 22,15-46.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 1103, notes the connection to the fourth clause of the Our Father Mt 6,10.

Regarding the scene as a whole pp. 1094-1095 he notes that Luke probably knew a second source for this episode, and that John also reflects awareness of the tradition. As far as he is concerned Matthew shows no dependence on any other source than Mark. On the other hand he admits that the pre-history of the Markan materials is itself very much debated. Mark may well have been drawing on a number of traditions.

Goulder, Luke (II), p. 741, claims that Luke has Mark’s version of the prayer before him, that the Matthean form has nearly taken over. With regard to the prayer he mentions that the Lukan version looks uncomfortably like Mt 26,42. In C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, pp. 363-364, the impact of oral tradition is suggested, Marshall, Luke, p. 831, suggests a second source. To this Goulder, responds that Matthew should be considered to be the source.

| 80 | § 97.3 | Mt 14,45 om | Mt 26,50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἐταῖρε, ἐφ’ ὦ πάρει | Yes | Lk 22,48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἱούδα, φίληματι τού τίνος τοῦ ἀνέδρασεν παραδίδους | Yes | Agreement in introduction content of saying totally different |

Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 355-356, notes that both Matthew and Luke have Jesus asking Judas a question and both agree in using an introductory phrase. A correspondence is Jesus’ verbal response to Judas’ action that is almost identical. On p. 356 he suggests that it’s not unlikely that Luke and Matthew had access to the same tradition, that Luke reworked it “inhaltlich starker.” The relationship of this tradition to the Markan Vorlage is difficult to assess. On p. 361 the direct parallels between Matthew and Luke point to post-Markan textual development. There are some elements that would be due to redaction. Because of the differences between Matthew and Luke it is hard to come to precision in this instance though he would suggest that Luke has reworked the material more than Matthew. The impact of ongoing oral tradition is not to be excluded as a possibility.

Rating: (1/IV) (Mk 14,43-52 - IV/III - 1, III-9, II/II, II - 2, I-4, I/IV -1)

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XIV), p. 1448, provides a survey of the opinion at that time and concludes that the Lukan account is the result of Lukan redaction of Mark with both Lukan composition and omission. This verse is deemed to come from Luke’s pen.

Liu, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 155, notes that the Matthean additions to Mark’s text are all sayings of Jesus. On p. 156 he reflects on how difficult it is to judge to what degree the sayings are redactional or Matthew puts into writing what has been circulating in the oral tradition.

BovON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p. 324, sees Luke returning to Mark as the source and Lk 22,47-53 is without doubt Markan in origin and this is recognised by the majority of exegesis. On pp. 325-326 he does not see Luke using another source than Mark here though he does argue for Luke being aware of oral traditions that were also used by John. See (n. 13), p. 326 for further discussion.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 1107, notes the links between Luke and John here that may indicate Luke had access to other traditions. Matthew may be drawing on traditional material in Mt 26,52-53. The Markan episode itself may be composite. He suggests that both Mt 26,46-56 and Lk 22,47-54 are primarily edited versions of Markan material.

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 289, judges Lk 22,47-53 to be Lk following Matthew’s order with additions and omissions being due to Luke’s compositional agenda.

Goulder (II), p. 744, notes the similarity in the introductory phrase then mentions how Luke goes on to clarify the Lord’s mind and makes the rebuke plain to see. For the scene of the arrest he sees the Markan framework to be clear, with new material that has echoes of Matthew, with the addition of Lukan colouring. Lukan redaction is considered a sounder option.
than a second source.

**Streeter,** *The Four Gospels,* p. 301, observes that while there is a common insertion of a comment of Jesus to Judas the tenor is so different it must be judged as a disagreement outweighing many small agreements.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 99.2:1.2</th>
<th>Mk 14,61</th>
<th>Mt 26,63</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 22,67</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in order and mood of verb of saying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ήνιοι εἰπής εἰ</td>
<td></td>
<td>εἰ σὺ εἶ... εἰπὼν ἦμιν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eunlat,** *Die "Minor Agreements*," pp. 365-366, mentions Mk 8,29; 14,61 and 15,32 where the Christ title is used in similar ways by Matthew and Luke.

Rating: (III/IV).

(Mk 14,55-65 has 30 negative agreements and 26 positive agreements).

**Luz (Mt 26-28),** p.174, claims that the only source for Mt 26,59-66 is Mark. There is "sprachlich" redaction by Matthew and the verb of saying is taken to be one of them. See (n. 7), p. 174.

**Fitzmyer,** *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV),* p. 1458, attributes Lk 22,66-68 to the L source, though some Lukan rewording can be detected. His tendency is towards ascribing Lk 22,66-71 to a Lukan source, though he is not absolutely certain.

**Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53),** p. 365, suggests that from Lk 22,47-23,5 Luke has Mark as the source. This source is reworked by Luke rather than there being recourse to another source.

**Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew,** p. 1128, suggests that in Mt 26,63 it is Matthew who abbreviates and expands.

**Mcnicol, Beyond the Q Impasse,** p. 296 argues that Luke takes Mt 26,63b and splits one question into two (Lk 22,67a and 70 a).

**Goulder, Luke (II),** p. 754, sees this to be based on Mk 14,61.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 99.3:2</th>
<th>Mk 14,62</th>
<th>Mt 26,64</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lk 22,70</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variation in number of personal pronoun and verb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ήνιοι εἰπής</td>
<td></td>
<td>ήμεν λέγετε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eunlat,** *Die "Minor Agreements*," pp. 366-367, notes that it is suggested that this correspondence goes back to a shared older tradition. The opposite development of the tradition seems to him to be possible in the same way.

Rating: (III/II)

**Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28),** p.174, claims that the only source for Mt 26,59-66 is Mark.

**Fitzmyer,** *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV),* p. 1458, sees that Luke's special source is responsible, as with Lk 22,66-68. The second question put to Jesus, and his half answer, is from Luke's special source, though Luke has reworded it. He ascribes Lk 22,66-71 to a Lukan source, though he is not absolutely certain.

**Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew,** p. 1120, suggests that both Luke and Matthew were aware of a second source. This phrase is judged to support that view.

**Mcnicol, Beyond the Q Impasse,** p. 296, argues that Luke takes Mt 26,63b and splits one question into two (Lk 22,67a and 70 a). One of the consequences of this is that Luke has to now create Jesus' first
answer that parallels Mt 26,64 σὺ εἶπας.


**Streeter, The Four Gospels,** p. 321, notes that there are no verbal agreements against Mark notes the agreement in content. If the explanation for the agreement is not text-critical then Streeter suggests Matthew and Luke are independent adaptations of Mk 15,2 assimilating Jesus' reply to the High Priest to that of the response made to Pilate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 99.4:2</th>
<th>Mt 14,62</th>
<th>Mt 26,64 ἀπ’ ἀρτί</th>
<th>No-correction of preposition needed</th>
<th>Lk 22,69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν</th>
<th>No-correction of preposition needed</th>
<th>Variation: similar content not same vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements",** p. 367, notes this agreement is normally either judged to be pre-Markan textual development, or the result of Lukan or Matthean redaction. The correspondence in Mk 14,25 needs to be considered where there is the same correspondence by both Matthew and Luke against the Markan text. Rating: (III/II)

**Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28),** See In (n. 8), p. 175, he considers this to be a "Pseudo Agreement" and the result of independent and varying redaction. The Lukan phrase is judged to due to Luke using another source.

**Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV),** p. 1467, mentions how Luke uses the phrase in Lk 1,48; 5,10. There is coincidental agreement with Matthew in sense not wording.

**Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew,** p. 1120, suggests Luke and Matthew were aware of a second source. This phrase is judged to support that view.

**McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse,** pp. 296-297, having looked at the usage of these cognate expressions in Matthew, Luke and Acts, combined with Luke's usual avoidance of ἀρτί is taken to be wholly consistent with the Two Gospel hypothesis.


**Streeter, The Four Gospels,** p. 321, is inclined to see this agreement as independent editorial insertions by Matthew and Luke (noting the same addition in Mt 26,29 and Lk 22,18). The phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is used 5 times in Luke and once in Acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 99.10</th>
<th>Mt 14,65</th>
<th>Mt 26,68 τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 22,64 τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Identical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements",** pp. 379-381 L interprets the agreements in this verse as improvements on the Markan text. In the phrase "who is the one striking you" he goes against it being unexplainable, or pre-Markan, or able to be explained as Matthean and Lukan coincidental redaction. He opts for a post-Markan pre-Lukan and Matthean change of the Markan text.
Hit was later introduced Mark in three main streams (later Egyptian, African and Caesarean) p. 326. He accepts the suggestion of C.H. Turner that the suggestion of the blindfolding of Jesus in Mt 26,67. Neirynck's suggestion brought into Luke from Matthew. The impact of the oral tradition is also a possible explanation that both Matthew and Luke drew upon in this instance. For the second example he is not convinced by Goulder’s suggestion of Lukan dependence on Matthew. See Goulder, Luke (II), p. 750.

Nolland, p. 1135, argues that the best solution to this correspondence is a second source known to Matthew and Luke. See p. 1135 where he makes the observation that while McLoughlin, Neirynck and Tuckett argue that the phrase is a secondary interpolation there is no manuscript evidence to support the assertion.

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 295, makes the observation that Luke adds the detail of Jesus’ being blindfolded before the demand that he prophesy. He has thereby eliminated the pointlessness of the Matthean question if Jesus can see the one striking him. This could be evidence of the secondary character of Luke. In (n. 4) the reader is directed to Farmer, The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis, pp. 148-151 and pp. 284-286.


Neirynck, ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ, p. 117, notes that the phrase is probably due to Lukan redaction of Mark the question is how to explain its presence in Matthew. The problem for him is the absence of the blindfolding of Jesus in Mt 26,67. On p. 137 he suggests that Mt 26,68 could be the exceptional case where an assimilation of Matthew to Luke has pervaded all textual witnesses. See Neirynck, Two-Source Theory, pp. 27-28 where Neirynck reprises the arguments put forth in the previous article.

See Goodacre, Goulder and the Gospels, pp. 102-107, who notes on p. 107 that Neirynck and Tuckett amend the Matthean text to remove the agreement. Goodacre notes Goulder's judgement that the phrase should not be put down to independent redaction or coincidence. See Goodacre, The Case Against Q, pp. 158-160, where he argues strongly against Matthew being textually assimilated to Luke.

Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 325-328, describes this as being the most remarkable of the minor agreements. Ultimately he argues that the textual tradition shows that at times it was interpolated into Mark in three main streams (later Egyptian, African and Caesarean) p. 326. He accepts the suggestion of C.H. Turner that the same was true for Matthew in this instance. Luke originally had the phrase and it was later introduced into Matthew.


| 84 | § 100.15:1 | Mk 14,72 | Mt 26,75 ἔξελθων ἔξω ἐκλάσειν πικρῶς | Yes | Lk 22,62 ἔξελθων ἔξω ἐκλάσειν πικρῶς | Yes |
Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 377-378, argues that this is clearly secondary to Mark and is to be understood as a deliberate improvement. He sees this can only be understood on the basis of a post-Markan change of the Markan text. Overall in this episode Ennulat traces the Lukana redaction of the tradition and through this reconstruction he treats the structural correspondences between Matthew and Luke that emerge. In the end it is explained on the basis of the post-Markan recension.

Rating: (I/II)

Lüt, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 213, makes it clear that the length of the phrase argues against independent redaction and sees basically two possibilities that are viable. The first is that it comes from the oral tradition (see Brown, Death of the Messiah (I), p. 611), or they both use a deuteromarkan recension as Ennulat suggests.

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XIV), p. 1465, looks at the textual tradition concluding that there is not enough testimony to exclude the verse. Other than the word "bitterly" everything else is well attested in Luke. It might possibly be Lukana composition he considers that it comes from L.

Bowen, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53), p. 344, treats the minor agreements in vs 62 and 64 in this passage and examines the possible text critical solution that since the phrase was lacking in some uncials (0171) and in old Latin manuscripts it was brought into Luke from Matthew. The impact of the oral tradition is also a possible explanation that both Matthew and Luke drew upon in this instance. He is not convinced by Goulder's suggestion of Lukana dependence on Matthew. See Goulder, Luke (II), p. 750.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 1143, sees this phrase representing the core of a case for a second source for the Petrine denials.

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, pp. 294-5, sees Luke following Matthew here except for the minor agreements, and the addition of Jesus turning and looking at Peter in Lk 22,61.


Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 323, notes how the phrase was omitted by both African and European Latin texts.

Hawkins, p. 211, sees this to be proof of a common source for Matthew and Luke.

| 87 | § 106.9.1.2 | Mk 15,30 | Mt 27,40 e1 | No – correction needed | Lk 23,37 e1 | No – correction needed |

Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", pp. 396-397, takes this as being another example of a shared tendency towards a Christological emphasis.

Rating: (I).

Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XIV), p. 1500, asks the question regarding Lk 23,33-38 as to whether Luke has introduced L material into Mark, or Markan material into L. Fitzmyer tends towards the latter, even though certainty is not assured.

Lüt, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 324, sees Matthew to be dependent on Mk 15,29-32 with the Matthean addition of the phrase “if you are the Son of God.” Luke is deemed to follow another tradition. Also he judges Ennulat’s suggestion as being unconvincing given that the elements are also found in other contexts (see n. 5). It is an agreement most likely to be coincidental.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>88</th>
<th>§ 107.5:1</th>
<th>Mk 15,39</th>
<th>Mt 27,54 καὶ τὰ γεγονότα</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 23,47 τὸ γεγονόταν</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ENNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements",** pp. 400-401, notes the substantive participle can be seen as a Lukan stylistic expression, this is not as likely as redactional activity on the part of Matthew. The Lukan textual parallels are, despite quite major changes, judged to be a new composition that is a redaction of the Markan text. The agreements are seen to be post-Markan. The majority of the agreements are judged to be due to redactional activity on the part of Matthew and or Luke. Few agreements are better explained on the basis of a recension (p. 402). Rating: (III/II)  
(For the section Mk 15,20-41 Ennulat notes 16 negative and 18 positive agreements - IV- 1, III-2, III/I-1, II-2, II-1)  
**FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV),** p. 1519, notes that in the Lukan context "the things going on" refer to the penitent criminal and the prayer of Jesus, whereas in Mt 27,54 it refers to the earthquake.  
**LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28),** p. 356, judges the phrase to be the result of independent redaction on the part of Matthew and Luke.  
**NOLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew,** p. 1218, suggests that Matthew re-joins the Markan sequence here develops the material in light of what has been added in Mt 27,51b-53.  
**McNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse,** p. 307, sees Lk 23,47-48 to be based on Mt 27,54-56.  
**STREETER, The Four Gospels,** p. 323, does not regard this coincidence as a real one since they apply to an event and a saying, neither of which are found in Mark.  
**HAWKINS, Horae Synopticae,** p. 211, takes this agreement to be proof of a common source for Matthew and Luke. |
| 89 | § 108.7:1 | Mk 15,46 | Mt 27,59 ἐντυλίξατο αὐτῷ | Yes | Lk 23,53 ἐντυλίξατο αὐτῷ | Yes | * |
| **ENNULAT, Die "Minor Agreements",** pp. 404-408, notes a wide range of explanations for this agreement – independent redaction, Lukan literary dependence on Matthew, Matthean and Lukan dependence on a recension, also a pre-synoptic tradition.  
Rating: (III)  
(Mk 15,42-16,8 has 23 negative and 26 positive agreements - IV-III-1, III-6, III/I-2, II-3, II/I-1)  
**FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV),** p. 1523, sees the episode to be mainly a redacted form of Mk 15,42-47. The agreement is not treated.  
**LUZ, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28),** pp. 376-377, notes that there are some spectacular agreements in this passage and this is one of those cited. He suggests on p. 377 that different explanations are required for each instance. This agreement could be due to a recension of Mark used by Matthew and Luke (acknowledged as being Ennulat's major thesis). See (n. 5), p. 377  
**BOTON, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53),** p. 484, argues against GOULDER, Luke (II), pp. 769-773 and the suggestion of Lukan dependence on Mark. He would suggest that the agreement comes from either the same stylistic reaction on the part of Luke and Matthew or the impact of an enduring oral tradition.  
**NOLLAND, The Gospel of Matthew,** p. 1231, notes the change in verb from Mark and that Luke and John have made the same change. It suggests the possibility of the influence of a source.  
**McNICOL, Beyond the Q Impasse,** p. 308, draws attention to the work of GOULDER, Luke (II), pp. 772-773, who notes the number of agreements of Matthew and Luke at this point. The wrapping of Jesus is
particularly noted as significant.


Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 323, sees this as possible assimilation of the text of Matthew to Luke’s more dignified and more conventionally appropriate word.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>90</th>
<th>§ 109.4:1</th>
<th>Mk 16,2</th>
<th>Mt 28,1 έπεφωσκούση</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Lk 23,54 έπεφωσκέν</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Different context, - variation in tense of verb – I did not include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Ennilat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 409, notes that in this context Matthew and Luke both agree in changing Mark, and in different ways. He doesn’t see the change to be certain to be redactional activity by either Matthew or Luke.

Rating: (III)


Luz, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28), p. 399, notes the agreements in this passage and rightly observes that the most striking agreement is the use of this rare word. At the same time he acknowledges that both Matthew and Luke use the word in different contexts and with different meanings. In (n. 25) he observes that Luke uses this word most unusually for twilight. Given that the word is a hapax legomenon in Matthew and Luke Luz considers that it cannot be independent redaction. In (n. 26), p. 400 he considers different solutions for the different agreements in the passage and this is judged to be possibly from the oral tradition. For the passage overall he thinks that a post-Markan recension is possible p.400.

Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew, p. 1243, makes the observation that Mk 16,1-8 is what Matthew returns to. On the other hand the notes there are enough agreements between Matthew and Luke, and Matthew and Luke and John, to make it likely a second source is involved.

McNicol, Beyond the Q Impasse, p. 308, draws attention to the work of Gould, Luke (II), pp. 772-773, who notes the number of agreements of Matthew and Luke at this point. It is only in this context that the word is used in the New Testament and supports McNicol, Duggan and Peabody’s view that there is a direct literary relationship between Matthew and Luke that is hard to explain on by means of the Two-Source hypothesis (See p. 309). The evidence is: a) extended verbatim parallel wording, b) repeated and extensive agreements against Mark, and c) characteristic Matthean syntactical usage appearing in Luke.


Streeter, The Four Gospels, p. 324, looks at the omission in the textual tradition of Luke and suggests that if the omission was original then it might be explained as due to assimilation from Matthew’s text.

Hawkins, p. 211, considers this to be proof of a common source for Matthew and Luke.

| 90 | § 109.9:1 | Mk 16,5 | Mt 28,3 ἁστράπη | Yes | Lk 24,4 ἁστράτωση | Yes | variation – similar idea – difference verb vs noun |
ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, p. 411, notes the difference between Matthew and Luke in the point of reference, however he argues that the use of the present participle could be Lukan redaction in the light of Luke 17.24. Since the word is so rare he finds it unlikely to be the result of independent redaction, and that it probably depends on a post-Markan reworking of the appearance of the young men.

Rating (II).


LÜS, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28)*, p. 399, notes this agreement and that Matthew and Luke share the detail in different ways. In (n. 26), p. 400, he observes that this could come from oral tradition. For the passage overall he thinks that a post-Markan recension is possible p. 400.

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53)*, p. 519, is of the opinion that Luke starts the chapter with the Markan tradition before moving on to his own special materials. In this he is judged to be consistent with his practice throughout the passion narrative. In (n. 13), p. 519, he suggests that Luke was not aware of the Matthean or Johannine depiction of this scene.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, (n. 16), p. 1247, observes that Matthew has the noun and Luke the participle. He suggests that there may be a trace of a second source here.

STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, p. 325, judges that coincidence might be the best explanation for the agreement. He mentions Lk 9,29 where the same participle is used. What Matthew compares to lightning is not the garments, the face.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>91</th>
<th>§109.17</th>
<th>Mk 16.8</th>
<th>Mt 28.8 ἀπαγγείλαι</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Lk 24.9 ἀπήγγειλαν</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Variation in tense of verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*, pp. 414-15, argues for a post-Markan and consistent reworking of the ending of Mark. His conclusions on pp. 415-416, are that the agreements are to be explained as post-Markan changes. The "sprachlichen" improvements are not best explained by Matthean or Lukan redaction. He notes that there is striking agreement in the use of rare vocabulary, as well as in the tendency to eliminate the lack of understanding by the disciples. This convinces him that Matthew and Luke base their work on a reworked text of Mark.

Rating (I).

(For Mk 15.42-16.8 he notes 23 negative agreements and 26 positive agreements - IV/III- 1, III/IV - 2, III - 20, III/I - 3, II/III- 2 II - 6, II/I - 1, I/II- 1).


LÜS, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 26-28)*, p. 399, suggests that given the use by Luke and Matthew of this verb that Matthew and Luke could well have had a version of Mark that ended differently to our present version. In (n. 22), he observes how the verb is a strong motif in this scene and he suggests that in Mt 28,28 it is redactional. He notes that elsewhere Luke introduces it on five occasions; therefore it has a greater likelihood of being Lukan redaction. For the passage overall he thinks that a post-Markan recension is possible (p. 400).

BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53)*, p. 521, examines Lk 24 noting how Luke knows and uses Mark, and takes hold of other reminiscences that were either independent or part of his special material.

NOLLAND, *The Gospel of Matthew*, (n. 31), p. 1252, mentions that Luke has the same verb, and that this may indicate a source origin. As can be seen with NOLLAND, he is usually quite circumspect in his suggestions (not indicating a written or an oral source).
Goulden, Luke (II), pp. 775-776, sees Luke turning to Matthew for structure and content. While the verb is considered congenial to Luke he could have used a more common word of speaking.

Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 300-301, claims that in the light of the lost ending of Mark and the angel’s command this would be the natural word one would use for the action of the women.

Appendix III

This particular appendix attends to variation in the minor agreements noted in Neirynck’s, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*. This examines a range of variations that extends beyond the list of significant minor agreements to the agreements generally.

Page Number HLS = Refers to the page number in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*.

HLS Reference = Reference to the particular minor agreement in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis*.

Mark = Gospel of Mark.

Matthew = Neirynck’s suggested agreement is provided in the Greek text.

SCE Matthew = This column notes whether the SCE volume of Matthew included this particular agreement. It also includes any possible corrections or modifications to be made to subsequent additions.

Luke = Neirynck’s suggested agreement is provided in the Greek text.

SCE Luke = This column notes whether the SCE volume of Luke included this particular agreement. It also includes any possible corrections or modifications to be made to subsequent additions.

Type of Variation = Any variation between the Matthean or Lukan forms of the agreement listed by Neirynck is noted.

Comment = This column includes reference to any corrections that may be necessary for subsequent editions of the SCE, or where the judgements of Neirynck are explored or questioned.
### Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Neirynck HLS reference</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>SCE Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>SCE Luke</th>
<th>Type of variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>§ 1.9</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,5</td>
<td>Mt 3,5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk (3,3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the case of the noun.</td>
<td>In Mk 1,5 χῶρα is the noun used. Ennulat, <em>Die ‘Minor Agreements’,</em> p. 36, notes that many see a Mark-Q overlap in Mk 1,2-8. He would still suggest the possibility of a recension as the explanation. Luke uses the noun Lk 3,3; 4,14,37; 7,17; 8,37 Acts 14,6. Matthew uses the noun only twice Mt 3,5 and 14,35. It is found also in Mk 1,28. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis,</em> p. 101, lists this as a significant minor agreement. Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX),</em> p. 452, judges Lk 3,1-3a to be Lukan composition. While he notes the suggestion of a Mark-Q overlap, he likewise argues that it is difficult to arrive at clarity in this instance. Robinson, <em>The Critical Edition of Q,</em> p. 6, judges this noun to be from Q. He is quite reserved in identifying the overlaps in this pericope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>§ 2.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,7</td>
<td>Mt 3,7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (3,7)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>The correspondence in this instance is that Matthew and Luke agree in providing an indirect object for the verb of saying. See Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements,</em> p. 267, for other examples. At best this is a stylistic agreement with different indirect objects in each instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>§ 3.3:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,9</td>
<td>Mt 3,16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 3,21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the case of the participle.</td>
<td>This was not judged to be a minor agreement simply as a redactional variation of Mark since the same verb is found in Mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>§ 3.3:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,9</td>
<td>Mt 3,16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 3,21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in case.</td>
<td>There is a partial agreement in that Matthew and Luke define the subject of the verb. See Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements,</em> p. 261, for other examples. However, since Jesus is already mentioned in Mk 1,9a it is more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>§ 3.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,10</td>
<td>Mt 3,16 ηπειράθησαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 3,21 ηπειράθησα</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the same verb – Matthew has Aor Ind Pass // Luke uses Aor Inf Pass.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in having a different verb rather than σημείωσαν. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, pp. 36-37, makes no judgement here given the possibility of a Mark-Q overlap, and the difficulty of reconstructing the Q tradition. Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em>, p. 480, notes the partial correspondence and explains it as being due to the influence of Isa 64 (63,19 LXX) and Ezek 1,1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>§ 3.5</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,10</td>
<td>Mt 3,16 τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 3,22 τὸ ἄγιον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Different noun used.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke agree in modifying Spirit as Spirit &quot;of God&quot; (Matthew 2x) or &quot;Holy&quot; Spirit (Luke 1x, also Matthew 5x). This degree of variation would not indicate dependence on a source, either oral or written. Both Matthew and Luke agree in defining the Spirit, in their own ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>§ 4.1.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,12</td>
<td>Mt 4,1 ἀνίχθη</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,1 ἀψέστη</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial verbal agreement. Variation – Compound verb in Matthew // Simple verb in Luke.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke agree to the extent that one uses the compound verb &quot;led up&quot; (Aor Ind Pass) and the other &quot;led&quot; (Impf Ind Pass). At best this is a partial agreement probably due to independent redaction, though the idea of leading could be shared from oral or written tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>§ 4.7</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,13</td>
<td>Mt 4,11 ἀφίησιν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,13 απέστη</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Variation in verbs.</td>
<td>There is no verbal agreement here. According to Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 37, there is Mark -Q overlap in the introduction and conclusion of the passage. Both Matthew and Luke agree that the devil departs from Jesus at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>§ 7.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,21</td>
<td>Mt (4,13) ἔλθων</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,31 κατηλθέν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial verbal agreement. Matthew uses Simple verb // Luke uses the Compound verb.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, pp. 41-42, rates this as (II) and considers that the arguments for the variations in this verse are not decisive in favour of independent redaction, or for the use of a Q parallel. He thinks it is possible that a re-worked Markan text is also possible. He does note that the changes in Lk 4,31-37 with regard to Mk 1,21-28 make a Lukan re-working of Mark likely. FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em>, p. 542, sees this to be Lukan redaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>§ 8.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,28</td>
<td>Mt (9,26) 4,24</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,37 (4,14)</td>
<td>No – English test needs correction</td>
<td>In examining texts such as this the complexity of the task of determining minor agreements becomes increasingly clear. These are summaries and it is easy to be confused as to what belongs to what, and what is being compared to what. The SCE English text for Luke needs to be corrected for 4,14. Both Mt 9,26 and Lk 4,14 agree in having ἐπέλεξεν, it is used in different contexts. There is a substantial amount of overlap in these summary reports and it is likely to be due to independent redaction. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 41, notes the complexity of untangling the redaction here, given that Matthew doesn’t have a direct parallel to Mk 1,21-28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>§ 9.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,29</td>
<td>Mt 8,14 ἔλθετεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,38 εἰσηλθεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial verbal agreement. Variation in Matthew uses Participle // Luke uses the Compound verb. The agreement is that it applies to Jesus in the singular. Mark and Matthew vary, use the same verb. Luke uses the compound verb. This could well be due to independent redactional activity. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 45, sees the agreements against Mk 1,29-31 as being post-Markan and capable of explanation as independent redaction, or due to the use of a recension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>§ 9.5:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,31</td>
<td>Mt 8,15 ἀναστὰσα</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,39</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Variation in both the verb and the mood. Matthew Aor Ind Pass // Luke has Aor Part Act. Matthew uses the same verb as Mark, in the passive voice. Luke uses another verb in the Pres Part Act. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 44, ranks this as (II). The reason for this judgement is that Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in that the woman raises herself. The SCE did not indicate this due to the lack of verbal agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>§ 10.5</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,34</td>
<td>Mt 8,16 πάντιας</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,40 ἐνὶ ἐκλότωρ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Both Matthew and Luke agree in the change to Mark’s report that Jesus healed “many” to “all” or “each”. Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 47, rates this as (II/III). The tendency towards highlighting Jesus as wonder worker is noted. This is argued to be a consistent tendency in the recension of Mark used by Matthew and Luke. At the same time the same tendency in Mark 3:10 is recognised. The SCE did not indicate this due to the lack of verbal agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>§ 12.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,38-39</td>
<td>Mt 4,23 εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk [4,43] εὐαγγελισθεὶς με δεὶ τὴν βασιλείαν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is agreement in terms of preaching the kingdom, variation in use of the noun and the use of the verb by Luke. Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis, p. 17, has well indicated that both Matthew and Luke emphasise that content of the message is the kingdom (Luke adds “of God”). Aland’s Synopsis, p. 37, indicates the parallel as Mk 1,35-38 and Lk 4,42-43 with no reference to Mt 4,23. The SCE followed that judgement. It is interesting to see that Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis has followed Huck-Greven, Synopse, p. 28 in its layout and has the same parallel texts (including Lk 8:1 also indicated by Ennulat). Once again we have a summary passage and, as with Mk 1,28, unravelling parallels, dependency and redaction is a complex matter. Ennulat, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 49-50, rates it (I) in terms of being best understood as depending on a post-Markan and pre-Lukan and Matthean reworking of Mark. I would be more inclined to see this as the kind of free rendering. Elsewhere it is only in Lk 8,1 and Acts 8,12 that preaching the kingdom is found. The gospel of the kingdom is only found in Mt 4,23. 9,35 and 24,14. Given these different contexts it is difficult to envisage a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>§ 13.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 1,40 (om)</td>
<td>Mt 8,1 σοφον</td>
<td>No – minor correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 5,12 σοφον</td>
<td>No – minor correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in case in a pronoun</td>
<td>The introduction and context for the healing of the leper is quite different in Matthew (after the Sermon on the Mount) whereas in Luke it precedes the Sermon on the Plain. The introductory phrases are most likely due to the redactional activity of Matthew and Luke, and there is no other dependence. It is true that Matthew and Luke have the same prefix in the plural but it is hardly a compelling argument for the use of a re-worked Mark or mutual dependence on it. This is a good example of how minor agreements need to be weighed. Even ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p 51, ranks the introductory sentence as (IV). Luke and Matthew’s redaction provide a setting for the pericope, and they agree in putting the focus on Jesus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>§ 14.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 2,11</td>
<td>Mt 9,6 κλεινην</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 5,24 κλίνον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial agreement with related, different nouns.</td>
<td>This was not included in the SCE as an agreement due to the fact that while the nouns are similar they are different. In my judgement it was not close enough to be noted as a full agreement. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-II), p. 582, sees the Lukan use of the diminutive as a stylistic change. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, notes the change to κρισιμωττόμιν Mark and ranks it (II) p. 66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>§ 14.9</td>
<td>§ Mk 2,6</td>
<td>Mt 9,3 ειπων</td>
<td>No-possible correction?</td>
<td>Lk 5,21 λεγοντες</td>
<td>No-possible correction?</td>
<td>Variation in a verb of saying – different tense.</td>
<td>This is not indicated as an agreement in the SCE. There is a partial agreement in that there is a verb of saying, rather than the opponents thinking to themselves. What this indicates is open to conjecture. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 64, notes they agree in using a form of λεγοντες. This is weighed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table above illustrates variations in agreements identified in Neirynck's *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.* Each row details a specific variation, including the page reference, the reference to the HLS, the mark reference, the text from Matthew and Luke, and notes on the type of variation and the comment associated with it. The comments provide context and analysis for each variation, highlighting the differences and dependencies among the texts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 § 14.18:1 § Mk 2,12</td>
<td>Mt 9,7 ἐγερθεὶς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 5,25 ἀναστάς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Different verbs are used.</td>
<td>See Mk 1,31 // Mt 8,15 // Lk 4,39 where Matthew and Luke have used the same verbs for rising. Matthew modifies Mark. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 67, ranks this as a (III) highlighting that Matthew and Luke change the finite verb form with ἐγερθεὶς with a participle, notes that the change of verb in Luke is due to Lukan redaction. (See NEIRYNCK, The Minor Agreements, pp. 207-210, where this occurs 19x).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 § 14.20:1 § Mk 2,12</td>
<td>Mt 9,8 ἐφοβήθησαν</td>
<td>No -noted</td>
<td>Lk 5,26 φόβου</td>
<td>No -noted</td>
<td>Partial agreement. Matthew uses verb of being afraid where Luke uses the noun for fear.</td>
<td>In the SCE Luke, (n. 74), p. 38, the shared theme of fear is noted, given the difference between noun and verb it was not marked as an agreement in the text. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 68, ranks the epiphany fear motif as (II) mentioning that Luke usually avoids the epiphany fear motif so it needs to be explained as to why it is included here. That is an interesting remark in the light of the fact that Matthew has the noun fear only 3x, Mark 1x and Luke 7x and 5x in Acts. The verb is found 14x in Acts and 17x in Matthew and 12x in Mark and 22x in Luke.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 § 16.8:1 § Mk 2,22</td>
<td>Mt 9,17 ἐκχείται</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 5,37 ἐκχυθήσεται</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in tense- Matthew uses Pres Ind Pass // Luke uses Fut Ind Pass.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, pp. 76-77, rates this (I) and asks the question whether the use of the verb is an unsuccessful Christological interpretation of Mk 14,24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>§ 16.8:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 2,22</td>
<td>Mt 9,17 άπολλυνται</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 5,37 άπολούνται</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in tense. Luke uses Fut Ind Mid// Matthew uses Pres Ind Mid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>§ 17.3</td>
<td>§ Mk 2,23</td>
<td>Mt 12,1 ἐσθιειν.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 6,1 ἐσθιον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in mood – Pres Inf Act in Matthew// Impf Ind Act in Luke.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Neirynck HLS reference</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>SCE Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>SCE Luke</th>
<th>Type of variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>§ 17.10:3</td>
<td>§ Mk 2,26</td>
<td>Mt 12,4 μόνος</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 6,4 μόνον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in case of adjective.</td>
<td>and Luke were aware of the later mention of eating in Mk 2,26 and then independently added it to clarify the development of the story in their own way. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), pp. 605-606, notes the minor agreements in this episode observes they can be exaggerated. At the same time the common omission of Mk 2,27 has to be confronted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>§ 18a.2:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,1</td>
<td>Mt 12,10 ἔτρεχων</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 6,6 ἔτρεχε</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in case of adjective.</td>
<td>In this instance both Matthew and Luke use the adjective rather than the Perf Pass Part found in Mark. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 88, rates this as (III/II). He notes that in the half verse there are correspondences in order that he rates (II) suggesting a recension. Furthermore, he suggests that the verb for &quot;withered&quot; is used for plants, and not in medical contexts by Luke and Matthew. Independent redaction by Luke and Matthew is not excluded. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 610, suggests that Luke is more consistent in using the adjective rather than the participle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>§ 18a.2:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,4</td>
<td>Mt (12,10)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 6,9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in</td>
<td>This was not judged to be a minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>§ 18b.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,1</td>
<td>Mt 12,9 ἁλόεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 14,1 ἐλθέειν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in the verb of movement</td>
<td>This is a good example of needing to clarify what texts are being compared to what texts. The story of the man with the withered hand is found in Mk 3,1-6 and paralleled in Mt 12,9-14 and Lk 6,6-11. Lk 14,1-6 and the story of the man with dropsy is unique to Luke; there are agreements with Mt 12,11 that the SCE noted. (Usually ranked as a Q saying). There are clear similarities in the language in the two stories. With regard to the question of doublets and whether this is L see FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1039. He does not see the saying as a Q saying. Despite the similarities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18b.3 § Mk 3.2</td>
<td>Mt 12,10 έγγοντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 14,3 έγγονεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation in verb of saying.</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18b.6 § Mk 3.4</td>
<td>Mt 12,11 ο δε εἶπεν αὐτοῖς τίς ἔσται εὖ ψυχῆν ἅγιοστος ὡς έξει πρόβατον ἐν καὶ ἕαν ἔμπεση τούτῳ τούς σάββαταν εἰς βοήθον, οὐχὶ κρατήσει αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγέρει;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 14,5 καὶ θέλων αὐτῶν ἀποκτείνησε ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὑσλον, ὦτα ὡς προφήτην αὐτῶν ἔισθεν.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wide variation in the saying and agreement.</td>
<td>Neirynck, Q Synopsis, p. 51, includes this as a Q passage. Robinson, The Critical Edition of Q does not; nor does the Kloppenborg, Q Thomas Reader, or Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1039. See above. In the four texts there is convergence in terms of setting (sabbath), opposition to Jesus’ healing from religious authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>§ 19.6 § Mk 3,10</td>
<td>Mt (4,24) νόος ὑς καὶ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 6,18 νόος ὑς καὶ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The judgement of the SCE was guided by the layout of ALAND, Synopsis and the more direct parallel provided by Mt 12,15-16, Mk 3,7-12 and Lk 6,17-19. Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis, p. 26, does place Mt 4,24 in brackets which indicates there is displacement. ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, p. 96, notes that Mt 12,15c is very short in its reference and that Luke shares only a quarter of the Markan vocabulary in the summary. Huck-Greeven, Synopsis, p. 69, despite the many parallels cited does not include it in the text. What this indicates is the amount of redactional activity that must be acknowledged. This is hardly an indication of sharing a common non-Markan tradition. That “diseases” is found in different forms in Matthew and Luke is likely to be coincidental (Mt 5x, Lk 4x, Mk 1x). Both Matthew and Luke use the word, though in different contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>§ 20.2:1 § Mk 3,13</td>
<td>Mt (5,1) οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 6,13 τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The phrase “the disciples” is used in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The setting for Mk 3,13 is the calling of the 12 as in Lk 6,12-16. The bracketed reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>§ 20.6:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,16</td>
<td>Mt 10,2 ο λεγόμενος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 6,14 ὁν καὶ ἀνώμασεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal correspondence.</td>
<td>to Mt 5:1 in Neirynck indicates displacement and that the phrase “his disciples” is present there. It is difficult to rate this as a minor agreement. It is more likely to be the coincidental use of the phrase in another setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>§ 20.8</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,16-18</td>
<td>Mt 10,2 ὁ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 6,14 τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor variation in case of noun.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, rates the correspondence as (II) pp. 104–105. He notes that both Matthew and Luke rework Mark in their own ways. FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em>, p. 614, sees the passage of the choosing the Twelve to be influenced by Mark, is mostly due to Lukan redaction. Given there was no verbal agreement it was not indicated in the SCE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>§ 22.1.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,22 (om)</td>
<td>Mt 12,22 δαιμονιζόμενος…. κωφός</td>
<td>Yes – some editorial corrections needed 9,32 - 33.</td>
<td>Lk 11,14 δαμόνον ….κωφόν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation. Pres Part Pass used in Matthew // noun used in Luke.</td>
<td>See MONAGHAN, <em>Luke</em> [n. 341, n. 348], pp. 92-93. There is a lack of consistency in the Matthean text Mt 9,32-33 that needs correction with regard to the variations between noun and participle. MONAGHAN,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>§ 23.1.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,31</td>
<td>Mt 12,46 ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,19 (11,27)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massive variation in the primary parallel and some variation in the secondary parallel with difference in application</td>
<td>The verbal agreement is only in the use of the pronoun. There are certainly more parallels in the language of the introductory formula in Lk 11,27, the context is significantly different. This suggests coincidental convergence in introducing scenes more than dependence on a source. Matthew uses the phrase “while he was speaking” in Mt 12,46;17,5; 26,47. It can also be found in Mark 5,35 in Lk 8,49;22,47,60 and Acts 10,44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>§ 23.2:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 3,31</td>
<td>Mt 12,46</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,19-20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation in the</td>
<td>The difficulty with identifying an agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 23.5:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>here is that Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em>, p. 30, has indicated a similarity between Mt 12.46 and [12.47] when two different verbs are used in the two verses. The SCE has indicated the similarity in the Mt 12.47 Mt (12.47) ἐστήκασιν Lk 8:20 ἐστήκασιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>§ 24.2:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, p. 116, ranks this minor variation as (II) and asks whether this correspondence really is insignificant since Matthew has avoided the superlative which is a stylistic preference, and that Lukan formulation is not recognizable as typically redactional. Reference is made to Lk 7.11 and 14.24 in (n. 19). He judges that the correspondences in this pericope are not to be interpreted as Lukan and Matthean redaction. Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em>, pp. 700-701, notes a number of minor agreements in Lk 8.4-8 evaluated as minor improvements of Mark's Greek rather than providing justification for dependence on a source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>§ 25.6:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, pp. 127-128, ranks the changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>§ 26.3:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,14</td>
<td>Mt 13,19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>It is true that both Matthew and Luke agree in modifying &quot;the word&quot; and do so with a noun in the genitive (either of the kingdom or of God). It is best identified as independent redaction. Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements,</em>, p. 129, notes that Luke and Matthew have understood Mk 4,14 as the headline to the parable and accentuated it in their own ways. He does not attend to this detail specifically looks at the overall restructuring of the parable in the light of the recension that Ennulat proposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>§ 26.6:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,15</td>
<td>Mt 13,19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in case and number.</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> pp. 131-132, notes that both Matthew and Luke agree in introducing the term &quot;heart.&quot; He wonders whether Mark avoided it. He rates this as (III/II) (p. 132). While he would not exclude independent redaction he does not find it sufficiently compelling as a solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>§ 26.11</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,20</td>
<td>Mt 13,23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in number. Matthew Sing // Luke Plur.</td>
<td>Not treated specifically by Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> p. 133. Overall he considers that while independent redaction is a possible explanation the elimination of the misunderstanding of the disciples, and the way that the text has been restructured suggest literary dependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>§ 26.11</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,20</td>
<td>Mt 13,23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in verb - Pres Part Act in Matthew // Aor Part Act in Luke.</td>
<td>The agreement here is only that Matthew and Luke agree in having a participle form of the verb used by Mark. Given it was the same verb it was not included in SCE. It could easily be the result of independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 § 27.1:1 § Mk 4,21</td>
<td>Mt (5,15) οὐδὲ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,16 Οὐδεὶς Οὐδεὶς (11,33)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in use of adjective by Luke // Matthew uses the coordinating conjunction.</td>
<td>For Lk 8,16 the SCE noted the parallels in Matt 5,15 and the Lukan doublet 11,33. There is certainly a partial agreement here in terms of negation that has been incorporated by Luke and Matthew, in their own ways. The saying is a recognised Mark-Q overlap (See Fleidermann, Mark and Q, pp. 75-80; Laufen, Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logenquelle und des Markusevangeliums, pp. 84,91). It is interesting to see that Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot; does not go into detail here noting that the saying is generally attributed as a Mark-Q overlap pp. 135-134. He also recognises the redactional activity of Luke and Matthew. Robinson, The Critical Edition of Q, p. 256, sees Lk 11:33 to be a Q passage and notes Lk 8:16 as a parallel and Gos. Thom 33.2.3. See Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 717, for a solid treatment of the tradition history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 § 27.2:1 § Mk 4,21</td>
<td>Mt (5,15) τιθέασιν αὐτῶν... ἄλλῃ</td>
<td>No – Yes - Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,16 (11,33) αὐτῶν... τίθησιν, ἄλλῃ</td>
<td>Yes – No - Yes</td>
<td>Variation in verb. Matthew 3rd plural // Luke 3rd sing. (Note: the verb is already in Mark).</td>
<td>The agreement in αὐτῶν was noted in the SCE not the verb given that the same verb is used in the Markan text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 § 27.3 § Mk 4,21</td>
<td>Mt (5,15) καὶ λύσαει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,16 ἰνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέψωσιν τὸ φῶς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>There is no verbal agreement in this section, though the idea of providing light for all the people in the house is certainly present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>§ 27.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,22</td>
<td>Mt 10,26 κεκαλυμμένον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,17 (12,2) συγκεκαλυμμένον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Different related verbs are used - partial agreement.</td>
<td>Here is an example of how well established sayings may have high levels of correspondence in content, low levels of verbal agreement. Luke is consistent in the doublet, even there minor changes in word order are present. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 717, makes some suggestions as to the ways in which the three sayings in Lk 8,16-18 are related to their doubles in Lk 11,13; 12,2 and 19,26. There are not only doubles the Q forms of these sayings have probably influenced how Luke incorporated the Markan forms of the sayings. This indicates that not only were certain sayings preserved in multiple forms (both written and oral) that written and oral traditions continue to impact on one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>§ 29.2:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,31</td>
<td>Mt 13,31-32 αυτού</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 13,19 ἐκατοτού</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor variation.</td>
<td>According to the conventions used in the SCE this was indicated Luke 12,2 as a different verb indicated in the footnote MONAGHAN, Matthew, (n.102) p. 61. It was the practice of SCE to indicate compound verbs as different verbs show the agreement in the Greek text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>§ 29.3:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4.31</td>
<td>Mt 13,32 ὑπάρχοντα</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 13,19 ὑπάρχοντα</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in tense.</td>
<td>Redactional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>§ 31.1:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 4.35</td>
<td>Mt 8,18 ο Ησσούς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,22 συτός</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 140, ranks this as (III). Here again it is interesting to see how the layout of HICK-GREEVEN, Synopse, p. 47, and ALAND, Synopsis, p. 76, impact on the judgement of Neirynck and Ennulat. Aland notes the parallel, in such a way where one is led to already look at Mt 8,18 as not a direct or perhaps consequential element in the interpretative task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>§ 31.3:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4.36</td>
<td>Mt 8,23 ἐμβάντα</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,22 ἐνεβη</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the verb.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 140, rates this agreement as (III/II). He doesn’t exclude independent redaction he notes the stylistic link with Mt 9,1 and observes that Luke’s and Matthew’s usage converge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>§ 31.5:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4.37</td>
<td>Mt 8,24 ἐν τῇ παράλυσι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,23 εἰς τὴν λίμνην</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 141, rates this a (II). He argues that Matthew and Luke had some reference to the Sea of Gennesaret in their Markan Vorlage. That may be so, here there is a story of a storm at sea. That Matthew and Luke mention the sea or the lake in different ways is easily to be explained as independent redaction, and as some convergence on a detail. How is it to be evaluated? This could easily be coincidence or another example of the sort of general agreement in a detail to be aligned with the impact of oral tradition, memory or independent redaction. FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 729, judges this to be a Lukan addition more accurately referring to the waters of Gennesaret as a lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>§ 31.8:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 4.38</td>
<td>Mt 8,25 ὑπήκορον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,24 διήγεραν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Luke uses a different related</td>
<td>The SCE noted the use of different verbs by Matthew and Luke. The agreement in tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>§ 31.14:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 4,41</td>
<td>Mt 8,27</td>
<td>oι άνεμοι</td>
<td>No ...... Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,25</td>
<td>οις άνεμοις</td>
<td>No...... Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>§ 32.3:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 5,2</td>
<td>Mt 8,28</td>
<td>δαιμονιζόμενοι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,27</td>
<td>δαιμόνια</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 § 32.13:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 5,13</td>
<td>Mt 8,32 οἱ δαιμόνες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,33 τὰ δαιμόνια</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in the nouns used.</td>
<td>NEIRYNCK, Horizontal-Line Synopsis is quite correct about pointing to the possibility of this being a minor agreement. Given the difference in sequence and in gender the SCE did not note it. Interesting that ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, notes this and rates it (III) p. 148. On reflection I stand by my initial judgement, agree it's a partial minor agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 § 32.16:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 5,14-15</td>
<td>Mt 8,34 ἐξήλθεν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 8,35 ἐξήλθον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke agree in the compound verb vary in number.</td>
<td>The difference in number is due to the fact that the subject in Matthew is the city, whereas in Luke it's the city and the country, and therefore plural. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 149, notes the patterns of avoidance in (n.45, 46, 47). See NEIRYNCK, The Minor Agreements, pp. 252-254, for the patterns of either changing simple verbs to compound and vice versa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 § 32.19:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 5,18</td>
<td>Mt (9,1) ἐμβὰς ἑπέστρεψεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,37 ἐμβὰς ὑπεστρεψεν.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Matthew and Luke agree in tense of first participle. The second verb used different, and not noted as an agreement.</td>
<td>NEIRYNCK, Horizontal-Line Synopsis is correct in noting the similarity in language, it needs to be acknowledged that the phrase is part of the story of the demoniac in Luke. It is used by Matthew as a transition into the story of the healing of the paralytic, whereas Luke moves on to the story of Jairus. It is noted by Neirynck that there is displacement, and that it is not the primary parallel. Given this displacement SCE did not note the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>§ 33.5:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 5,23</td>
<td>Mt 9,18 ἔτελευτησεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 8,42 ἀπέθνησεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Neirynck, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 153, ranks this change (I/II) and cannot see how this could be due to independent redaction, though he does note the different ways they modify the Markan phrase. He also notes that Mark’s phrase ἐσχάτως ἔχει is a hapax. Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em>, p. 743, mentions the minor agreements in Lk 8:46-48 and sees only the shared mention of the hem of the garment as having any significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>§ 34.5</td>
<td>§ Mk 6,3</td>
<td>Mt 13,55 ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 4,22 ἱοσήφ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke refer to Jesus as the son of the carpenter, or the son of Joseph. Mark speaks of Jesus the carpenter and the son of Mary. Matthew modifies the noun from Mark whereas Luke adds the name of Joseph to the context. Neirynck, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, pp. 159–161, rates this (II/I) and sees this change, despite the variation, to be due dependence on a recension taken up by Matthew and Luke in their own fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>§ 35.5:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 6,7</td>
<td>Mt 10,1 καὶ θεραπεύειν .....νόσον Mt (10:8) δαιμόνια</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,1 τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in word order of healing and the number of the noun disease.</td>
<td>The healing of diseases provides no problem as a minor agreement, and SCE agrees with Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em>. It is true that the noun δαιμόνια is found in both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>§ 35.6 § Mk 6,7 (om)</td>
<td>Mt (10,7) ηρώσσετε... ό βασιλεία</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,2 κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Matthew uses Sing / Luke uses Plur.</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke, and that it is in the same general context. However, Mk 6,7 and Mt 10,1 both refer to unclean spirits as opposed to Luke 9,1 referring to demoniacs. Mt 10,8 agrees with Mk 6,12 regarding δήμιονας. It is difficult to see it as an agreement against Mark. Ennulat, &quot;Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 162, acknowledges the difficulties in studying the minor agreements in Mk 6,6b-13 due to the fact that is judged to be a Mark – Q overlap. Despite that he would still argue that there are correspondences that can be traced back to dependence on a recension. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX), p. 753, judges the differences in Lk 9,2 as due to Lukan redaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>§ 35.7 § Mk 6,7 (om)</td>
<td>Mt (10,8) θεραπευέτε</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,2 ἰεροθεαπευόμενον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Different verb of healing used in the two contexts.</td>
<td>See Monaghan, Luke, p. 84, where this has been treated. The differences were noted and Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis, placed Mt 10,8 in brackets as a secondary parallel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>§ 35.9:1 § Mk 6,8</td>
<td>Mt 10,9-10 μὴ δέ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,3 μὴ δέ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Luke is consistent is using a different negative coordinating conjunction.</td>
<td>Mark uses μὴ for all the things not to be taken on the road where Matthew's preference is for μὴ δὲ in Mt 10,9-10 where Luke prefers using μὴ δέ in Lk 9,3 Matthew and Luke agree in removing the Markan exception of taking a staff on the journey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>§ 36.2:1 § Mk 6.14</td>
<td>Mt 14,1 τὴν ακοὴν Ἰησοῦ,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,7 τα γινόμενα πάντα</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>In interesting to see that Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, focuses on the mention of the tetrarch which is a clear minor agreement, does not look at the phrase identified in Neiryck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis.</em> Matthew, Mark and Luke all shape this episode in their own fashion with their own introductory material, and there is no compelling reason to see any minor agreement against Mark. See Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (1-IX),</em> p. 757, for an evaluation of the Lukan modifications to the Markan passage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>§ 38.4:1 § Mk 6.32</td>
<td>Mt 14,13 ἀνεχώρησαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,10 ὑπεχώρησαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the compound verbs used by Matthew and Luke.</td>
<td>See Monaghan, Luke, (n.260), p. 72, and Matthew, p. 89, where the similarity and the difference was noted. For consideration of the minor agreements in Lk 9,10-17 see Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (1-IX),</em> p. 763, where he deals with the possibility of whether two different sources lie behind the account of the feeding of the five thousand. His judgement is that Mark is the primary source, that Luke is influenced by another tradition incorporated in the process of redaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>§ 38.5:1 § Mk 6.33</td>
<td>Mt 14,13 ἀκούσαντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,11 γνώντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement in verbs uses. Agreement in using Aor Part Act Masc Nom Plur.</td>
<td>There is no difficulty with the minor agreement of the crowds following Jesus. However, there are different verbs used by Matthew and Luke for knowing about Jesus’ location, and Mark uses the compound verb ἐπανέστησαν. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 170, does note that Matthew and Luke agree in replacing Mark’s parataxis with a participle construction (see Neiryck, <em>The Minor Agreements</em>, p. 207) and rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>§ 38.9</td>
<td>§ Mk 6,34 (om)</td>
<td>Mt 14,14 και ἑθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρράστους αὐτῶν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,11 καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπεῖας ἱάτο.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No direct verbal agreement. The closest is the verb for healing illness, and the noun illness.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>§ 38.13</td>
<td>§ Mk 6,36</td>
<td>Mt 14,15 τοὺς ὀχλοὺς</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,12 τὸν ὀχλὸν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in number.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke agree in using crowd/s instead of Mk’s “them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>§ 38.15.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 6,37</td>
<td>Mt 14,16 ἔχουσιν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (9,11) ἔχοντας</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in context – not sufficiently close.</td>
<td>It was not judged to be a direct parallel, and while it is in the same general context it is not in the same specific context in the narrative. In Matthew it is part of Jesus’ dialogue with the disciples. In Luke it is part of the introduction to the narrative. At best this is a partial minor agreement. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em> notes the displacement by placing it in brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>§ 49.8.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 8,30</td>
<td>Mt 16,20 διεστέλλετο</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,21 παρῆγγειλεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>There is no verbal agreement. Matthew, Mark and Luke all agree in having Jesus commanding the disciples not to speak about him. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 188, notes how Mark’s theme of Jesus being on the way has been eliminated by both Matthew and Luke, and he notes the consistency of both changing other Christological sayings. Ennulat rates this (II/III) one notes how guarded his claim for a recension actually is. Ennulat claims that it seems not impossible that the Markan text was modified by the addition of διαστέλλωμα, and that Luke decided to...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>§ 50.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 8,34</td>
<td>Mt 16,24 ἐλθεῖν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 9,23 ἔρχεσθαι</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the same verb.</td>
<td>In both volumes of the SCE the similarity and differences are indicated and accompanying footnotes provided (Monaghan, Matthew, pp. 100-101, Luke, pp. 74-75). Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, pp. 188-189, looks at the three Markan passion predictions together for two reasons. The first is that on compositional grounds they belong together, and second, that they repeat certain correspondences between Matthew and Luke against Mark. He notes the possible reasons being suggested, a pre-Markan tradition, special source, influence of Q, or the influence of Matthew on Luke. Ennulat argues for a distinct and identifiable tendency in the post-Markan re-working of the passion predictions (p. 95). He believes the correspondences cannot be adequately explained on the basis of independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>§ 51.6:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 9,4</td>
<td>Mt 17,3 Μωϋσῆς καὶ ἀλλήλου</td>
<td>Yes - minor correction needed in English</td>
<td>Matthean text</td>
<td>Lk 9,30 ἀλλήλου, ...Μωϋσῆς καὶ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Agreement in Matthew and Luke in gender in the Markan noun (Moses). Use of pronoun in a different case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>§ 51.9:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 9,7</td>
<td>Mt 17,5 έτι αὐτοῦ λαλούντος</td>
<td>No - minor correction needed i.e. underline pronoun</td>
<td>Lk 9,34 ταύτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντας</td>
<td>No - minor correction needed i.e. underline pronoun</td>
<td>Variation in verb.</td>
<td>(See Mk 3,31). There is an agreement in using a participle construction of pronoun + a verb of saying, the verb used by Matthew and Luke is not the same. ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, p. 206, rates the use of the phrase &quot;while he was still speaking&quot; as (II/III). He notes that the Lukan phrase here is unusual. It is argued that it is more likely that what we have in Luke is probably closer to the Markan re-worked text than Matthew who is already being consistent with Mk 5,35 and 14,43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>§ 53.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 9,14</td>
<td>Mt 17,14 εἰδόντων</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,37 κατελθόντων</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Luke uses a compound verb while Matthew agrees with the Markan verb. The agreement is in having an Aor Par Act Masc Plur Gen.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, pp. 208-209, notes how Matthew and Luke agree not only in verbal correspondences, also in their abbreviating of the Markan pericope. This particular detail is not treated. Ennulat is convinced that there is a post-Markan reworking of the text that was much abbreviated (p. 213). FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke</em> (I-IX), p. 806, lists the minor agreements in this episode and while he is tempted to think that Matthew and Luke have substituted a shorter Q episode he is convinced the best solution is to see the Lukan version as a redaction of Mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>§ 53.4:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 9,17</td>
<td>Mt 17,14-15 ἀνθρώπος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,38 ἀνήρ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, p. 210, rates this as (III) and sees it to be the result of Matthean or Lukan redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>§ 53.5:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 9,17</td>
<td>Mt 17,15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 9,38</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal</td>
<td>See FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 55                          | § 53.21:2               | § Mk 9,27 | Mt 17,18 και ἑθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς | No | Lk 9,42 και ἱσσατο τὸν παιδῶν | No | Different verb of healing. Agreement in noun, variation in case. | Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", p. 213, notes the "sachlich" minor agreement of healing that is rated (I) indicating dependence on a recension. The difference in the verb for healing is rated (III), meaning it can be adequately explained as independent redaction. The use of παῖς rather than the diminutive used by Mark is an agreement and is noted. See Ennulat where this is rated (II) (p. 213). |
| 56                          | § 55.3                  | § Mk 9,34 | Mt 18,1 ἐστιν | No-correction needed | Lk 9,46 ἐίη | No-correction needed | Variation in verb to be. Matthew uses Pres Ind Act // Luke uses Pres Opt Act. | This minor agreement is partial present, and needs to be corrected in the SCE. It could easily be redactional, especially since Luke uses the rare form of the optative. Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", notes the usage on p. 215 and rates it (III). See Neirynck, The Minor Agreements, pp. 272 and 127ff. |
| 56                          | § 55.5                  | § Mk 9,35 | Mt 18,4 μεγέθους | No | Lk 9,48 μέγας | No | Variation in Matthew using comparative adjective // Luke uses the adjective. | Μεγέθους is used not in Mk 9,35, in the introductory phrase in 9,34. In the light of this it is difficult to see this as being introduced by dependence on a shared source. Matthew is consistent between 18,4 and Mt [23,11]. Luke 9,46 has μεγάς and concludes with μέγας. In Matthew's version the disciples ask the question outright, whereas Luke has Jesus perceiving their thoughts. Ennulat, Die "Minor Agreements", notes that both Matthew and Luke avoid the direct question Jesus puts to the disciples in Mark. Ennulat ranks the changes to Mk 9,35 |
Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in NEIRYCK, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>§ 58.3 § Mk 9,50 (om)</td>
<td>Mt 5,13 Βληθέν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 14,35 βάλλουσιν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in same verb. Luke uses Pres Ind Act // Matthew has the Aor Pass Part</td>
<td>The verb is clearly the same, Luke and Matthew vary in their usage. This is still part of the Mark-Q overlap. ROBINSON, The Critical Edition of Q, p. 460, opts for the Lukian form as being that of Q.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>§ 60.1 § Mk 10,13</td>
<td>Mt 19,13 προσεμέθησαν ..., ἐπέτιμησαν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 18,15 Προσέφερον ..., ἐπέτιμων</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Matthew and Luke vary in using the same verb found in Mark</td>
<td>In this instance both Matthew and Luke use the same two verbs as Mark. The variation is between Aor Ind Pass (Matthew) and the Impf Ind Act (Mark and Luke). In the second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be (II) arguing that the agreement is unlikely as coincidental redaction (p. 215). For the episode ENNULAT argues for a pre-Matthean and Lukian re-working of Mark with a heightened Christological emphasis (p. 217). See FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IV), pp. 815-816. His assessment is that these matters of relationship and dependence are difficult to assess in the face of the Markan doublet that both Matthew and Luke pick up and develop in their own manner.
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>§ 61.2:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 10,17</td>
<td>Mt 19,16 ἐίπεν</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 18,18 λέγει</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in tense of the verb.</td>
<td>For accuracy this should be corrected in the SCE. There is agreement in having a verb of saying even if Matthew uses the Aor Ind Act and Luke the Pres Part Act. This agreement is not treated by ENNULAT, and it is most likely due to independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>§ 61.4:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 10,20</td>
<td>Mt 19,20 λέγει</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 18,21 ἐίπεν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in tense of the verb.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 225, rates the change of the Markan verb (II/I) by Matthew and Luke as hardly redactional given that in 5 of 6 occasions when Mark uses φημῃ in the Impf it is avoided. He notes that Matthew and Luke introduce it into Markan material see (n.29), p. 225. Such a minor agreement with variation hardly indicates dependence on a recension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>§ 63.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 10,28</td>
<td>Mt 19,27 Τότε</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 18,28 δὲ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 231, notes how Matthew and Luke both agree in introducing the question of Peter with a conjunction and rates it (III). On the face of it the convergence combined with the variation would suggest independent and coincidental redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>§ 64.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 10,34</td>
<td>Mt 20,19 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 18,33 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in word order and addition of definite article.</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke agree in mentioning the third day. It is interesting to note that in this instance Luke has Art Noun Art Adj whereas in Lk 9,22; 24,7,46 the sequence is Art Adj Noun as found in Mt 20,19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 62             | § 67.4                  | § Mk 10,47 | Mt 20,30 ἔκραξαν λέγοντες | No | Lk 18,38 ἔβοσκεν λέγαν | No | Variation in verb and number. | Both Matthew and Luke use different verbs for “crying out”, and Matthew has this in the plural. There is agreement in using the Aor Ind Act rather than Mark’s "he began to cry
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>§ 68.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,1</td>
<td>Mt 21,1 ἡγίσαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 19,29 ἐς ἡγίσαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in number of the verb.</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke agree in using the Aorist rather than the historic present found in Mark. However they disagree in number. It is a redactional and stylistic variation. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 246, rates this verse (II/II) and notes that Luke uses the same construction in Lk 15,25 and Lk 19,41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>§ 68.8</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,4</td>
<td>Mt 21,6 ἑρεμήθεντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 19,32 ἀπεκλήθεντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement, agreement in the use of Aor Part Act Masc Nom Plur.</td>
<td>Not mentioned by Ennulat. The verb used by Luke is the verb already found in Mark. Matthew chooses a different verb of movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>§ 68.12</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,7</td>
<td>Mt 21,7 ἐπεκάθησαν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 19,35 ἐπεβίβασαν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Different verb and subject.</td>
<td>In Matthew Jesus sits upon the animal, in Luke he is placed upon it. The only agreement here is that both verbs are compound, and share the prefix ἐπ. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 249, rates this as (III/II). He notes this could go back to a recension used by Matthew and Luke. The argument is hardly conclusive. It could just as easily be due to independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>§ 68.14</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,8</td>
<td>Mt 21,8 ἑσπράϊνουν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 19,36 ὑπεστράϊνον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation of compound verb in Luke // simple verb</td>
<td>Mark has the people strewwing their garments on the road as does Luke who uses the compound verb which Monaghan, Luke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>§ 68.15.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,9</td>
<td>Mt 21,9 ὑζλοι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 19,37 ἐλθείος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Different noun used.</td>
<td>in Matthew. Agreement in tense, voice, and number. (n.546), p. 148, recognizes. Matthew uses the Markan verb has two actions, the first consisting of strewing garments on the road, the second strewing the branches on the road. Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 249, finds it noteworthy that Matthew and Luke agree in using the imperfect tense does not rate it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>§ 68.17</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,9 (om)</td>
<td>Mt (21,15) ἰδόντες</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 19,37 εἶδον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in verb of seeing.</td>
<td>This looks to be largely coincidental, though there is a partial agreement in the concept of seeing the marvels/wonders Jesus is doing. The subject is different. In Luke it is the multitude of the disciples and in Matthew it is the high priests and scribes. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em> places it in brackets. This agreement is not treated by Ennulat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>§ 68.19</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,10</td>
<td>Mt (21,16) εἰσαν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 19,39 εἰσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation is the addition of the preposition in Luke.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>§ 69.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,11</td>
<td>Mt 21,17 ἐπιλείσθη</td>
<td>No – possible correction</td>
<td>Lk (21,37) ἐπιλέξετο</td>
<td>No – possible correction</td>
<td>Variation in use of Aor Ind Pass by Matthew/Impf Ind Midd by Luke.</td>
<td>Here is a good example of how far the context should extend when suggesting a parallel. It is true both Matthew and Luke have Jesus lodging, in different contexts. Aland, <em>Synopsis</em>, p. 237, does not emphasise it as a parallel, not does Hck-Greeven, <em>Synopse</em>, p. 195. On consideration SCE did</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>§ 72.1 § Mk 11.22-23</td>
<td>Mt (17,20) ἐρείτε 21,20</td>
<td>Yes - possible minor correction needed for Greek text</td>
<td>Lk (17,6) ἐλέγετε</td>
<td>Yes - possible minor correction to Greek text needed</td>
<td>Variation in tense, agreement in person and number.</td>
<td>Matthew, Mark and Luke all agree in having a saying about faith. Mark and Matthew agree in referring to a mountain. Luke is unique in applying it to the mulberry tree. Robinson, <em>The Critical Edition of Q,</em> pp. 492-493, has the saying about the mustard seed as a Q saying, and the reference to the mulberry tree is Q. The Gospel of Thomas 48, talks about the mountain. Ennulat, <em>Die “Minor Agreements,”</em> p. 258, notes the complexity and difficulties for his task given the Q parallel. (See Fleddermann, <em>Mark and Q,</em> pp. 178-182.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>§ 73.2:1 § Mk 11.27</td>
<td>Mt 21,23 διδάσκοντι</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 20,1 διδάσκοντος</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in case of the Pres Part Act.</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die “Minor Agreements,”</em> p. 259, notes that both Matthew and Luke replace the idea of Jesus being approached when he was walking for teaching. Generally this change is seen to be independent redaction. He considers it to be traditionally conditioned in some way and rates it (II/I). For the section in general Mk 11.27-33 Ennulat thinks that it has been structurally altered, and the best explanation is dependence on a recension (pp. 262-263). See Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>§ 73.3:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,27-28</td>
<td>Mt 21,23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,1-2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in application of the phrase.</td>
<td>This agreement was not included in SCE and it raises the question of what is identified as a parallel. In Luke τὸν λαοῦ in the introductory phrase, and the object of the verb is the people since they are being taught by Jesus. In Matthew the object of Jesus' teaching is not mentioned, and τοῦ λαοῦ is used to further identify the priests as priests &quot;of the people&quot;. Is this a minor agreement or not? The same word is there the application is completely different. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 260, notes the use of the word, and the fact that it is used differently. He rates it as (III) and notes that Mt 2,4; 21,23; 26,3,47; 27,1 uses this to describe Jewish authorities as being &quot;of the people&quot; on a number of occasions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>§ 73.10:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,32</td>
<td>Mt 21,26 φοβοῦμεθα</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,6 ημεις</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>The only similarity that can be detected here is that of the idea of the 1st person plural referring to the Jewish authorities. This is not treated by Ennulat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>§ 73.11:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 11,32</td>
<td>Mt 21,6 ἔχουσιν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,6 ἔστιν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>The agreement is the use of a verb in the Pres Ind Act, there is variation in both the verb used, and the number. Matthew has the same verb as Mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>§ 74.14</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,10 (om)</td>
<td>Mt 21,42 λέγει αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,16-17 αὐτοῖς ἐίπεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Agreement in personal pronoun and that the verb is a verb of saying. Variation in tense.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 267, notes this and ranks it (III/II). Both Matthew and Luke change Mark's transition to the saying adding an introductory clause to the quotation from the Psalm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>§ 75.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,15</td>
<td>Mt 22,18 γνωř ... πονηρίαν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,23 κατανοήσας πανοργίαν Lk (20,20)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement except for partial</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 271, notes the different verbs for knowing, emphasizes that both Matthew and Luke use...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>§ 75.5:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,15</td>
<td>Mt 22,19 ἐπιδείξατέ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 20,24 ἔδιξατε</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>There is variation between the compound verb in Matthew and the simple verb used in Luke.</td>
<td>There is verbal agreement in the stem of the verb and in the use of the Aor Ind Act 2nd Per Plur. Given that Mark uses another verb entirely (ἐφεπείτε) this is judged to be a significant agreement. <strong>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</strong> pp. 272-273, notes that Matthew and Luke make it clear that the opponents actually carry the coins of Caesar. In this way the demand to show the coins presumes they have them. He rates the change as (II) and the omission of Mark’s ἱκετεύσεως (III).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>§ 75.7</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,17</td>
<td>Mt 22,21 οὖν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,25 τοινον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement</td>
<td><strong>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</strong> pp. 272-273, rates the minor agreements in this verse (III/II).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>§ 75.8</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,17</td>
<td>Mt 22,22 ἐθαμάσασθαν…</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 20,26 θαμασάσθαντες…</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial agreement in Matthew and Luke.</td>
<td>In this instance Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in using the simple form of the verb rather than Mark’s ἐξήθαμασθοῦν. On the other hand, they do so in different ways (Matthew - Aor Ind Act // Luke - Aor Part</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table continues with more entries.*
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>§ 756.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,18</td>
<td>Mt 22,23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 20,27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same compound verb stem. Variation in Aor Ind Act in Matthew//Aor Part Act Nom Masc Plur in Luke.</td>
<td>Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>προσήλθων</td>
<td></td>
<td>Προσελήντες</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act. Ennulat, <em>Die “Minor Agreements”,</em> p. 273, rates this (II). See Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements</em>, p. 252, regarding the preferred simplex form of the verb. The second agreement is noted by Ennulat and rated (III) (p. 273). He sees that matters can also be explained as a transfer of Mk 12.12b (noted in Monaghan, Matthew (n. 227), p. 134); however, it can also be explained as depending on a recension. To Ennulat’s credit he is trying to be scrupulously fair, which is just as well given the lack of verbal agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>§ 76.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,20</td>
<td>Mt 22,25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement in any of the examples.</td>
<td>For the usage of these two parts of speech see Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements</em>, pp. 203-204. Ennulat, <em>Die “Minor Agreements”,</em> (n.31), p. 276, refers to Neirynck, <em>The Minor Agreements</em>, pp. 211-213. Ennulat sees the combination of these parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.... γῆμας... ἐπελεύσαν</td>
<td></td>
<td>οὖν... λαβὼν... ἀπέθανεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He argues that Mark has been re-worked prior to Matthew and Luke, and that they have independently re-worked the re-worked text (III). The last two elements indicated in Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em> are not treated by Ennulat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>§ 76.8</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,24</td>
<td>Mt 22,29</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,34</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above shows variations in agreements identified in Neirynck’s *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.* The entries indicate whether the agreements are noted in Matthew, SCE in Matthew, SCE in Luke, and whether they are noted in Luke. The comments provide context for the agreements, including Ennulat's analysis and the historical and textual implications.*
Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>§ 76.9</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,25</td>
<td>Mt 22,30 τῆς ἀναστάσει</td>
<td>Yes - correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 20,35 τῆς ἀναστάσεως</td>
<td>No - correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in case.</td>
<td>Matthew uses the noun resurrection twice in Mt 22,30,31. In Luke the noun is used three times in Lk 20,33,35,36. Mark only has the verb in 12,25, has the noun in 12,23. Here is a good example of how complicated matters can become in determining minor agreements. Monaghan, Luke, p. 156, has a minor agreement noted in Lk 20,36. Monaghan, Matthew p. 1.3, takes the second reference as a minor agreement in Greek. Given that the word is already present in Mark the minor agreement has to be such when Mark has the verb, and the others have the noun. Clearly Lukian and Matthean redactions have to be considered as playing a role here. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 277, makes mention of the omission of the verb &quot;to rise&quot; and its replacement by the substantive &quot;resurrection&quot;. He observes in (n.36) that Luke uses the noun in uniquely Lukian material in Lk 2,34; 14,14; Acts 24,15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>§ 77.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,28</td>
<td>Mt 22,35 πειράζων</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 10.25 ἐκπειράζων</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in Matthew using the simple verb and Luke using the compound verb.</td>
<td>Monaghan, Luke, (n. 3.31), p. 86, and Matthew (n. 2.31), p. 135, both indicate the agreement and variation. Ennulat, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, pp. 283-284, notes that usually this is seen to be Q or independent redaction. He finds both possibilities unlikely. Robinson, The Critical edition of Q, p. 200, concurs. Ennulat rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>§ 77.1:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,28</td>
<td>Mt (22,34) ἐφίμοσεν τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,40 ὑπέτει γὰρ ἐτόλμασεν ἐπεφυτέαν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is no verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke agree in noting Jesus’ impact in either silencing the Sadducees, or the scribes not daring to ask him a question. Given the variation and lack of verbal agreement this looks like free redaction with an emphasis on the response of the Jewish religious authorities to Jesus’ teaching. Is this based on oral tradition, memory or coincidence? See ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreement”, p. 287, for his judgement that it is due to dependence on a recension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>§ 77.4:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,29-30</td>
<td>Mt 22,37 αὐτῷ</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 10,26 αὐτὸν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in case.</td>
<td>This variation is determined by the constructions used. It is minor variation of a very minor agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>§ 77.8:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,34</td>
<td>Mt (22,46) οὐδὲ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,40 γὰρ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>The agreement here is that both Matthew and Luke use a conjunction, though there is clear variation. Other than that they agree in changing the word order. See ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreement”, p. 287, rates this (III).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>§ 78.3:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,36</td>
<td>Mt 22,43 καλεῖ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,42 λέγει</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Luke uses the Markan verb in the Pres Ind Act in contrast to Mark’s Aor Ind Act. Matthew and Luke agree in having a different tense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>§ 79.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,37-38</td>
<td>Mt 23,1 ἐλάλησεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 20,45 εἶπεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low verbal agreement – same tense different</td>
<td>With verbs of saying it is hardly a strong indication of agreement, or of dependence and best interpreted as the result of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Neirynck HLS reference</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>SCE Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>SCE Luke</th>
<th>Type of variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>§ 79.2:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 12,38</td>
<td>Mt 23,6 φιλούσιν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 20,46 φιλούστων</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variable in Pres Ind Act in Matthew //Pres Part Act in Luke</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>§ 81.4</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,2</td>
<td>Mt 24,2 ἀφίην λέγει ὑμῖν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 21,6 ἔλεγον ἡμέρει ἑν αἷς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 297, notes the prophetic cast of the saying (despite the obvious differences) and rates this as (II) noting how the Lukan phrase is very similar to Lk 17, 22 and not noted by Aland, Synopsis. He finds it difficult to see this as Lukan redaction, and argues that Luke already knew at Lk 17,22ff that the phrase would be used in Lk 21. It is difficult to see how that would be the case (that's if I have understood this correctly). He argues that Matthew has changed the prophetic phrase to his more frequently used &quot;Amen I say to you&quot; formula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>§ 82.4:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,8</td>
<td>Mt 24,7 καὶ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 21,11 τε</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Variation in coordinating conjunction used.</td>
<td>In this saying both Matthew and Luke agree in using more coordinating conjunctions with καὶ being the most prominent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>§ 83.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,9</td>
<td>Mt [10,17] Γὰρ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 21,12 (12,11) -</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, pp. 300 - 301, argues that both Matthew and Luke ground the saying with the use of γὰρ and avoid the asyndetic sentence structure of Mark. (See Neirynck, The Minor Agreements,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in **Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>§ 83.9</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,12</td>
<td>Mt 24,9 ὑμῖν</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 21,16 ἐν ὑμῖν</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in case.</td>
<td>p. 211f). The convergence of Matthew and Luke in this sentence structure here is rated as (II/I). The argument is clear. Luke only uses the coordinating conjunction in Lk 21,9. There is no use of it in the context of this particular saying. In the general context this conjunction is used by both Matthew and Luke not in the same way. This looks to be more a correspondence that comes through independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>§ 84.2</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,15</td>
<td>Mt 24,17 τὰ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (17,31) κοίτα</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Matthew uses the definite article // Luke uses the pronoun.</td>
<td>The article and the pronoun agree in being in the Neut Plur and Acc. Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>”, p. 312, notes this and rates it (III).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>§ 85.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,21</td>
<td>Mt (24,26) μὴ ἔσεσθε</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (17,23) μὴ ἔσεσθε</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in the compound verb used. Partial agreement in the use of the Aor Subj Act 2nd Pers Plur.</td>
<td>Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>”, p. 313, notes that there is no direct Lukan parallel to this Markan text draws attention in Lk 17,23. He acknowledges the probability of the influence of a Q variant here (p. 314). Ennulat recognises that the abbreviation of the Markan text by Luke makes a certain judgement almost impossible. Mark-Q overlap also has to be considered, along with Matthean and Lukan redaction and stylistic improvement. All this makes determining minor agreements very difficult indeed. Mt 24,23 is deemed to be the parallel to Mk 13,21 and there are clear points of contact with Lk (17,23) and Mt (24,26) that are not deemed to be direct parallels in Neirynck. See Fitzmyer, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)</em>, pp. 1164-1165, for a discussion of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>§ 86.3</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,26</td>
<td>Mt 24,30 καὶ τότε κύψονται πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 21,26-27 ἀποσφυγέων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φύσιν καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke agree in having additional material that addresses the response of tribes of the earth and the people generally. For the section Mk 13,24-27 Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> p. 317, mentions only a small number of correspondences, and they are still judged to be noteworthy and post-Markan in origin. He judges them to be traceable despite the &quot;sprachlich unterschiedlicher Ausformungen&quot; in the Matthean and Lukan texts. This particular agreement is not addressed by Ennulat. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em> is correct in identifying this as worthy of attention, it looks more like redactional activity that coincides in tendency than anything else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>§ 88.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 13,33</td>
<td>Mk (25,13) οὖν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 21,36 δὲ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement. Both Matthew and Luke have a coordinating conjunction.</td>
<td>This is a partial minor agreement at best with both agreeing in having a coordinating conjunction. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em> notes Mt 25,13-15 as a secondary parallel. Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> p. 317, wisely makes the observation that the materials in this section can only be examined in a very fragmentary way when there are no direct parallels to the section p. 319. Ennulat makes the point that given Luke’s radical abbreviating of the text only 50% of the passage Mk 13,1-37 is comparable in the first instance (pp. 319-320). He is not convinced of a Lukan Nebenquelle, or a pre-synoptic level either.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>§ 88.3 § Mk 13,34</td>
<td>Mt 25,14 ἐκάλεσέν... παρέδωκεν</td>
<td>Yes  Yes</td>
<td>Lk 19,13 καλέσας... ἐδοκεν</td>
<td>Yes  Yes</td>
<td>Variation in mood. Variation - Matthew uses the compound verb // Luke uses the simple verb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is certainly agreement here the Parable of the Pounds has no Markan parallel. Given that this is a Q passage it is hardly a minor agreement except that Mk 13,34 has the idea of a man going on a journey and leaving slaves in charge (See Robinson, <em>The Critical Edition of Q</em>, pp. 524-556). FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)</em>, pp. 1228-1232, judges that the form of Q was probably closer to that found in Matthew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>§ 90.4 § Mk 14,4</td>
<td>Mt 26,8 ἱδόντες... λέγοντες</td>
<td>No - correction needed Yes</td>
<td>Lk 7,39 ἱδόν... λέγειν</td>
<td>No - correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in number and subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a clear similarity in this that the SCE should have identified and it needs to be corrected. ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, rates the verb of seeing (III/IV) p. 329, noting that the impact of the Markan text on Luke should not be excluded. There is a similarity in construction how is it to be interpreted? See FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)</em>, p. 686, where he considers that the story of the sinful woman is not so much a re-working of Mark, as much as a tradition which existed in different forms in the oral tradition. This has much to commend it as a suggestion. The only caveat would be to not assume that the oral tradition was limited to an earlier phase of the tradition history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>§ 90:5:1 § Mk 14,5-6</td>
<td>Mt 26,10 αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 7,40 αὐτόν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in case and number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is nothing unusual to have a personal pronoun after a verb of saying. Does this indicate literary dependence? ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;</em>, pp. 329-30, rates this as (III). Mention is made of the Lukan tendency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>§ 90.7</td>
<td>§ Mk 14.8</td>
<td>Mt 26,12 γὰρ μήρον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 7,46 δὲ μήρῳ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>§ 91.1</td>
<td>§ Mk 14.10</td>
<td>Mt 26,14 ὁ λεγόμενος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 22,3 τὸν καλούμενον</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>§ 93.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 14.17-18</td>
<td>Mt 26,20 ἀνέκειτο</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 22,4 ἀνέπεσεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>§ 93.3</td>
<td>§ Mk 14.19</td>
<td>Mt 26,22 εἰμι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk [22,23] εἶν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>§ 94.5</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,25</td>
<td>Mt 26,29 ἀπ ἀρτί</td>
<td>Lk (22,18) ἀπό τοῦ νόν</td>
<td>No – correction needed ἀπ'</td>
<td>No – correction needed ἀπό</td>
<td>Partial verbal agreement in the use of the preposition.</td>
<td>The Markan text uses οὐκετές whereas both Matthew and Luke have some variation of ἀπ' and some adverb or noun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>§ 96.1:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,32</td>
<td>Mt 26,36 ἔρχεται</td>
<td>Lk 22,40 γενομένος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em> has drawn attention to the agreement in the use of the verb in the singular applying it to Jesus. Different verbs are used. Matthew also uses the same verb as Mark. This agreement is not treated by Ennulat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>§ 96.5:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,36</td>
<td>Mt (26,42) γενήθητο τὸ θέλημα σου.</td>
<td>Lk 22,42 τὸ θέλημα μον… γίνεσθω</td>
<td>No – possible correction needed</td>
<td>No – possible correction needed</td>
<td>There is strong verbal agreement here, variation in the personal pronoun.</td>
<td>A text such as this is a fascinating one. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis</em>, sees Mt (26,42) is not the primary parallel. In Monaghan, <em>Matthew</em> p. 162, this phrase was linked with Mt 6,10 and the Our Father. Given the layout of ALAND, <em>Synopsis</em>, p. 298, that formed the basis of my work the correspondence was not noted. In Huck-Greeven, <em>Synopsis</em>, p. 254, the same is true. This provides a good test case for how agreements can be missed or noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Neirynck HLS</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>SCE Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>SCE Luke</th>
<th>Type of variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.1:3</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,43</td>
<td>Mt 26,47 ἢλθεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 22,47 προηχέτο</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>Neirynck is correct in drawing attention to the phrase, and the similarity in the construction. Here there is an instance of a similar phrase with variation. ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 350, observes how striking the phrase is, and gives a good overview of the range of explanations offered. He notes that generally Matthean redaction based on the Our Father is adopted to explain this and that the use of the same phrase in Acts 21,14 indicates that it is a traditional formula. He rates the correspondence (III/II) (p. 350). FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke</em>, p. 1442, notes the connection with Acts 21,14 and 22,14 and while it has a connection to the Matthean form of the Our Father it is not part of the Lukan one.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.3</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,45 (om)</td>
<td>Mt 26,50 ἐταῖρε, ἐφ’ ὁ πάρει</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 22,48 ἢδεια, φυλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ανθρώπου παραδόσεως;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>In SCE the introductory phrase &quot;Jesus said to him&quot; is noted as an agreement what follows is clearly different. ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 356, notes the agreement in that Jesus responds verbally to Judas. He judges that it is likely that Matthew and Luke used a common tradition. What relation this has to the Markan Vorlage is difficult to evaluate. This is rated (I/IV). FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)</em>, p.1448, judges Luke’s phrase to come from Luke’s pen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.4:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,45</td>
<td>Mt 26,51</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 22,49</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>There is no doubt a linguistic link between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.5</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,47</td>
<td>Mt 26,51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 22,49-50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in the same verb used.</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke agree in having the same verb, one needs to recognise that Luke has emphasised it with the addition of the disciples' question to Jesus about whether they would strike or not. The use of a different verb to Mark is noted by ENNULAT, &quot;Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 357, and rated (III).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.6</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,47</td>
<td>Mt 26,51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk (22,51)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ENNULAT, &quot;Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 357, notes how both Matthew and Luke avoid the Markan diminutive of ear. This is rated (II). In Lk 22,50 Luke uses an alternative noun to either Matthew or Mark. In Luke (22,51) the same noun is used by Matthew and Luke. The reason this is not a direct parallel is that Luke is the only one describing the healing of the ear. That Luke uses two nouns in the same context is noteworthy. See FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 145.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>§ 97.7</td>
<td>§ Mk 14,47</td>
<td>Mt 26,52</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 22,52</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very little verbal agreement.</td>
<td>This is such a frequently occurring phrase for both Matthew and Luke it is hard to judge it as an agreement. It needs to be recognised that the context is different. In Mt 26,52 Jesus is speaking to the disciple with the sword. In Lk 22,52 Jesus is speaking to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82 § 99.2:1</td>
<td>Mk 14,61</td>
<td>Mt 26,63 έπις</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 22,67 έπιον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation - Matthew uses Aor Subj Act // Aor Impv Act in Luke.</td>
<td>Both Matthew and Luke correspond in the demand of the High Priest for Jesus to tell them if he is the Christ. ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, p. 365, rates this as (III/IV) rates the Matthean and Lukan use of a conditional and more complicated sentence structure as (II). FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)</em>, p. 1458, attributes Lk 22,67-68 to L. Such an agreement can certainly be due to independent redaction given the variation, it could be indicative of an oral tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 § 99.3:2</td>
<td>Mk 14,62</td>
<td>Mt 26,64 αὐτὸ ... σὺ εἰπάς</td>
<td>No – possible correction</td>
<td>Lk 22,67, (22,70) αὐτοῖς ... (ὑμεῖς λέγετε)</td>
<td>No – possible correction</td>
<td>Variation in pronoun and verb. Matthew uses Sing // Luke uses Plur.</td>
<td>This material is very difficult to evaluate in terms of agreements regarding the pronouns and verbs of saying. Mark has a variety of verbs and tenses. It would seem that Matthew and Luke share the tendency to more frequently use pronouns for the indirect objects of verbs of saying than does Mark. Is that simply a stylistic difference and coincidence? ENNULAT, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements</em>, pp.366-367, draws attention to the lack of a direct reply &quot;I am&quot; found in Mk 14,62 as significant. Luke has two questions and two replies on the part of Jesus. This would partly explain the SCE not indicating the partial agreement. Ennlat notes that some argue for a special Lukan source, though the sentence construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 § 99.4</td>
<td>Mk 14,62</td>
<td>Mt 26,64 ἀπ’ ἀρπη</td>
<td>No – correction needed ἀπ’</td>
<td>Lk 22,69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῶν</td>
<td>No – correction needed ἀπὸ</td>
<td>Partial agreement in use of preposition.</td>
<td>could indicate Lukan redaction. The second response of Jesus corresponds to Matthew, and some have argued that Matthew and Luke draw on an older source here. He sees the opposite could also be true i.e. a post-Markan tradition. The phrase is rated (III/II). See Mk 14,25 where Matthew and Luke use the same constructions. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 367, observes that this agreement is often judged to be pre-Markan, or independent redaction on the part of Matthew and Luke. Ennulat rates it as (III/II). There is consistency in their similarity and difference that argues for them both relating the episode in their own way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 § 99.7</td>
<td>Mk 14,64</td>
<td>Mt 26,65-66 ἵκε νῶν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 22,71 γὰρ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement – Matthew uses Adverb // Luke uses Conjunction.</td>
<td>ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 368, rates this as (II/III) and highlights it as a significant agreement. That Matthew and Luke relate the event in their own manner is clear enough. For the scene as a whole Ennulat is not convinced of the need for recourse to a non-Markan source used by Matthew and Luke. He notes the amount of probable independent redaction, does not exclude the agreements as being the result of dependence on a recension (p. 369).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 § 100.1.2</td>
<td>Mk 14,66</td>
<td>Mt 26,69 ἐκαθῆμενο</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 22,56 καθήμενον</td>
<td>Yes (vs 55 not 56)</td>
<td>It would need to be noted that SCE used Lk 22,55 where Peter is mentioned as sitting and the verb is exactly the same. Lk 22,56 would then most likely be Lukan redaction picking up and repeating the detail. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 372, notes the repetition and the shared detail rating it (II). It is true that Mk 14,54 mentions Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>§ 100.6</td>
<td>Mk 14,69</td>
<td>Mt 26,71 ἀλλη</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 22,58 ἐτερος</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>sitting with the guards (συνεκκοθημενος). Both Matthew and Luke agree in using the simpler form of the verb. Ennulat wonders whether Luke might have had Mark’s sandwich arrangement before him. See (n. 18), p. 372. In (n. 19) he makes mention of Senior’s suggestion that Matthew’s use of the flashback could be redactional he looks at Luke’s repetition as hardly redactional. There is however, no reason why it couldn’t be the result of independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>§ 100.7:2</td>
<td>Mk 14,69</td>
<td>Mt 26,71 μετα</td>
<td>No – possible correction needed</td>
<td>Lk (22,59) μετ</td>
<td>No – possible correction needed</td>
<td>Here is a good example of the complexity of determining agreements in this sequence of challenges to Peter. Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis,</em> rightly notes Lk 22,59 as the secondary parallel. Mk uses μετα μετα εξ Mt has μετα μετα εξ Lk has συν εξ μετα Given this combination it is difficult to argue for a minor agreement in Matthew and Luke against Mark. Luke uses a different preposition for each question. If anything this shows how redactional activity is involved. Ennulat, <em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements,&quot;</em> p. 374, notes that if it is true that Luke has transferred the first and third challenge to Peter he finds it striking that there is a correspondence about being with Jesus and he rates it (II). This might be striking to him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference Neirynck HLS</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>SCE Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>SCE Luke</th>
<th>Type of variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>§ 100.8</td>
<td>Mk 14,70</td>
<td>Mt 26,72 ἀνήρ</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 22,58 ἀνήρ</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in case.</td>
<td>This is another good example of how minor agreements should be weighed and identified. In this instance it is not included in the SCE. There is no doubt that the same word is used. The reason it was not included as an agreement is that in Mt 26,72 the word is applied to Jesus (I do not know the man) whereas in Luke Peter is addressing the one questioning him in the vocative (Man, not me). Ennulat, <em>Die “Minor Agreements”,</em> p. 374, notes that this is generally assessed as being due to independent redaction, he judges it to be due to dependence on a recension. For all that he rates it only (III) which is probably advisable given the significant variation in application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>§ 100.9:1</td>
<td>Mk 14,70</td>
<td>Mt (26,71) ἄλλη</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 22,59 ἄλλος</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in gender.</td>
<td>Not treated by Ennulat. The Marcan sequence of those who challenge Peter is: young woman, young woman (again), bystanders. Matthew has the sequence: young woman, another young woman, those standing. Luke has the sequence of challengers as: young woman, another (male), another (male). SCE didn’t note this agreement it should be corrected for completeness sake. It is a minor agreement among many, and could easily come from independent redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>§ 101.1:1</td>
<td>Mk 15,1</td>
<td>Mt 27,1 γενομένης... πάντες</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 23,1 (22,66) ἐγένετο (22,66) ἡπάν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in verb and adjective, and in the placement.</td>
<td>Mk 15,1 mentions ἢλον the Sanhedrin. Both Matthew and Luke agree in using another adjective for “all” though there is some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§101.3:3</td>
<td>Mk 15,1</td>
<td>Mt 27,2 αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον τῷ.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 23,1 ἠγαγον αὐτὸν τὸν</td>
<td>No – correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in compound verb in Matthew // simple verb in Luke. Variation in case of article and the noun that goes with it.</td>
<td>The SCE needs correction in the use of the pronoun. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 393, rates this as (IV) and the result of independent redaction. The use of the verb, despite the variation, is judged by Ennulat to be due to dependence on a recension and is rated (I/II). For Lk 23,1-5 see FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV), p. 1472, who notes the amount of Lukan formulation is remarkable, and he judges it to be a Lukan reworking of Mark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§103.5</td>
<td>Mk 15,12</td>
<td>Mt 27,21-22 ἀπολύσεω</td>
<td>No – possible correction needed</td>
<td>Lk 23,20 ἀπολύσαι</td>
<td>No – possible correction needed</td>
<td>Variation in the verb in terms of tense and mood. Matthew uses Aor Subj Act 1st Sing / Luke uses Aor Inf Act.</td>
<td>The verb is found in Mk 15,6,9,11, in Mt 27,15,17,21, and in Lk 23,18,20,22 (the last example is unique to Luke). In the context it is not clear that a minor agreement should be indicated. It looks more like Matthew and Luke have freely redacted the scene and placed the verb where they deemed most appropriate. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 387, rates this (III/III). FITZMYER, The Gospel According to Luke, (X-XXIV), p. 1487, sees this part of the episode as coming from Mark, and that it has been re-worked and redacted by Luke. He sees no need for positing an independent source.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§103.8:1</td>
<td>Mk 15,13</td>
<td>Mt 27,22 λέγοντις</td>
<td>Yes – correction of</td>
<td>Lk 23,21 λέγοντες</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation – Matthew uses Pres</td>
<td>Matthew and Luke agree in using another verb than ἔκφασαν found in Mark. ENNULAT,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>§ 103.10:2</td>
<td>Mk 15,14</td>
<td>Mt 27,23 σταυρωθήτω</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 23,23 σταυρωθήναι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation - Matthew uses Aor Impv Pass // Luke has Aor Inf Pass.</td>
<td><em>Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> pp. 388-398, notes the correspondence rating it (III/II). The structural correspondence of the Impf + λέγοντες is suggested to have possibly come from dependence on a recension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>§ 106.1</td>
<td>Mk 15,22</td>
<td>Mt 27,33 ἠλθόντες...</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 23,33 ἠλθόν...</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation Matthew uses Aor Part Act // Luke has Aor Ind Act.</td>
<td>There is clear correspondence in the verb of movement. See Mk 14,10 for the same usage in Matthew and Luke for a verb of naming. This would indicate independent redaction. <em>EENULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> pp. 393-394, rates this as (IV/III). FITZMYER, <em>The Gospel According to Luke</em> (X-XXIV), p. 1500, classifies this as Lukan redaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>§ 106.5:1</td>
<td>Mk 15,25</td>
<td>Mt 27,36 ἑτήρουν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 23,35 ἑθερόν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
<td>There is partial agreement in a general sense that there is a group doing something i.e. either watching or guarding. In Matthew it is the guards, and in Luke it is the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>§ 106.6:1</td>
<td>Mk 15,26</td>
<td>Mt 27,37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk (23,38)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minor variation.</td>
<td><em>EENULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;,</em> p. 395, notes how both Matthew and Luke have distinctly different additional material here. This leads him to the judgement that positing a shared common tradition is speculative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>§ 106.13:2</td>
<td>Mk 15,32</td>
<td>Mt 27,44 λησταί</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 23,39 κακουργησαι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement</td>
<td>Not mentioned by ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”, pp. 397-398 in his treatment of minor agreements in Mk 15,29-32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>§ 107.5</td>
<td>Mk 15,39</td>
<td>Mt 27,54 και τα γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν… λέγοντες</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 23,47 το γενόμενον ἐδόξασεν τόν θεόν λέγον</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Verbal agreement No verbal agreement Verb already found in Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>§ 108.2</td>
<td>Mk 15,42</td>
<td>Mt 27,57 (om) v. 62 παρασκευήν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 23,50 (om) v. 54 παρασκευής</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in placement and case</td>
<td>The SCE did not indicate this as a minor agreement. An instance like this is of interest in that it shows the difficulties associated with determining agreements. In Mk 15,42 mention is made of the day of preparation. Matthew and Luke make no mention of this at the introduction to the scene. Luke mentions the day of preparation later in the scene, as does John 19,42. Matthew mentions the day of preparation in the beginning of the next scene that is unique to that Gospel. Where does a pericope begin or end? Should the word be deemed to be Markan since it is in all three? What are we do with the variation in placement? To my mind it is reasonable to understand this as being the result of independent redaction of a well-established tradition in the Passion narrative. ENNULAT, Die “Minor Agreements”,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>§ 109.4:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 16,2</td>
<td>Mt 28,1 ἐπιφωσκούσῃ</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk (23,54) ἐπέφωσκεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Variation in form. Matthew uses Pres Part Act// Luke has Impf Ind Act.</td>
<td>Neirynck, <em>Horizontal-Line Synopsis,</em> notes the correspondence, also the displacement of the Lukan parallel. The direct parallel is deemed to be Lk 24,1. In Lk 23,54 the verb is used of the beginning of the sabbath at the burial of Jesus. In Matthew it is used of the dawn of the first day of the week. That the word is present in Matthew and Luke is beyond dispute, in determining correspondences how close should the passages be in order to be counted as parallels? The rule of thumb used in the SCE was that of the Gospel synopsis itself. Neither the layout of Aland, <em>Synopsis,</em> p. 324 and p. 325, or Huck-Greeven, <em>Synopsis</em> p. 273 p. 275 would lead one to indicate this as an agreement. That is not to say that it is not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>§ 109.9:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 16,5</td>
<td>Mt 28,3 ἀστρονη</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 24,4 ἀστραπτοίς</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>Matthew has Noun // Luke uses Pres Part Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>§ 109.10:2</td>
<td>§ Mk 16,5</td>
<td>Mt 28,4 φόβοι</td>
<td>No (See. n. 733)</td>
<td>Lk 24,5 ἐμφόβοι</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial agreement.</td>
<td>Matthew uses noun // Luke uses the adjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>§ 109.11</td>
<td>§ Mk 16,5</td>
<td>Mt 28,6 εἰπεν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 24,5 εἰπαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in number.</td>
<td>The similarity and variation was noted in SCE Greek text, not in the English. The reason for this is that Matthew, Mark and Luke share the same verb of saying. Matthew and Luke agree in having the same tense, however, it needs to be admitted that the reference is significantly different. In Matthew it refers to what Jesus said, whereas Luke has the verb of saying referring to the divine messengers. Such a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, Horizontal-Line Synopsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>§ 109.12:1</td>
<td>§ Mk 16,6</td>
<td>Mt 28,5 φοβείσθε…</td>
<td>Lk 24,5 ἐμφώβηθον…</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial agreement - Matthew uses of verb // Luke has the adjective.</td>
<td>correspondence is more apparent than real, particularly given such a frequently occurring verb. ENNULAT, Die &quot;Minor Agreements&quot;, p. 412, rates the agreement as (III) with reference to Neirynck, The Minor Agreements, p. 223, and the shared avoidance of the historic present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 28,6 γάρ…</td>
<td>καθὼς εἶπεν</td>
<td>Lk 24,6 ἄλλα…</td>
<td>ὡς ἐλάλησεν</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No verbal agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 28,8 ἀπαγγείλαι</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lk 24,9 ἀπήγγειλαν</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variation in mood of verb. Matthew uses Aor Inf Act // Luke has Aor Ind Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91 § 109.17 § Mk 16,8 Mt 28,8 ἀπαγγείλαι Yes Lk 24,9 ἀπήγγειλαν Yes Variation in mood of verb. Matthew uses Aor Inf Act // Luke has Aor Ind Act.
## Appendix III - Variations in agreements identified in Neirynck, *Horizontal-Line Synopsis.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>§ 109.18</td>
<td>Mk 16,8</td>
<td>Mt 28,19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lk 24,47</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is low verbal agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two correspondences were not picked up in SCE. The layout of the Aland, Synopsis, p. 332, does not place these texts side by side. The Huck-Greeven, Synopse, p. 279, treats these texts in the same way. There is clearly partial agreement in both texts referring to all the nations and the name. In Matthew the great commission is to baptise is in the name of the Father, Son and Spirit. In Luke repentance and forgiveness are to be preached in Jesus’ name. Emmut does not treat these minor agreements indicated by Neirynck, Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV),* p. 1581, sees “in his name” to be redactional.